United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 165 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JANUARY 15, 2019 No. 8

House of Representatives

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, 2018, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

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

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 440,000 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. COLE) 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. Shutting 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

Printed on recycled paper.

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.

Mr. Speaker, if Leader MCCARTHY truly finds it unacceptable for this shutdown to continue, I ask him and all my Republican colleagues to join us in urging Senator MCCONNELL, who has called shutdowns ''failed policy,'' 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 Area 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, through 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 pain pill addiction does not discriminate on age, race, gender, or socioeconomic status. Your neighbor could be using heroin, and so could their high-honors high school student.

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 are 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 take action. 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, another 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 that 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 personnel. If we had more and modern helicopters, 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 Coast Guard will miss their paychecks today, the first time that I know of in recent history that members of the uniformed military are not being paid by their government.

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 stiffing 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.

□ 1015

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.

For 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 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 declarations and forever remember and honor the actions of the 20-year-old 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.

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 the last 15 years guarding the national borders as a CPB 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 of the Interior Department.

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 ripple effect throughout our economy. It is the Federal workers, but it is also everyday citizens who depend on routine functioning of government in order to meet their obligations.

Let me read a letter from Karle, 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 the 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 paperwork 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 the government, when 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 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

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

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 after his 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 it best when he calls the current impasse ''a political game of chicken.''

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.

HONORING ED BURNS

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 storied career.

A Navy veteran, Ed became a teacher after graduating from La Salle College and Temple University. He later served as the head of the Bensalem Recreation Department and served on the school board.

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.

Jewish people enjoy freedom, acceptance, and assimilation in this country like we never have before. Sadly, in recent years, there has been a disturbing uptick in anti-Semitic rhetoric and acts both in the U.S. and Europe.

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 acts and rhetoric.

This bill elevates the State Department's top position to that of Ambassador, reporting directly to the Secretary of State. The stature of this position sends the strong message that we are committed to combating anti-Semitism here and abroad.

As a Jewish woman, anti-Semitism is personal for me, but we need to understand this in the context of the larger issues of intolerance and White nationalism that are gaining traction in our country right now.

No minority is safe when any minority is targeted. We should all be on high alert when Muslims, Blacks, Latinos, and immigrants are cast as ''the other,'' scapegoated, and dehumanized. We cannot sit idly by while people are targeted for how they dress, how they look, or how they choose to worship.

I ask my counterparts in the Senate to pass this bipartisan bill. Let's show the world that America takes this issue seriously and that hate has no place here.

END HUNGER NOW

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I hope the President will start paying attention to the negative impacts of his pointless government shutdown when, in coming weeks, his actions deliver a devastating blow to some of America's most vulnerable families.

In 2018, over 40 million Americans participated in SNAP, the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, formerly known as food stamps, or about 12 percent of the population.

When the President and Senate Republicans let USDA's funding expire, the problem didn't just affect Federal employees; it extended to low-income families, farmers, and businesses.

If this shutdown continues, 40 million Americans will be at even greater risk of food insecurity as soon as March 2019, not to mention the millions of Americans who participate in child nutrition programs like school meals and other programs like WIC, the Women Infants and Children Food and Nutrition Service.

Last week, Secretary Perdue announced that USDA only has enough money to fund SNAP until the end of February. This means that in a few short weeks, millions of American families won't know where their next meal is coming from simply because the President wanted to throw a temper tantrum over building a wall.

Now, some may ask, why panic over something that won't happen for another month? Our timing on this is crucial. Just because we have time before SNAP, child nutrition programs, or WIC lose funding does not mean that we should wait until the last minute to fix the problem.

Nearly two-thirds of SNAP participants are children, elderly, or people with disabilities. In my home State of Massachusetts, over 760,000 people receive assistance. It is a program that is crucial for low-income, hardworking families.

SNAP is often just a supplement to a person's or family's monthly food budget. The average SNAP participant receives about $126 a month, which breaks down to a little over $1.40 per person, per meal.

□ 1030

Believe it or not, the funds that the President is demanding for his wall could be used to pay for an entire month of food for all 40 million SNAP participants, and then some.

And while the SNAP funding problem starts with low-income families, depending on how long this shutdown continues, furloughed Federal employees themselves may temporarily need to rely on SNAP to keep food on the table.

The shutdown is also negatively impacting thousands of businesses that are seeking and updating their SNAP licenses, not to mention the negative impacts on thousands of farmers who are already feeling the backlash of the President's tariffs. These same farmers are facing further setbacks, because they will now face delays in processing and receiving the exact Federal aid that was promised to help subsidize their losses.

Madam Speaker, none of this has anything to do with the debate over border security. The President should not be holding these families hostage over this debate.

Last Thursday, the House passed a key spending bill to fund the USDA because we recognize the crippling effects that these funding gaps have on the American people. We have programs like SNAP, WIC, and Federal farm loans for a reason: because they make a difference in people's lives.

We owe it to our constituents to listen to their voices and to do the job they elected us to do, but we can't do it without the support of our Senate colleagues. Madam Speaker, our counterparts in the Senate ought to consider all that is at stake when they shut down our government. This isn't about partisanship. This is about acting in the best interest of our constituents.

Today marks the 24th day in what has become the longest Federal shutdown in our country's history, and we have nothing to show for it. What a shame. The President ought to consider the real impact his shutdown is having on Federal employees and low-income families, children, seniors, and persons with disabilities.

It is not a game, Mr. President. This isn't the art of the deal. Real people are being hurt. Real lives are being thrown into chaos. Let's reopen the government so we can have an informed and rational debate about how best to secure our southern border.

Madam Speaker, I am not going to be silent while millions of families are caught in the crosshairs of a medieval solution to the real 21st century challenges this country is facing. Families, children, farmers, and small businesses don't deserve this. We can't let this government shutdown get to a point where we fail to provide our most vulnerable citizens with the food assistance that they need to thrive. That is cruel.

Let us do the job we were sent here to do. Let's end this stupid shutdown. Let's stop families from going hungry, and let's end hunger now.

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. That very 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 he helped to cofound 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 to recall 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 to Lillian Nance Langford as the oldest of six children. He was a proud graduate of Parker High School in Birmingham, Alabama. After high school, he enlisted in the United States Air Force, serving for 5 years during the Vietnam war.

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 6 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 Fairfield, Alabama, 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 more 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.

While Mayor Langford'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

reverse a longstanding Medicare prohibition on critical health services for our seniors.

Since its implementation in 1965, Medicare has excluded coverage for hearing aids and related audiology services, routine dental care, and routine eye exams and eyeglasses, despite the large number of older Americans who critically need these items and services.

The Commonwealth Fund reports that, among all Medicare beneficiaries who needed a hearing aid, only 75 percent did not have one. Of those who had trouble eating because of problems with their teeth, 70 percent had not seen a dentist in the past year. And of those who had trouble seeing, 43 percent had not had an eye exam in the past year. The reason for many seniors was affordability.

According to the latest statistics from the Kaiser Family Foundation, more than half of Medicare beneficiaries live on incomes below $26,200 per year. For them to pay out of pocket creates extreme hardship.

Sadly, reliable data shows that neglect of all health, and even the lack of routine dental exams and cleanings, can deteriorate overall physical health and exacerbate serious and complicated health problems that increase with age.

It is also increasingly well documented that untreated vision and hearing loss diminishes quality of life and increases the risk of costly health outcomes, such as falls and resulting disability, depression, and dementia.

My bill would remove the restrictions currently prohibiting Medicare coverage of these basic healthcare necessities such as eyeglasses, hearing aids, and dental care. Expanding Medicare coverage for these services is a cost-effective intervention that will prevent accidents, falls, cognitive impairments, and increases in chronic conditions and oral cancer.

Madam Speaker, if we do not address these gaps in health coverage now, the overall health of our aging population will continue to suffer and the need for costly and avoidable services will increase. But most importantly, giving our older adults the gift of hearing, vision, and oral health would go a long way toward helping our seniors enjoy their golden years free from depression and social isolation.

It is time to recognize that total healthcare for our seniors must include adequate access to vision, hearing, and dental services. I urge my colleagues to cosponsor the Seniors Have Eyes, Ears, and Teeth Act, and ensure a healthier future for all our seniors.

□ 1045

PUT THE PEOPLE FIRST AND END GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

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

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 Andover with furloughed IRS employees, 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 confronted 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 reopens the Federal Government, 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 largest and 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 was here as a staffer in 1995 during Newt Gingrich's shutdown and remember feeling that it was an unprecedented event, never to happen again. Sadly, that feeling was wrong.

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 to see.

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 the administration keeps the government closed, it threatens the financial security of Federal workers, the people who process our taxes, inspect our food, and ensure airport 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 wherever 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 gentlewoman 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 cataclysmic invasion of Poland starting World War II.

This year, we will commemorate the 80th anniversary of that moment.

Then more recently, Gdansk's redemptive transformative role in world history with the courageous Solidarnosc worker strikes that tripwired the collapse of 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 ascertain 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 gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, today reflects two interesting commemorations. First, it is the actual 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 in a segregated 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 business.

As I mention this, I do it because of where we are today. It is important to note the tragic impact that we cannot see that are not the headlines of Federal employees, their families, but even those who are not Federal employees impacted 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 pathway for that to happen, because 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 be 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.

□ 1100

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 of Pennsylvania. 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, $42 million for 41 days of work, $105 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.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

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

PRAYER

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

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 Defence 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 his 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 U.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 lifesaving 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 they should 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, Johnson's 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.

□ 1215

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, I rise today 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. Kaptur, 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. Garamendi, Ms. Speier, Ms. Gabbard, Mr. Norcross, Mr. Gallego, Mr. Moulton, Mr. Carbajal, Mr. Brown of Maryland, Mr. Khanna, Mr. Keating, Mr. Vela, Mr. Kim, Ms. Kendra S. Horn of Oklahoma, Mr. Cisneros, Ms. Houlahan, Mr. Crow, Ms. Torres Small of New Mexico, Ms. Slotkin, Ms. Sherrill, Ms. Hill of California, Ms. Escobar, Ms. Haaland, Mr. Golden, Mrs. Trahan, and Mrs. Luria.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR: Mrs. Davis of California, Mr. Grijalva, Mr. Courtney, Ms. Fudge, Mr. Sablan, Ms. Wilson of Florida, Ms. Bonamici, Mr. Takano, Ms. Adams, Mr. DeSaulnier, Mr. Norcross, Mr. Krishnamoorthi, Mr. Espaillat, Ms. Jayapal, Mr. Morelle, Ms. Wild, Mr. Harder of California, Mrs. McBath, Ms. Schrier, Ms. Underwood, Mrs. Hayes, Ms. Shalala, Mr. Levin of Michigan, Ms. Omar, Mr. Trone, Ms. Stevens, and Mrs. Lee of Nevada.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE: Mr. Rush, Ms. Eshoo, Mr. Engel, Ms. DeGette, Mr. Michael F. 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, Mr. Loebsack, Mr. Schrader, Mr. Kennedy, Mr. Cárdenas, Mr. Ruiz, Mr. Peters, Mrs. Dingell, Mr. Veasey, Ms. Kuster of New Hampshire, Ms. Kelly of Illinois, Ms. Barragán, 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. Larson 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. DelBene, Ms. Judy Chu of California, Ms. Moore, Mr. Kildee, Mr. Brendan F. Boyle of Pennsylvania, Mr. Beyer, Mr. Evans, Mr. Schneider, Mr. Suozzi, Mr. Panetta, Mrs. Murphy, Mr. Gomez, and Mr. Horsford.

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. WATSON COLEMAN). 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 9:35 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 recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or votes objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

The House will resume proceedings on postponed questions at a later time.

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, 2019 (division C 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 gentlewoman from Texas (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 a full-year agreement 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 then 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 flooding our shores. Tens of 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

remain 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, who is the chair-designate of the Energy and Water Development, and Related Agencies Subcommittee.

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Speaker, I thank Chairwoman LOWEY 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 service workers 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 laughing up a storm. They already ship it here hidden in legal cargo. They dug tunnels under the 650 miles of border that already exists. They figured that out. And they have been flying 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 don't 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 departments and pay the men 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 an additional 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 don't stop the drug trade or undocumented migration of individuals by shuttering the entire Department of Homeland Security or furloughing the border agents or making them go to work with no pay. He has 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 the time.

Madam Speaker, I think we all agree that the American people expect this legislative body to deliver solutions to the difficult challenges that face our Nation each and every day.

As a longtime member of the Appropriations Committee, I have worked with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle over the years to try to reach agreements when we were trying to fund the Federal Government. What we have to do is try to find common ground.

The matter of how we fully fund the Federal Government for the remainder of FY19, of course, remains unsolved basically for one reason: My colleagues on the other side of the aisle won't negotiate. They have rejected requests to negotiate a deal. They need to come to the table with a counteroffer. Instead, they continue to kick the can down the road and continue to play politics with this issue.

Our colleagues reject the solutions requested by the professional personnel who actually protect the border. By digging in a position which is political and not policy, ultimately, they are responsible for the shutdown of the government agencies.

However, this short-term CR, known as a continuing resolution, does not solve the problem. The Democratic leadership has said 100 percent no. This bill hits, basically, the snooze button for a few more weeks. I think it is time that our colleagues on the other side of the aisle wake up and negotiate and come back to the table to find a real solution.

Mrs. LOWEY. Madam Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman 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.

This week, I spoke with a room full of these victims. Aviation safety experts detailed for me how the Trump shutdown has eroded 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.

□ 1230

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.

Democrats in the House 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 coequal branch of government that the Constitution describes.

So today, House Democrats will do just that and give Senate Republicans 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 into law without delay.

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 my Democratic colleagues pull political stunts rather than make serious efforts to find a compromise to reopen the government.

This legislation that we have before us today has only seen the light of day for less than 24 hours. Democratic leadership is abusing the suspension list—something usually reserved for 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 partisan 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 calls, it is incumbent upon us 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, I rise 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 who decide not to vote, they count 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 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 the economy 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.

Rather than 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 ''no'' 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 gentlewoman 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 that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

SECTION 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

(2) in paragraph (5)(A)—

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

(B) by inserting ''for what by law the agency is responsible'' after ''under this Act''.

SEC. 3. NOTIFICATION OF VIOLATION.

Section 202 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 prohibited by a provision of law covered by paragraph (1) or (2) of section 201(a), as applicable, the head of the agency subject to the finding 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 the discriminatory or retaliatory act 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 and protections 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—

(A) by inserting ''Homeland Security and'' before ''Governmental Affairs'';

(B) by inserting ''Oversight and'' before ''Government Reform''; and

(C) by inserting ''(in an electronic format prescribed by the Office of Personnel Management)'' after ''an 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.

(3) TRANSITION PERIOD.—Notwithstanding the requirements of section 203(a) 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 60 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 (9)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(B) in subparagraph (B)(ii), by striking the period at the end and inserting '', and''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(C) for each such finding counted under subparagraph (A), the agency shall specify—

''(i) the date of the finding;

''(ii) the affected agency;

''(iii) the law violated; and

''(iv) whether a decision has been made regarding necessary disciplinary action as a result of the finding.''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(11) Data regarding each class action complaint filed against the agency alleging discrimination or retaliation, including—

''(A) information regarding the date on which each complaint was filed;

''(B) a general summary of the allegations alleged in the complaint;

''(C) an estimate of the total number of plaintiffs joined in the complaint if known;

''(D) the current status of the complaint, including whether the class has been certified; and

''(E) the case numbers for the civil actions in which discrimination or retaliation has been found.''.

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 ANTIDISCRIMINATION 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 2302(b)(1) of title 5, United States Code, and adjudicated through the Equal Employment Opportunity process from inception to 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, after all appeals relating to such action have been exhausted, include a notation of the adverse action and the reason for the action in the employee's personnel record.''.

(b) PROCESSING AND REFERRAL.—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:

''TITLE IV—PROCESSING AND REFERRAL

''SEC. 401. PROCESSING 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. 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 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 purposes of seeking 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 initiates disciplinary action.

''(d) SPECIAL COUNSEL APPROVAL.—A Federal agency may not take disciplinary action against a Federal employee for an alleged act of discrimination or retaliation referred by the Commission under this section except in accordance with the requirements of section 1214(f) of title 5, United States Code.''.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—The table of contents in section 1(b) of the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (5 U.S.C. 2301 note) is amended—

(1) by inserting after the item relating to section 206 the following:

''Sec. 207. Complaint tracking.

''Sec. 208. Notation in personnel record.''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''TITLE IV—PROCESSING AND REFERRAL

''Sec. 401. Processing and resolution of complaints.

''Sec. 402. No limitation on Human Capital or General Counsel advice.

''Sec. 403. Head of Program reports to head of agency.

''Sec. 404. Referrals of findings of discrimination.''.

SEC. 8. NONDISCLOSURE AGREEMENT LIMITATION.

Section 2302(b) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (13)—

(A) by inserting ''or the Office of Special Counsel'' after ''Inspector General'';

(B) by striking ''implement'' and inserting ''(A) implement''; and

(C) by striking the period that follows the quoted material and inserting ''; or''; and

(2) by adding after subparagraph (A), as added by paragraph (1)(B), and preceding the flush left matter that follows paragraph (13), the following:

''(B) implement or enforce any nondisclosure policy, form, or agreement, if such policy, form, or agreement prohibits or restricts

an employee from disclosing to Congress, the Office of Special Counsel, or an Office of the Inspector General any information that relates to any violation of any law, rule, or regulation, or mismanagement, a gross waste of funds, an abuse of authority, or a substantial, and specific danger to public health or safety, or any other whistleblower protection.''.

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. 135.

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.

Madam Speaker, today I am very pleased to bring to the floor six bills from the Committee on Oversight and Reform. Each bill, I am very glad to say, enjoys bipartisan sponsorship. These measures will strengthen protections for Federal employees and for congressional interns and enhance accountability and improve the Federal procurement and grant processes.

The first measure we are bringing today is H.R. 135, the Federal Employee Antidiscrimination Act. This bill is essentially identical to legislation that has passed the House in each of the two previous Congresses. In the 114th Congress, the measure passed by a vote of 403–0; and in the last Congress, it passed by voice vote.

Madam Speaker, I thank my colleagues—Representatives MEADOWS, NORTON, SENSENBRENNER, and JACKSON LEE—for working with me on this measure.

□ 1245

I thank them for their leadership and their commitment for improving our Federal equal opportunity programs.

Let me also thank Tanya Ward Jordan, Paulette Taylor, and all the members of the Coalition 4 Change, known as C4C, for their work on this measure and for their years of perseverance as we have worked to try to get this measure enacted into law.

One of my highest priorities as chairman of the Oversight Committee is to protect the right of every single Federal employee, every Federal job applicant, and indeed of every citizen, to equality of opportunity. While the clear majority of Federal workplaces are in compliance with the standards for a model Equal Employment Opportunity program promulgated by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, sadly, some still are not. It is past time for these failures to be corrected.

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 employees suffer 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 the head of each agency 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 shut down 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 get paid so 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 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. 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 identify and correct instances of discrimination throughout the Federal Government.

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 discriminatory 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 Capital of the United States—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 desiring to work 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 dictatorial 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, not to mention a court suit that is probably being prepared, just in case, as I speak.

But, Madam Speaker, I am coming to the floor as well to urge our committee—and the new Democratic majority of which I am a member—to use this crisis of Trump's making to carefully rethink the President's emergency powers, leaving him ample room to move in case of an actual emergency while giving Congress more latitude to contain executive excess.

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

Mr. CUMMINGS. Madam Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia an additional 2 minutes.

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, in the meantime, I want to lay before the House the easiest of compromises. When I was a tenured professor of law at Georgetown University Law School, I taught negotiations. We usually worked with a number of issues in a negotiation at the same time. However, the easiest compromise to reach is one that involves a number. The number the President clings to is $5 billion. I can think of endless ways—and I am sure every Member can—to compromise that number.

So in the name of a mounting number of Americans who are beginning to feel the consequences of the shutdown, though they are not Federal employees—not to mention the Federal employees themselves—I am asking even for my side to make a more concerted effort to reach an agreeable number, even though the polls show that the American people are with the Democrats on this issue.

As a suggestion, I ask that the Democrats appoint a subcommittee and that the administration do the same to 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 who are Democrats who control this House. I ask that we accept it, use it, run with it, and settle this matter now.

Madam Speaker, I thank 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 constantly go in to the 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.

□ 1300

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 to 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 simply want to have a nice day, who simply want to have some reasonable entertainment that does not cost them a lot by going for a walk in the park; for getting the services that are needed; for making sure that our airplanes do not have folks on them carrying guns.

These folks who we saw in the airport over the weekend, they are the same ones who are coming in day after day and working for no pay. We are better than that, and I am praying that we will get this issue resolved.

The gentlewoman from the District of Columbia talked about the number of people who she has in her district who are Federal employees. We, in Maryland, have over 100,000 Federal employees, and we have so many people who work for the Federal Government through contracting. There must be a way to get this done.

I am going to close, but I will give the gentlewoman her opportunity, and then I will come back, Madam Speaker. Therefore, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. 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.

I thank my colleagues who worked very hard on this bill: Congressman MEADOWS, Congresswoman NORTON, Congressman SENSENBRENNER, 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 Security and Governmental 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 enable 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 instance of waste, 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 the same representation 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 employers 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 and deserve.

For these reasons, I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 135 to strengthen the policies surrounding work place 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. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

FEDERAL INTERN PROTECTION ACT OF 2019

Mr. CUMMINGS. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 136) to amend title 5, United States Code, to protect unpaid interns in the Federal Government from workplace harassment and discrimination, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 136

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 Intern Protection Act of 2019''.

SEC. 2. PROHIBITED PERSONNEL PRACTICES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 2302 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(g)(1) All protections afforded to an employee under subparagraphs (A), (B), and (D) of subsection (b)(1) shall be afforded, in the same manner and to the same extent, to an intern and an applicant for internship.

''(2) For purposes of the application of this subsection, a reference to an employee shall be considered a reference to an intern in—

''(A) section 717 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000e–16);

''(B) sections 12 and 15 of the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967 (29 U.S.C. 631, 633a); and

''(C) section 501 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 791).

''(3) In this subsection, the term 'intern' means an individual who performs uncompensated voluntary service in an agency to earn credit awarded by an educational institution or to learn a trade or occupation.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 3111(c)(1) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting ''section 2302(g) (relating to prohibited personnel practices),'' before ''chapter 81''.

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 materials on H.R. 136.

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 which 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 the American people. Federal internship programs help agencies identify and develop the next generation of Federal employees. In exchange, interns gain valuable work experience.

Many interns 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.

Unfortunately, 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 intern candidate.

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 rely on the discretion and integrity of the managers to prevent this behavior.

I still say we can do better than that, so I urge the House to join me today in supporting this measure. I look forward to working with my Senate colleagues to move this bill through the Senate and, finally, get it to the President's desk.

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

Mr. CASTEN of Illinois. Madam Speaker, today I will cast my vote in favor of H.R. 136, The Federal Intern Protection Act of 2019. But I will do so with the concern that it does not go far enough. This bill, for all of the improved protections it does afford, fails to provide to Federal interns with the basic safeguards against harassment that are common to their counterparts in corporate America.

Having spent 16 years as a CEO of companies ranging from 10–200 employees, I know this subject well. In my private-sector workplaces, our harassment policies protected paid and unpaid employees from harassment as this bill does. But those policies did not stop there. We also prohibited harassment against any contractors or suppliers who were on our premises or who were working with our staff in environments that were reasonably considered to be work related—for example, at an off-site dinner meeting.

We then went further still and required that any contractors or 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.

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 workspace not only for our paid and unpaid employees but also for committee staff, and staff from other Members' offices, as well as visitors.

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 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.

Section 8E of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended—

(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 gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland.

□ 1315

GENERAL LEAVE

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 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.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 202, the Inspector General Access Act. I thank Representatives RICHMOND, HICE, and LYNCH for the bipartisan manner in which they worked on this very important bill in the last Congress.

The Inspector General Access Act would allow the inspector general of the Department of Justice to investigate allegations of misconduct by Department attorneys. The IG is statutorily independent and currently has the authority to investigate other DOJ personnel.

The IG is barred from pursuing appropriate investigations into attorneys at the Department. Under current law, the authority to investigate attorneys is restricted to the Office of Professional Responsibility within DOJ. OPR is not statutorily independent, and its head is not confirmed by the Senate like the IG is. Treating attorneys differently from other personnel is simply unfair.

Michael Horowitz, the inspector general at the Department of Justice, recently testified before our Committee on Oversight and Reform, and this is what he said: ''This bifurcated jurisdiction creates a system where misconduct by FBI agents and other DOJ law enforcement officers is conducted by a statutorily-independent IG appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate, while misconduct by DOJ prosecutors is investigated by a component head who is appointed by the Department's leadership and who lacks statutory independence. There is no principled reason for treating misconduct by Federal prosecutors differently than misconduct by DOJ law enforcement agents.''

H.R. 202 would not prohibit OPR from investigating attorneys. It would simply add the ability to investigate attorneys, when appropriate to the IG's authority, an additional layer of accountability.

Empowering IGs has been and should continue to be a nonpartisan issue. The Committee on Oversight and Reform relies on the work of IGs. We strongly support efforts to help them do their jobs effectively and efficiently.

A bill identical to the one before us passed the House on a voice vote in the last Congress. I urge my colleagues to continue their support for IGs by supporting the Inspector General Access Act.

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 continuance 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 allegations of misconduct by 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 1988. At the time DOJ IG was created, OPR retained the specific authority.

H.R. 202 seeks to harmonize the Department of Justice IG's investigative authority with the rest of the Federal inspectors general who are not similarly restricted. Congress and this committee have consistently supported the need for independent and transparent oversight of Federal agencies and programs. The current bifurcation of investigative authority at DOJ is inconsistent with this committee's history of supporting the notion of an unencumbered IG.

The DOJ IG is not without its own oversight. The IG is confirmed by the Senate, accountable to the public, and is only removable by the President after notification to Congress. Further, the IG has statutory reporting obligations to both agency leadership and Congress.

The OPR, in contrast, lacks such independence from the agency it is obligated to investigate. The director of OPR is selected and appointed by the attorney general, answers to the attorney general, and can be removed or disciplined only by the attorney general. The IG's independence is critical to the value of their work.

Also critical to the value of the IG's work is transparency. The IG maintains transparency by publishing its reports on a public website. The website also contains information about the IG's operations and functions and a full archive of completed and ongoing work. This standard of transparency does not apply to OPR. Adverse findings by OPR against a DOJ lawyer are subject to review by the Department's leadership and can be overruled by the Department's leadership without any transparency.

It is important to note that this division of authority is a unique situation amongst the Federal IG community. The need for this legislation has also been discussed in multiple hearings before the Oversight and Reform Committee and in reports by watchdog groups.

The DOJ IG, Michael Horowitz, testified before the Oversight and Reform Committee on the importance of eliminating this discrepancy. Congress's own watchdog, the Government Accountability Office, has issued reports with recommendations to empower the DOJ IG.

This is a good bill, Madam Speaker, 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 gentlewoman 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, but 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.

Based on newly reported documents 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 IG 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—as 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 unusual 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 multimillionaire 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.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL,
November 29, 2018.

Hon. TREY GOWDY,
Chairman, Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Hon. ELIJAH E. CUMMINGS,
Ranking Member, Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN AND RANKING MEMBER CUMMINGS: I write to express my strong support for H.R. 3154, the ''Inspector General Access Act of 2017'' (Access Act), which your Committee approved unanimously on September 27, 2018. The Access Act would amend the Inspector General Act (IG Act) to provide the Department of Justice (DOJ) Office of the Inspector General (OIG) with authority to investigate allegations of misconduct against DOJ attorneys for their actions as lawyers, just as the OIG has authority under the IG Act to investigate allegations of misconduct made against any non-lawyer in the Department, including law enforcement agents at the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA), the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives (ATF), and the U.S. Marshals Service (USMS). Currently, under Section 8E of the Inspector General Act, the OIG does not have the authority to investigate allegations of misconduct made against DOJ attorneys acting in their capacity as lawyers; this role is reserved exclusively for the Department's Office of Professional Responsibility (OPR).

The Access Act has received broad, bipartisan support over successive Congresses because it promotes independent oversight, transparency, and accountability within DOJ and for all of its employees. For these

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 attorney misconduct was inconsistent with 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 investigate alleged professional misconduct by attorneys who work in the agency it oversees. 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.

Alleged professional misconduct by DOJ prosecutors, like any alleged misconduct by DOJ agents, should be subject to statutorily independent oversight:

Over fifteen years ago, the Department and Congress recognized the importance of statutorily independent OIG oversight over all DOJ law enforcement components (FBI, DEA, USMS, and ATF) when Attorney General Ashcroft authorized the OIG to conduct additional law enforcement oversight in 2001 and Congress legislated it in 2002. Yet, allegations against Department prosecutors for professional misconduct continue to be handled exclusively by OPR. As a result, presently, if an allegation of misconduct is made against the FBI Director, it is reviewed by the OIG; by contrast, if an allegation of professional misconduct is made against the Attorney General, it is handled by OPR, a Departmental component that the Attorney General supervises.

The rationale supporting independent oversight for alleged misconduct by law enforcement applies with equal force to alleged wrongdoing by federal prosecutors, regardless of the nature of the alleged misconduct. There is no principled reason to have two standards of oversight at DOJ—one for federal agents, who are subject to statutorily independent and transparent oversight by the OIG, and one for federal prosecutors, who are not for allegations of professional misconduct. This is particularly true given the extraordinary power that Department lawyers have to charge individuals with crimes, to seek incarceration, and to pursue the seizure of assets and property.

The OIG's independence, established by statutory authorities and protections, facilitates objective and credible investigations of misconduct allegations, as well as unbiased reports that identify and make useful recommendations for improving the Department. The OIG is headed by a Senate-confirmed Inspector General who can only be removed by the President, with prior notice to Congress. The OIG's statutory independence is bolstered by the OIG's dual obligation to report findings and concerns both to the Attorney General and to Congress. The independent OIG is able to make critical investigative and audit findings without fear of reprisal.

Conversely, OPR has no statutory independence or protections. The OPR Counsel is appointed by and answers to the Attorney General, and can be removed or disciplined by the Attorney General. Although a November 27, 2018 letter from DOJ's Office of Legislative Affairs (OLA) on H.R. 3154 states that ''OPR has always acted independently,'' it does not point to any protections, statutory or otherwise, that exist to ensure OPR's independence from the Attorney General, nor has DOJ proposed strengthening OPR's independence by adding such protections. Indeed, the letter fails to explain or even address why DOJ believes it is better to have a non-statutorily independent entity handle attorney professional misconduct cases rather than a statutorily independent organization, as is the case for law enforcement professional misconduct allegations.

The OIG's independent and transparent oversight enhances the public's confidence in the DOD's programs and improves its operations:

In addition to independence, the OIG considers transparency a crucial component of its oversight mission. With limited exceptions, the OIG ensures that the public is aware of the results of our work. The majority of our reports are posted on our public website at the time of release to ensure that Congress and the public are informed of our findings, in a comprehensive and timely manner. The OIG, consistent with the IG Act, publishes on our website summaries of investigations resulting in findings of administrative misconduct by senior government employees and in matters of public interest even when the subject is not prosecuted. We post such summaries without identifying the investigative subject consistent with the legal requirements under the Privacy Act. Because of this commitment to transparency, there are currently hundreds of OIG reports, audits, and reviews posted on our web site. There are also summaries of dozens of OIG investigative reports posted, including recent reports involving significant misconduct by senior DOJ officials.

In contrast, there are currently only a total of five reports (other than annual reports) posted on OPR's website. Four of those five reports are from 2008 and were the result of OPR's joint work with the OIG, and which the OIG posted on our website consistent with the IG Act and our practice. The fifth report was completed by OPR in 2013 and only released in 2015 in response to a Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) request. Moreover, although the OLA letter states that ''OPR discloses a substantial amount of information about its work and findings in its annual report,'' this information is not reported in a timely or comprehensive manner. Congress and the public only find out about some, but not necessarily all, of OPR's work when it issues an annual report.

An example of this dichotomy can be found in a case involving an Oregon lawyer who was arrested by the FBI and wrongly imprisoned after mismatched fingerprints linked him to the 2004 bombing at a Madrid train station. The OIG investigated the allegations of FBI agent misconduct, while the Department's OPR investigated the allegations of attorney misconduct. This bifurcation led to inconsistent treatment. The OIG report on the actions of the FBI agents was published on the OIG's website, but OPR did not publish the report on the conduct of the DOJ attorneys who were involved in the same case.

Transparency ensures greater accountability, and sends an important deterrent message to other Department employees. The credibility of the Department's disciplinary process is inevitably reduced when the responsible component operates under the direction of the Department's senior leadership and is not subject to public scrutiny because of limited transparency.

The OIG has demonstrated its excellence in reviewing complex legal and factual issues, including employee ethics and misconduct matters:

Over the past 30 years, the OIG has shown that it is capable of fair and independent oversight of the DOJ. The jurisdictional limitation of Section 8E(b)(3) is an unnecessary historical vestige of the fact that OPR was in existence prior to the statutory creation of the OIG in 1988. Those who unsuccessfully tried in 2002 to forestall Congress from providing the OIG with oversight of alleged misconduct by FBI and DEA agents contended that those cases required specialized expertise—just like the Department argues currently that prosecutorial oversight requires specialized expertise—and that argument was roundly rejected and has proven to be entirely without merit. The decision by Congress to extend OIG jurisdiction in 2002 to encompass misconduct by FBI and DEA agents has allowed for significant and important oversight of DOJ's law enforcement operations, and has had significant positive impact on the integrity of those agencies' operations.

The OIG has consistently demonstrated our ability to handle complex legal and factual issues 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 prior to the 2016 presidential election, which involved evaluating the professional conduct by FBI agents, FBI lawyers, and FBI senior officials, we have investigated the FBI's actions involving its former agent Robert Hanssen, the FBI's activities related to James ''Whitey'' Bulger, the DEA's oversight of its confidential informant program, the DEA and other components' handling of sexual misconduct and harassment cases, the operation of the FBI laboratory, ATF's actions involving Operation Fast and Furious, and the FBI's use of its national security authorities (National Security Letters, Patriot Act Section 215, FISA Amendment Act Section 702).

Each of those and many other reviews resulted in independent and transparent findings by the OIG, and resulted in changes to Department operations that enhanced their effectiveness and thereby increased the public's confidence in those programs. Moreover, OIGs throughout the government, including at the Department of Homeland Security and the Securities and Exchange Commission, have authority to investigate misconduct allegations made against attorneys at those agencies and they have demonstrated that they are fully capable of dealing with such matters covering a wide range of complex legal issues. The DOJ OIG is the only OIG, to our knowledge, that is barred by the IG Act from reviewing misconduct by lawyers within the agency it oversees.

The Access Act would provide the OIG with oversight over Department lawyers in a manner that is entirely consistent with its oversight authority over Department non-attorneys:

The present oversight system that applies to allegations made against any DOJ nonlawyer, as provided for in the IG Act and Department regulations, is precisely the oversight mechanism that the Access Act seeks to apply to Department lawyers. Specifically, under the current system for DOJ nonlawyers, all non-frivolous misconduct allegations must be provided to the OIG for the OIG's review and determination as to whether it is of the type and nature that warrants and necessitates independent OIG investigation. Given the OIG's limited resources, the OIG handles only those allegations that warrant an independent OIG investigation, and therefore the OIG returns routine and less serious misconduct allegations to Department components, such as the FBI's Inspections Division and the DEA's OPR, for their handling and investigation. For those matters that the OIG retains, when the OIG completes its investigation, it sends its report to

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 ''different investigative standards,'' ''decrease[d] efficiency,'' or ''inconsistent application'' of legal standards. There is no evidence that it has impacted the components ''ability to successfully defend any significant discipline decision before the Merit Systems Protection Board.'' Yet this parade of horribles is precisely what the OLA letter claims will occur if attorneys are treated in the same manner as Special Agents and nonattorneys 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 federal 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 quick and bipartisan action this body will take today when we pass this bill so that we can get it to the President's desk for his signature as soon as possible.

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

Mr. RICHMOND. Madam Speaker, I want to thank Chairman CUMMINGS for bringing this important legislation to the Floor.

In 2005, shortly after Hurricane Katrina, a group of New Orleans police officers opened fire on a handful of unarmed African American civilians walking across Danziger Bridge, killing two and injuring four.

This occurred during the heart of the Hurricane Katrina aftermath and left deep scars on our community.

Years later five officers were convicted on a variety of charges for these actions.

However, their convictions were vacated in 2013 due to misconduct by Department of Justice prosecutors.

In my efforts to find out what happened and why, and to also get transparency for my constituents, I received a DOJ report that was heavily redacted and missing crucial facts.

I also learned that the DOJ Inspector General lacked the authority to investigate those actions.

The DOJ was being left to investigate itself in situations like this and the American people were being left without the full story.

That ultimately led to the victims and their families never receiving the full measure of justice they were owed.

This bill grants the Office of the Inspector General for the Department of Justice the authority to investigate alleged misconduct committed by Department of Justice attorneys when they act in their capacity as lawyers.

Currently, the OIG has jurisdiction to review alleged misconduct by non-lawyers in the DOJ, but the DOJ's own Office of Professional Responsibility exercises jurisdiction over alleged misconduct committed by DOJ attorneys when they are litigating, investigating, or providing legal advice.

From fiscal year 2002 through fiscal year 2013, Office of Professional Responsibility documented more than 650 infractions, including allegations that federal attorneys intentionally misled courts and alleged abuses of the grand jury or indictment process.

In most of these matters—more than 400—OPR categorized the violations at the more severe end of the scale: recklessness or intentional misconduct as opposed to error or poor judgment.

However, the DOJ does not make public the names of attorneys who acted improperly or the defendants whose cases were affected. As a result, the DOJ, its lawyers, and the internal watchdog office itself are protected from meaningful public scrutiny and accountability.

This simple change in jurisdiction will ensure that people facing federal charges get a fair day in court and that the U.S. government is properly represented in disputes with corporations where taxpayer dollars are on the line.

We must ensure that innocent people are not wrongly convicted and sent to prison, and that tainted cases do not cause convictions of guilty parties to be thrown out.

With stakes as high as these, it is essential that DOJ attorneys be held to highest possible standards of accountability.

While the Office of Professional Responsibility's investigations and actions are notorious for their secrecy, the OIG's independence and transparency will enhance the public's confidence in DOJ's operations.

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.

This 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

''(a) 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 produced or manufactured in the United States.

''(b) AVAILABILITY EXCEPTION.—Subsection (a) does not apply to the extent that the head of the agency concerned determines that satisfactory quality and sufficient quantity of a flag described in such subsection cannot be procured as and when needed at United States market prices.

''(c) 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 commissary, military exchange, or nonappropriated fund instrumentality operated by an agency.

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

''(d) PRESIDENTIAL WAIVER.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The President may waive the requirement in subsection (a) if the President determines a waiver is necessary to comply with any trade agreement to which the United States is a party.

''(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 102 of title 40.

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

(2) 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)(1), 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.

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 have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 113.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1330

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 certain 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 agency flag purchases, 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 law governing DOD 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 ''an Administrator'' and inserting ''a Federal Chief Information Officer''; and

(ii) by inserting before the period at the end the following: ''and 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 (e), by striking ''The Administrator'' and inserting ''The Federal Chief Information Officer'';

(G) in subsection (f)—

(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''; and

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

''(18) Oversee 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 (f)—

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

(ii) in paragraph (5), by striking ''the Administrator'' and inserting ''the Federal Chief Information Officer''.

(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**'';

(B) in subsection (a)—

(i) in paragraph (1), by striking ''E–Government Fund'' and inserting ''Federal IT Fund''; and

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

(C) in subsection (b), by striking ''Administrator'' each place it appears and inserting ''Federal Chief Information Officer''; and

(D) in subsection (c), by striking ''the Administrator'' and inserting ''the Federal Chief Information Officer''.

(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 '', the Administrator,'' and inserting '', the Federal Chief Information Officer,''; and

(C) in subsection (c)—

(i) in paragraph (1)—

(I) by striking ''The Administrator'' and inserting ''The Federal Chief Information Officer''; and

(II) by striking ''proposals submitted to the Administrator'' and inserting ''proposals submitted to the Federal Chief Information Officer'';

(ii) in paragraph (2)(B), by striking ''the Administrator'' and inserting ''the Federal Chief Information Officer''; and

(iii) in paragraph (4)—

(I) by striking ''the Administrator'' and inserting ''the Federal Chief Information Officer''; and

(II) by striking ''E–Government Fund'' and inserting ''Federal IT Fund''.

(6) E-GOVERNMENT REPORT.—Section 3606 of title 44, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in the heading, by striking ''**E–Government**'' and inserting ''**Annual**''; and

(B) in subsection (a), by striking ''an E–Government status report to the Committee on Governmental Affairs of the Senate and 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''.

(7) TREATMENT OF INCUMBENT.—The individual serving as the Administrator of the Office of Electronic Government under section 3602 of title 44, United States Code, as of the date of the enactment of this Act, may continue to serve as the Federal Chief Information Officer commencing as of that date, without further appointment under such section.

(8) REFERENCES.—Any reference to the Administrator of the Office of Electronic Government in any law, regulation, document, record, or other paper of the United States shall be deemed to be a reference to the Federal Chief Information Officer.

(9) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) TABLE OF SECTIONS FOR CHAPTER 36 OF TITLE 44.—The table of sections for chapter 36 of title 44, United States Code, is amended—

(i) by striking the item relating to section 3602 and inserting the following new item:

''3602. Office of the Federal Chief Information Officer.'';

(ii) by striking the item relating to section 3604 and inserting the following new item:

''3604. Federal IT Fund.'';

and

(iii) in the item relating to section 3606, by striking ''E–Government'' and inserting ''Annual''.

(B) PRESIDENTIAL INNOVATION FELLOWS PROGRAM ADVISORY BOARD.—Section 3172(b)(3) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking ''the Administrator of the Office of Electronic Government of the Office of Management and Budget'' and inserting ''the Federal Chief Information Officer''.

(C) POSITIONS AT LEVEL III.—Section 5314 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking ''Administrator of the Office of Electronic Government'' and inserting ''Federal Chief Information Officer''.

(D) TABLE OF SECTIONS FOR CHAPTER 5 OF TITLE 31.—The table of sections for chapter 5 of subtitle I of title 31, United States Code, is amended by striking the item relating to section 507 and inserting the following new item:

''507. Office of the Federal Chief Information Officer.''.

(E) OFFICE OF ELECTRONIC GOVERNMENT.—Section 507 of title 31, United States Code, is amended—

(i) in the heading, by striking ''**OFFICE OF ELECTRONIC GOVERNMENT**'' and inserting ''**OFFICE OF THE FEDERAL CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICER**''; and

(ii) by striking ''The Office of Electronic Government'' and inserting ''The Office of the Federal Chief Information Officer''.

(F) PROGRAM MANAGEMENT IMPROVEMENT OFFICERS AND PROGRAM MANAGEMENT POLICY COUNCIL.—Section 1126(b)(3)(A)(i)(II) of title 31, United States Code, is amended by striking ''The Administrator of the Office of Electronic Government'' and inserting ''The Federal Chief Information Officer''.

(G) ELECTRONIC GOVERNMENT AND INFORMATION TECHNOLOGIES.—Section 305 of title 40, United States Code, is amended by striking ''the Administrator of the Office of Electronic Government'' and inserting ''the Federal Chief Information Officer''.

(H) CAPITAL PLANNING AND INVESTMENT CONTROL.—Section 11302(c)(4) of title 40, United States Code, is amended by striking ''the Administrator of the Office of Electronic Government'' each place it appears and inserting ''the Federal Chief Information Officer''.

(I) RESOURCES, PLANNING, AND PORTFOLIO MANAGEMENT.—Section 11319(d) of title 40, United States Code, is amended by striking ''Administrator of the Office of Electronic Government'' each place it appears and inserting ''Federal Chief Information Officer''.

(J) E-GOVERNMENT ACT OF 2002.—Section 207(f)(3)(C) of the E-Government Act of 2002 (Public Law 107–347; 44 U.S.C. 3501 note) is amended by striking ''the Administrator of the Office of Electronic Government'' and inserting ''the Federal Chief Information Officer''.

(b) ESTABLISHMENT OF CHIEF INFORMATION SECURITY OFFICER AND REPORT ON IT EXPENDITURES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 36 of title 44, United States Code, is further amended by adding at the end the following new sections:

''§ 3607. Federal Chief Information Security Officer

''(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established in the Office of Management and Budget a Federal Chief Information Security Officer, who shall—

''(1) be appointed by the President;

''(2) be within the Office of the Federal Chief Information Officer; and

''(3) report directly to the Federal Chief Information Officer.

''(b) DUTIES.—The Federal Chief Information Security Officer shall—

''(1) direct the cybersecurity efforts of the Office of Management and Budget;

''(2) carry out the duties of the Director related to the security of information and information systems for agencies, including the duties and responsibilities assigned to the Director under subchapter II of chapter 35; and

''(3) carry out such other duties and powers assigned by the President, the Director, or the Federal Chief Information Officer.

''§ 3608. Technology investment planning and oversight process

''(a) REPORT ON INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY EXPENDITURES.—The head of each agency shall submit to the Federal Chief Information Officer a report on any expenditure on information technology by that agency.

''(b) IMPLEMENTATION.—The Director shall establish a process to implement subsection (a), and may update such process, as necessary, that shall—

''(1) use a widely accepted industry standard taxonomy with common data elements and definitions; and

''(2) display, on a website accessible to the public, timely, searchable, computer-readable data on the information technology expenditures, projects, and programs of agencies, if such information would otherwise be subject to public disclosure under section 552 of title 5, commonly known as the Freedom of Information Act.''.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 36 of title 44, United States Code, is further amended by adding at the end the following new item:

''3607. Federal Chief Information Security Officer.

''3608. Technology investment planning and oversight process.''.

(3) DEADLINE.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director shall establish the process described in section 3608(b) of title 44, United States Code, as added by paragraph (1).

(4) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Federal Chief Information Officer shall submit to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate a report on the status of establishing the process described in section 3608(b) of title 44, United States Code, as added by paragraph (1).

SEC. 3. PROPOSAL RELATED TO SHARED SERVICES.

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Federal Chief Information Officer shall submit to Congress a proposal for consolidating information technology across the Federal Government, especially among Federal agencies not referred to under 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 proposal.

SEC. 4. NO ADDITIONAL FUNDS AUTHORIZED.

No additional funds are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this Act and the amendments made by this Act. This Act and the amendments made by this Act 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 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

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 Federal Chief Information Security Officer, who 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 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. FOXX 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 role to the formation of 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 somebody like Mr. HURD, who is very, very familiar with these sometimes 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 at 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 Office (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 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 Funding Accountability and Transparency 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, transparency 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. 6401. 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 grant 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'—

''(A) 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 Government facilities, services, and property;

''(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; or

''(ii) an agreement that provides only—

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

''(II) a subsidy;

''(III) a loan;

''(IV) a loan guarantee; or

''(V) insurance.

''(5) SECRETARY.—The term 'Secretary' means the head of the standard-setting agency.

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

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

"SEC. 6402. 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 Governmentwide data standards for information reported by recipients of Federal awards.

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

''(A) standard definitions for data elements required for managing Federal awards; and

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

''(b) SCOPE.—The data standards established 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.

''(c) REQUIREMENTS.—The data standards required to be 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

''(5) incorporate the data standards established under the Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act of 2006 (31 U.S.C. 6101 note).

''(d) 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 created under the 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. 6403. 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 agencies to apply 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) GUIDANCE.—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 publishes a list of such exceptions, including exceptions for Indian Tribes and Tribal organizations consistent with the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act; and

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

"SEC. 6404. AGENCY REQUIREMENTS.

''Not later than 3 years after the date of the enactment of this chapter, the head of each agency shall ensure that all of the agency's grants and cooperative agreements use data standards for all future information collection requests and amend existing information collection requests covered by chapter 35 of title 44 (commonly referred to as the Paperwork Reduction Act) to comply with the data standards established under section 6402, consistent with the guidance issued by the Secretary and the Director under section 6403.''.

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of chapters for subtitle V of title 31, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to chapter 63 the following new item:

''64. Data Standards for Grant Reporting 6401''.

SEC. 4. SINGLE AUDIT ACT.

(a) AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 7502(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,''.

(2) Section 7505 of title 31, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(d) Such guidance shall require audit-related information reported under this chapter to be reported in an electronic form consistent with the data standards established under chapter 64.''.

(b) GUIDANCE.—Not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director shall issue guidance requiring audit-related information reported under chapter 75 of title 31, United States Code, to be reported in an electronic form consistent with the data standards established under chapter 64 of title 31, United States Code, as added by section 3.

SEC. 5. 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 enable the collection, public display, and maintenance of Federal award information as a Governmentwide 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 Governmentwide website as determined appropriate by the Director.

(c) FOIA.—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. 6. 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(a).

(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 6402(a)(2) of title 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 6401 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. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

□ 1345

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

Madam Speaker, the Grant Reporting Efficiency and Agreements Transparency Act, 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 required 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.

Under this bill, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget and the Secretary of Health and Human Services would be required to establish governmentwide data standards for grant reporting—again, efficiency and effectiveness.

The bill would encourage OMB and HHS to make the information that grant recipients report fully searchable and machine-readable. This would provide greater transparency into the money spent on the grants because spending data would be more usable.

The bill also would require that data collected from grant recipients be published on a single public portal.

Madam Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentlewoman, Ms. FOXX, for working with Representative CONNOLLY last Congress on the use of nonproprietary identifiers for grants and grantees. She, too, has worked in a hard, bipartisan way to bring solutions to problems, to bring practical solutions to problems.

The bill before us would allow this issue to be carefully considered to ensure it is workable.

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 appreciate very much the comments made by my colleague from Maryland and appreciate particularly the emphasis this afternoon that has been placed on bipartisan bills and efficiency and effectiveness in the Federal Government. Those are values that should not be assigned to any particular party. 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 proud to sponsor legislation 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 injuring 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 bread it has earned. 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 comments 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.

Madam Speaker, in 2017, the Federal Government awarded $662.7 billion in grants funding to State agencies, local and Tribal governments, agencies, nonprofits, 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.

Unless 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 grantees report will alleviate compliance burdens; provide instant insights for grantor agencies and Congress; and enable easy access to data for oversight, analytics, and program evaluation.

Digitizing and, therefore, automating the reporting process would have a twofold effect. First, it allows grantees to maximize every dollar they receive

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 endorsing 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, Demand Progress, 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. That 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 bipartisan efforts 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 that we will take these 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 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. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

REJECTING WHITE NATIONALISM AND WHITE SUPREMACY

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 41) rejecting White nationalism and White supremacy.

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 race-mixing as akin to 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, embracing inclusive 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 when in the distant future some man, some faction, some interest, should set up the doctrine that none but rich men, or 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 take courage to renew the battle which their fathers began—so that truth, and justice, and mercy, and all the humane and Christian virtues might not be extinguished from the land; so that no man would hereafter dare to limit and circumscribe the great principles on which the temple of liberty was being built'';

Whereas Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., while recognizing that ''no other nation can mean to us what our nation means'', condemned ''nationalism perverted into chauvinism and isolationism'' as ''preached by . . . the advocators 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, from any corner of 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 because, unique 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. Thanks to each wave of new arrivals to this land of opportunity, we're a nation forever young, forever bursting with energy and new ideas, and always on the cutting edge, always leading the world 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 would ''be rescued by 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 115–58, 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. ADAMS). 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.

GENERAL LEAVE

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.

□ 1400

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 be the first to condemn 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 be.

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

''White nationalist, white supremacist, 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 in 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 fester 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 hatred, and 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 to truth too 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 on the shoulders of 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''—yes, Black men as well as White 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 dishonor that equality, recognize and rectify it, and set a more just path forward.

In 1807, President Thomas Jefferson—himself a slave owner—publicly supported the abolition of the slave trade, imploring Congress to ''withdraw 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 assumed for the eventual total extirpation 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 any way defensible.

It does all Americans good to revisit our path out of darkness that feeds racial injustice so 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 movement 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 1798 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 territory 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 Northwest Ordinance frequently to show that the Founders opposed the expansion of slavery. And, in the 1860s, these States, along with a number of their fellow States, formed the coalition 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 transcendent laws of nature and of nature's God'' and ''the rights of humanity announced in the Declaration of Independence.''

Our first Republican President, Lincoln, understood this well. When Lincoln was a young man, he said the Founders established ''political institutions, conducing more essentially to the ends of civil and religious liberty, than any of which the history of former times tell 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 Judge 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. Today, our fellow citizens are watching to see 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 foolish. Its tenets are as ridiculous 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 not a person 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, any place 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. Any ideology that comes 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 disapprove of Representative STEVE KING'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 by a gunman 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; and we saw in Charlottesville, Virginia, at the white nationalists' Unite the Right rally, where they chanted the Nazi phrase, ''blood and soil.''

□ 1415

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.''

Then 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 should be condemned by this body, and I call upon my colleagues to join me in doing so.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING).

Mr. KING of Iowa. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia for yielding me time to address this issue.

I understand and recognize the gravity of this issue that is before us. I can hear it from the voice of the gentleman from Georgia. I can hear it from Mr. CLYBURN. And I can hear it from Mr. NADLER.

I know all of you, and I think I know all of you well. I thought you all knew

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, 'White nationalist, white supremacist, Western civilization' ''—there is a dash in there, a pause—'' 'how did that language become offensive?' ''

I understand how you interpreted my words when you read them this way. There is no tape for this interview that I did. It was 56 minutes long. There are some notes on the other end, but there is no tape. There is no way to go 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—how did that language become offensive? Why did I sit in classes teaching me about the merits of our history and civilization''—that is the end of the quote—just to watch ''Western civilization'' become a derogatory term in political discourse today? That is what I believe happened.

And 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.

As I read these so far down, number four, number five, all the way through all of these resolutions, all of the ''whereases'' that are here in this resolution, I agree with all of them.

I agree with every word that you have put in this. It is an honest and a direct resolution put together to address a subject that has been too long before the public dialogue in this country.

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 expressions of intolerance that are contradictory to the values that define the people of the United States.'' Well, I agree with that.

Just a couple of weeks ago, I stood on this floor with a Bible in my hand, and I took an oath to support and defend the Constitution of the United States. That Bible wasn't just a regular Bible picked up somewhere. That was a shirt-pocket-sized leather Bible that my Great Uncle John Richardson carried in his shirt pocket for 3 years in the Civil War.

I come from a family of abolitionists. Maybe I would have some artifacts from his cousin, my five times great-grandfather, 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 absolutely believe in that. It is in my heart and my soul, and in my works. By their fruits you shall know them.

But The New York Times has a different version of this. They make a habit of attacking the President, as a matter of fact. And I look at this language that is here, this resolution that the House of Representatives once again rejects white nationalism, white supremacy, and hateful expressions of intolerance that are contradictory to the values that define the people of the United States. I agree with that language, as I have said. But I would add to it the language that I used on this floor, this very place, last Friday afternoon, when I said I would strengthen it by adding my previous statements, which not only correctly reject white nationalism and white supremacy as evil ideologies, but also condemn anyone that supports 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.

So 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 you state here is right, and it 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 with my good friend from Iowa. I do believe that we are all created equal with certain inalienable rights. What I would say to him is that Western civilization is what we all are. There is no denigrating of Western civilization. It is what America is.

We are the greatest leader of Western civilization. We are the greatest leader of the free world. But what we are speaking about is, of course, the words ''white nationalism'' and ''white supremacy,'' for it is clear that the FBI makes a direct point between dehumanizing and derogatory comments, which come from white nationalists and white supremacists, to the idea that it generates, as you have heard here on the floor of the House. It generates the death of Dr. Martin Luther King. It generates Charlottesville. It generates Charleston, South Carolina. It generates hateful acts that result in death.

This is the kind of tolerating of this that we cannot suffer and the intolerance that we cannot suffer. Because the idea of white nationalism, as superior to others, and white supremacy indicates that somebody else might die.

This resolution is an important resolution to affirm to this Congress and this Nation that we believe that we all are created equal and, as Dr. King said, that, ''We shall overcome.'' And, some day, we shall overcome.

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.

Matthew 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 that 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 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. MCCARTHY 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 superiority, and hate whenever it raises its ugly head so that it will not come back to bite us once again.

So today, hopefully, in the House, we have done that. I commend my Republican colleagues and Mr. COLLINS, and I hope that when hatred and bigotry once against surface, raises its head, which it will, that we will stand together as Americans to condemn it and not see fine people on both sides.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. STEWART).

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 our 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. Unfortunately, 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 worshipers 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.

□ 1430

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 those who enable it.

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, rich, poor, 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 STEVE KING's recent comments asserting that terms like ''white supremacist'' should be acceptable 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 all of us know, more and more people are feeling emboldened today to publicly voice bigoted and evil views like these. We have seen it in discussions around Charlottesville, the current debate on immigration, and in criticism of football players silently and peacefully protesting police brutality.

These views are contrary to our country's founding values of fairness and equality. America was founded 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 ideal. 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 unacceptable 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 they are hauling 75 pounds of drugs across the border.

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 gentlewoman 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 partywide turn away from racism for all of us on both sides.

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 each other, 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 in the debate.

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 thank Chairman NADLER for yielding, and I also want to thank Majority Whip CLYBURN for his leadership in putting this resolution together.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution, which sends a clear message that we will not accept hate or bigotry within this House.

Let me be clear: While Congressman KING's comments condoning white supremacy were abhorrent, they were not a surprise to many of us. In years past, Congressman KING has implied that Dreamers are drug dealers; he has endorsed far right, authoritarian, and neo-Nazis sympathizers; and he has repeatedly reiterated the belief that multicultural communities are a threat to our society. These racist beliefs should not be espoused by anyone, let alone a United States Congressman.

I grew up in the Jim Crow South, Madam Speaker. I know that racism and discrimination don't just cause pain. When these beliefs become policies, which Congressman KING votes on and writes, they institutionalize a vicious system that people of color have to deal with as it relates to being denied equal rights and equal respect. These are the consequences of white supremacy.

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

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

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Speaker, I ask 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 chair 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 should 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 respect it, 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.

□ 1445

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 a 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 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 not stand against anyone who would tear that down, especially if there was ever a thought in this country from anybody, 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. KRISHNAMOORTHI) to close the debate on our side.

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI. 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 condemn white supremacy 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 rabid racism 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 rabid racism. 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 (Mr. NADLER) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 41.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

The motions to suspend the rules and:

Pass H.J. Res. 27;

Agree to H. Res. 41; and

Pass H.R. 135;

in each case by the yeas and nays.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

FURTHER ADDITIONAL CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 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 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 gentlewoman 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:

[Roll No. 31]

YEAS—237

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

Hayes
Heck
Herrera Beutler
Higgins (NY)
Hill (CA)
Himes
Horn, Kendra S.
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Huffman
Hurd (TX)
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Luján
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McAdams
McBath
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Morelle
Moulton
Mucarsel-Powell
Murphy
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Norcross
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rose (NY)
Rouda
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shalala
Sherman
Sherrill
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Soto
Spanberger
Speier
Stanton
Stefanik
Stevens
Suozzi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres Small (NM)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Van Drew
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wexton
Wild
Yarmuth

NAYS—187

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

NOT VOTING—9

DesJarlais
Huizenga
Jones
Marino
Mast
Payne
Sensenbrenner
Thompson (MS)
Wilson (FL)

□ 1517

Messrs. ZELDIN, DAVIDSON of Ohio, BILIRAKIS, and BROOKS of Alabama changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

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. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 424, nays 1, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 32]

YEAS—424

Abraham
Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Allred
Amash
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Axne
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Bergman
Beyer
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bost
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady
Brindisi
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Case
Casten (IL)
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Cisneros
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Cline
Cloud
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Conaway
Connolly
Cook
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Cox (CA)
Craig
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Cummings
Cunningham
Curtis
Davids (KS)
Davidson (OH)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny K.
Davis, Rodney
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duffy
Duncan
Dunn
Emmer
Engel
Escobar
Eshoo
Espaillat
Estes
Evans
Ferguson
Finkenauer
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fletcher
Flores
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx (NC)
Frankel
Fudge
Fulcher
Gabbard
Gaetz
Gallagher
Gallego
Garamendi
García (IL)
García (TX)
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Golden
Gomez
Gonzalez (OH)
Gonzalez (TX)
Gooden
Gosar
Gottheimer
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Green (TX)
Griffith
Grijalva
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Haaland
Hagedorn
Harder (CA)
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings
Hayes
Heck
Hern, Kevin
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Higgins (NY)
Hill (AR)
Hill (CA)
Himes
Holding
Hollingsworth
Horn, Kendra S.
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Hudson
Huffman
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson (TX)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Kustoff (TN)
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamb
Lamborn
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Lesko
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Loudermilk
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marshall
Massie
Matsui
McAdams
McBath
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McHenry
McKinley
McNerney
Meadows
Meeks
Meng
Meuser
Miller
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Morelle
Moulton
Mucarsel-Powell
Mullin
Murphy
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Newhouse
Norcross
Norman
Nunes
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Olson
Omar
Palazzo
Pallone
Palmer
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Pelosi
Pence
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Posey
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reschenthaler
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Riggleman
Roby
Rodgers (WA)
Roe, David P.
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rooney (FL)
Rose (NY)
Rose, John W.
Rouda
Rouzer
Roy
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rutherford
Ryan
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scalise
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shalala
Sherman
Sherrill
Shimkus
Simpson
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Smucker
Soto
Spanberger
Spano
Speier
Stanton
Stauber
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stevens
Stewart
Stivers
Suozzi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Timmons
Tipton

Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres Small (NM)
Trahan
Trone
Turner
Underwood
Upton
Van Drew
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Waltz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watkins
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westerman
Wexton
Wild
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Wright
Yarmuth
Yoho
Young
Zeldin

NAYS—1

Rush

NOT VOTING—9

DesJarlais
Huizenga
Jones
Marino
Mast
Payne
Sensenbrenner
Thompson (MS)
Wilson (FL)

□ 1526

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced 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 on 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

Abraham
Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Allred
Amash
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Axne
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Bergman
Beyer
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bost
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady
Brindisi
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Case
Casten (IL)
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Cisneros
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Cline
Cloud
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Conaway
Connolly
Cook
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Cox (CA)
Craig
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Cummings
Cunningham
Curtis
Davids (KS)
Davidson (OH)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny K.
Davis, Rodney
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duffy
Duncan
Dunn
Emmer
Engel
Escobar
Eshoo
Espaillat
Estes
Evans
Ferguson
Finkenauer
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fletcher
Flores
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx (NC)
Frankel
Fudge
Fulcher
Gabbard
Gaetz
Gallagher
Gallego
Garamendi
García (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Golden
Gomez
Gonzalez (OH)
Gonzalez (TX)
Gooden
Gosar
Gottheimer
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Green (TX)
Griffith
Grijalva
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Haaland
Hagedorn
Harder (CA)
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings
Hayes
Heck
Hern, Kevin
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Higgins (NY)
Hill (AR)
Hill (CA)
Himes
Holding
Hollingsworth
Horn, Kendra S.
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Hudson
Huffman
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson (TX)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Kustoff (TN)
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamb
Lamborn
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Lesko
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Loudermilk
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marshall
Massie
Matsui
McAdams
McBath
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McHenry
McKinley
McNerney
Meadows
Meeks
Meng
Meuser
Miller
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Morelle
Moulton
Mucarsel-Powell
Mullin
Murphy
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Newhouse
Norcross
Norman
Nunes
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Olson
Omar
Palazzo
Pallone
Palmer
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Pence
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Posey
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reschenthaler
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Riggleman
Roby
Rodgers (WA)
Roe, David P.
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rooney (FL)
Rose (NY)
Rose, John W.
Rouda
Rouzer
Roy
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Rutherford
Ryan
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scalise
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shalala
Sherman
Sherrill
Shimkus
Simpson
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Smucker
Soto
Spanberger
Spano
Speier
Stanton
Stauber
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stevens
Stewart
Stivers
Suozzi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Timmons
Tipton
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres Small (NM)
Trahan
Trone
Turner
Underwood
Upton
Van Drew
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Waltz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watkins
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westerman
Wexton
Wild
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Wright
Yarmuth
Yoho
Young
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—9

DesJarlais
Huizenga
Jones
Marino
Mast
Payne
Sensenbrenner
Thompson (MS)
Wilson (FL)

□ 1537

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 272

Mr. PETERSON. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 272.

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

There was no objection.

COMMUNICATION FROM CASE WORKER/FIELD REPRESENTATIVE, THE HONORABLE JACKIE SPEIER, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from Sera Alptekin, Case Worker/Field Representative, the Honorable JACKIE SPEIER, Member of Congress:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, January 9, 2019.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
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, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the privileges and rights of the House.

Sincerely,

SERA ALPTEKIN,
Case Worker/Field Representative.

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:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, January 9, 2019.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
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, I have 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 PREPARER

(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 celebrity rabbit hopping contest, the grand champion junior market goat and lamb show, the draft horse competitions, 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.

□ 1545

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 millions of 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 incoming Senate President Karen Fann and House Speaker Rusty Bowers. I wish everyone in the Arizona Legislature, including staff, a productive legislative session in the months to come.

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 TSOs to Border Patrol, to Customs and Border Protection, to air traffic controllers, but those around the Nation—the two Federal employee family 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 amends 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 illegal 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 businessman, 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 NDSU 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 was driven by partisan politics, in violation of the law. The Constitution requires that the Census count every person living in our country, and the administration's attempt to add a citizenship question was 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. Any action to delay or divert 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 paychecks 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.

□ 1600

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 did a continuing resolution 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 next day. Sometime between that evening when it passed the Senate 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 appropriations sometime 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 before this veteran dies because the National Archives is shut down. Normally, we could. 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. He 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 show 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 2½, 3 percent, in that range, 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 negotiation 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.

Madam 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.

However, we want to open 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 training that 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 take a look, or 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 refuges in California are shut down, 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 go duck hunting at the fish and wildlife refuges, as you have normally done, even though you put your bid in and you had January 15 for your date to hunt ducks at the refuge. Nope, 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. He shut down 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, infants. 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 now. 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 settled and drop a $5 billion—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 hangar 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 slush 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.

□ 1615

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 levees downstream from the Oroville Dam are subject to one of the appropriations in the disaster recovery bill. If Oroville Dam had broken, within 1 hour a city of 40,000, Oroville, would be under 30 feet of water.

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 American River and 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 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 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.

Where?

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 public knows 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, 2019. 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 leash 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—a 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 $900 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, Madam Speaker, 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 such as Paradise, California; or Redding, California which also suffered a few thousand homes burned and destroyed, not nearly as many deaths fortunately.

□ 1630

So the Stafford Act is what we know as FEMA, Federal Emergency Management 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 declaration of a disaster.

The Federal Government then steps in and begins to provide funding to rebuild, to help the individuals who have lost everything, through the Small Business Administration and some direct grants, and to help communities put back in place their infrastructure. It is a wonderful expression of America's 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 President.

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. President? 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 they are still sifting 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 mismanaged, for a whole variety of historic reasons, many of which we have actually made steps to improve here in legislation.

So what is with this man that he would wake up one morning and say: No more help from the Federal Government.

Does he think everything is about leverage? 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 Department of Interior, the Department of the Treasury, the IRS, the EPA, the Department 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 gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), my colleague, who comes from an extraordinary family.

And another generation has joined us.

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Madam Speaker, I appreciate Mr. GARAMENDI'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 FRED 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 underneath 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 get it wrong because they are not doing their work; they are not able to work. Just imagine some huge pile-up 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 companies right now are 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 pay-less payday for the whole family, no income coming in at all.

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 Youssef, 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 buying formula 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 edu.gov 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 by this.

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 food supply or something that isn'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 putting workers back to 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 businesspeople who run a restaurant or a barbershop near a government facility are robbed of their income.

The economic effects are devastating. There is no reason for it.

I appreciate Mr. GARAMENDI's leadership on this. I just wanted to come down 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. GARAMENDI. 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, whether it is the weather or a 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 metro 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 prior was not good enough, 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—all of us, regardless of party—are shooting ourselves in the foot and actually reducing now the economic projection of our GDP 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 for a systemic 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.

□ 1645

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 continue to 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 nobody 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 disagree with many of the points that I have made earlier today. I saw a few jaws clenching, biting down on their teeth, just wanting to get in the mix of it.

Mr. MEADOWS asked for time, and I didn't really want to hear that, but the gentleman will have time in just a moment. I am not sure what he is going to argue, but I would be pleased to hear why this shutdown is good, why it is necessary to keep the government of America, the essential parts of the government—not the military. The Medicare checks continue to go out, and that is happening. The military, Department of Defense, we funded that earlier, and that continues, and thankfully so.

But the Treasury Department, SEC, EPA, Agriculture—I didn't even get into agriculture, although I have a $4.5 billion farm gate agricultural district. They are hurting.

The crop checks that they need and the assurance they need to their lenders that they will be able to plant their crops when the rainy season is over in a few weeks, it is not happening now, so that is delayed. And it may be, if it goes much longer, they will miss their planting opportunities.

Food stamps will soon be unavailable, and millions of Americans may, under that circumstance, be very, very hungry. Why is it worth it? Why is it worth it?

Why don't we start up government, pass the legislation that is over in the Senate, encourage, cajole, browbeat a few Senators to pass the legislation, put it on the President's desk, and then he can have that mantle of shutting down the government once again very clearly?

We will deal with border security. We have over the years, and recently we have done that and we will do it again. But that is a negotiating process. We negotiate on virtually everything around here.

I have yet to get my way; but then, I am one of seven children. I learned very, very early, I don't get my way very often. I would like to participate in that process of give-and-take.

And for proper comprehensive border security, we know—I won't speak names. Perhaps that will get me in trouble here. But more than one of you sitting there and I have had conversations about border security, about immigration and how we could solve that problem. That is going to take some time, and surely there are places for a fence or a wall or concrete or steel or whatever, those places for improved ports of entry, more personnel.

I haven't even started to talk about the children that were separated. That will get me off on another thing that wouldn't be helpful now. But that takes time, and you and I know that we need to solve that problem.

So let's start our government today, tomorrow. Let's prove to the world that it really is an American Government—not shut down but operating, all of its good and all of its extraordinary work and, occasionally, the mistakes that it makes. But it is not operating now.

And then let's take the time over the next 30 days, 60 days, whatever you want to put on it, to negotiate 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.

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, not by 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 policies on border security, which are 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. It is shut down over the topic of border security 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 human 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 political 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 release these illegal aliens at a Greyhound station 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.

Some more quotes from the same article:

> But over the summer and fall of 2018, it has become clear that there 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 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 of 2018 than in many months 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, coughing and feverish, 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 to do its job humanely and effectively. They lack the legal resources. They lack the financial resources.

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 all manner 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 letter from Director Vought at OMB, which I will include in the RECORD.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT, OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET,
Washington, DC, January 6, 2019.

Hon. RICHARD SHELBY,
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: 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 support his ongoing commitment to dramatically reduce the entry of illegal immigrants, criminals, and drugs; keep out terrorists, public safety threats, and those otherwise inadmissible under U.S. law; and ensure that those who do 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 the current 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 infrastructure to provide requisite impedance and denial. In short, a physical barrier—wall—creates an enduring capability that helps field personnel stop, slow down and/or contain illegal entries. In concert with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, CBP has increased its capacity to execute these funds. The Administration's full request would fund construction of a total of approximately 234 miles of new physical barrier and fully fund the top 10 priorities in 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 at least $563 million for 75 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 supports some Border Patrol Agent hiring, fulfilling this request requires an increase of $100 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 $571 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 $798 million over the FY 2019 funding level in the Senate version of the bill.

Humanitarian Needs: The President requests an additional $800 million to address urgent humanitarian needs. This includes additional funding for enhanced medical support, transportation, consumable supplies appropriate for the population, and 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. Specifically, $675 million would provide Non-Intrusive Inspection (NII) technology at inbound lanes at U.S. Southwest Border Land Ports of Entry (LPOE) would allow CBP to deter and detect more contraband, including narcotics, weapons, and other materials that pose nuclear and radiological threats. This would require an increase of $631 million over the FY 2019 funding level in the Senate version of the bill.

In addition, to address the humanitarian crisis of unaccompanied alien children (UACs), Democrats have proposed in-country asylum processing for Central American Minors. This would require a statutory change, along with reallocation of State Department funds to establish in-country processing capacities at Northern Triangle consulates and embassies. Furthermore, for the new procedure to achieve the desired humanitarian result, a further corresponding statutory change would be required to ensure that those who circumvent the process and come to the United States without authorization can be promptly returned home. Without the latter change, in-country processing will not reduce the unauthorized flow or successfully mitigate the humanitarian crisis.''

These upfront investments in physical barriers and technology, as well as legislation to close loopholes in our immigration system, will reduce illegal immigration, 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 inflow 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 every one of 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 trafficking rings, and 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.

We will hear from Mr. GRIFFITH. We will also hear from 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 one of my colleagues believes that 2,028 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 in ICE custody 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, the border is littered with the clothes of new victims because 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 was talking to a Border Patrol agent last summer. He said:

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 time for 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 walls around medieval fortresses to the fencing around the White House and our military installations today.

Ask a tort lawyer whether leaving your pool 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 46 miles of reinforced fencing 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 argue 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 Israel, 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 them secure their borders. But, at the same time, the House is crippled with inaction at securing 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 to stop posturing 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 work together 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 a humanitarian crisis. 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 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, he was sitting 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 perils that my colleagues opposite 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 none more appropriate than today 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 what we have at 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 them and fair compromise.

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).

□ 1715

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 diverted 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 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 robbed of that dream by illegal aliens.

In July 2018 in my hometown of Huntsville, Alabama, two drug-cartel related illegal aliens took Oralia Mendoza and her 13-year-old granddaughter, Mariah Lopez, from their

home in the dark of night. Oralia was stabbed to death while her teenage granddaughter, Mariah, was forced to watch. Later, and in order to eliminate a witness, the illegal alien drug cartel members then beheaded Mariah and abandoned her body in the woods not far from where I live. Mariah's decaying body was not found for weeks. Mariah was a special needs student at Challenger Middle School. Her teachers described her as a ''sweet little girl'' who ''had a lot of friends.''

I have a Washington staff member, Michaila Lindow, who well remembers being baby-sat as a young child by family friend, Tad Mattle. In 2009 in Huntsville, Alabama, then 19-year-old Tad Mattle was driving home with his girlfriend from a church social. While stopped at a traffic light, an illegal alien, who was fleeing the scene of yet another crime and whose blood alcohol content was three times the legal limit, rear-ended Tad Mattle's car. This illegal alien had three prior DUIs. Tad Mattle's car exploded on impact, tragically killing Tad Mattle and his girlfriend. Tad, the oldest of three children, enjoyed making music and served as percussion leader in the Grissom High School marching band. Three days before he was killed, Tad was awarded a full scholarship to the University of Alabama in Huntsville, where he planned to pursue an engineering degree.

Mr. Speaker, each of these horrific deaths have one thing in common: none of these lives would have been stolen from us, but for illegal aliens aided and abetted by Democrats who protect, promote, and prefer the lives of illegal aliens to the lives of American citizens.

Mr. Speaker, these killings on American soil will continue if America does not secure our porous southern border.

As for those who support amnesty and open borders, how many American lives and dreams must be snuffed out by illegal aliens before Washington has the guts and integrity to secure our porous southern border? How many Americans, dead Americans, does it take before you will start saving lives rather than aiding and abetting those illegal aliens who take them?

Mr. PERRY. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Alabama and yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. HICE).

Mr. HICE of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I thank my good friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, for his leadership on this.

I am honored to be 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 advancement continues to march 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, 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 met many angel 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 from 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 many more families will no longer hear 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 there today with these angel families, they would not have left saying this is a manufactured crisis. They would have been pricked to the heart of the reality of what we are facing in this country.

And yet they refuse to come to the table. They refuse to come with real solutions. They refuse to compromise at all.

Instead, as has already been mentioned, this past weekend they go to Puerto Rico on a virtual vacation while hundreds of thousands of American workers are losing their paychecks, being held by Democrats off on a vacation at an island getaway.

The Democrat playbook is nothing but obstruct at all costs. And, again, this was played out today while the President invites them to the White House, and they refuse to show up yet again, showing what they are really made of. And they refuse to deal with our borders.

More than 49,000 Americans died last year from heroin and opioid-related overdoses, and yet the Democrats, with their open border policies, refuse to deal with this situation.

I am convinced that they are becoming accomplices in the countless deaths yet to come by their refusal to deal 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 ensure 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.

Madam Speaker, again, I thank my friend; I appreciate so much the time.

Mr. PERRY. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman. I yield to 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

was never that great, and they cheer on MAXINE WATERS when she says go out and harass anyone who supports the President.

Today's left thinks that America is just another country, just one of the 190-some countries on the planet.

Madam Speaker, the United States of America is not just another country. It is the greatest Nation in history that has done more good for more people than any country ever; a special place, a special place where people from all over the world, all shapes, 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, we believe that there is a difference, a big difference, between legal immigration and illegal immigration. And 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.

□ 1730

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 is important. 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. Mr. 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 our country today?

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 ranchers who live in the region several times alone recently. There is no other way to put this: The situation on the American side of the border is dire and equally as grave on the other side.

For 8 years under the Obama administration, the Federal Government effectively told Americans that their safety and their sovereignty were not important. They told Border Patrol and ICE agents that the jobs they were doing were essentially pointless, because the Obama administration was going to find as many ways as possible to prevent further border security and circumvent the immigration laws passed by Congress, including reducing the pay of Border Patrol agents.

If the House Democrats have their way, they will continue down this suboptimum, irresponsible path until it is simply too late.

I visited the 75-mile stretch of the border that crosses through one of Arizona's Indian reservations. Along the way, the Border Patrol agent who was guiding us pointed out drug shacks and lookouts that the cartels use to alert smugglers of the Border Patrol's presence. It is astounding, quite frankly.

Some will argue that there is fencing along many of those miles and try to convince you that the area is secure and no fencing is necessary. But let me tell you something, that is not true. The fencing consists of a single strand of barbed wire. There might be some Normandy barriers, those cross barriers, now and then, and there is some pole fencing, all of which easily can be walked over or stepped through. No one who has been there can argue with a straight face that the ability to walk across the border with little effort can be called secure.

On that same trip, I met with cattle ranchers near Nogales. Each of those families has encountered multiple illegal aliens on their property—in fact, on a regular basis. It is so grave that they set up cameras so they could capture footage of the illegal traffic. I have seen that footage; I have seen the videos. It is not groups of sweet mothers and children coming across. It is groups of armed, young men, with drugs strapped to their backs, 50-pound packages. They are wearing carpet shoes to disguise their footprints in the dirt.

I recently spoke with a rancher along the border. He has told me that he has been victimized by three home invasions and more than a dozen burglaries, not counting the near constant trespasses that victimize his family.

I am curious to know what the open border advocates think about that kind of traffic. Should known drug smugglers have the freedom to traipse across private property and come into America? These Americans own their land, but the House Democrats see no reason to protect them from this invasion.

To any Member of the Chamber who disagrees with border security, or doesn't know how to describe it, including with a wall, how would you feel about constant trespassing and vandalizing of your own property? Don't you think the government should do something about it, or should we just turn a blind eye?

During a more recent trip, I had lunch with about 15 rank-and-file Border Patrol agents working in southern Arizona. These are the men and women defending our borders every day. They are putting their lives on the line, chasing after armed drug smugglers and being assaulted by illegal aliens they encounter.

By the way, just a couple of weeks ago, there was one attacked who had his face broken open by a rock after he was bitten and punched and attacked. Let me tell you, it leads to low morale in the agency.

They are the only DHS law enforcement agency that received a pay cut under the previous administration, and we can't fund them back yet. I don't understand that.

When they hear Members of Congress condemn the work they are doing and advocating instead for lawlessness and open borders, these agents have little incentive or motivation to continue fighting for our Nation's security.

This morning, I stood, like others have mentioned, with Angel Families who have lost loved ones. Two of them are in my district, the families of Brandon Mendoza and Grant Ronnebeck. They have suffered unjust harms. They have lost their children.

When I hear the gentleman from California say, oh, we can't get to the Smithsonian museum, well, for these people, their children will never get to the Smithsonian museum. They will mourn, and they do grieve. I am thankful for them standing up.

I will just tell you, ladies and gentlemen, there is a crisis on the border. We must deal with this with courage.

I call on my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to quit being obstructionists. We have to fund a border wall and the border security asked for.

Mr. PERRY. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GRIFFITH).

Mr. GRIFFITH. Madam Speaker, ''Facts are stubborn things; and whatever may be our wishes, our inclinations, or the dictates of our passions, they cannot alter the state of facts and evidence.''

John Adams made that statement almost 250 years ago. I recall his words

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 surged an astounding 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 illegal immigrants 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 31 percent of women and 17 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 73 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. By 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, Democrat 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 that deal.

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 $675 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 should anyone 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 what is right: 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.

□ 1745

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. And there are 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 immigrants to go unchecked. Liberal cities and liberal States with liberal policies supported by our liberal colleagues continually put Americans in jeopardy.

Just last night, three MS–13 gang members were picked up and arrested for assault on a 16-year-old. 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, instead, to go to Puerto Rico to party with over 100 D.C. lobbyists while calling on non-U.S. citizens to be able to have the right to vote, and they watched the play, ''Hamilton.''

It is no wonder we haven't been able to negotiate a deal with the Democrats. 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 Florida, and I now yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CLOUD).

Mr. CLOUD. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for yielding.

This debate over securing our border has become a debate over the morality of our efforts, and I welcome that debate. But if we are to debate this issue of border security on the basis of morality, it is fair for us not only to ask how this issue affects our own Nation, but to look across our border and see how our national policy affects those beyond our borders.

For those of us who live near our southern border, we understand all too well the effects of the criminal cartels who profit from abusing our Nation's generous immigration laws.

When I visited the Rio Grande Valley just recently, a rancher with land on the border described the situation, saying that he finds dead migrants on his land all the time.

In my hometown of Victoria, Texas, 19 migrants died of suffocation and overheating after being trapped in the back of a trailer abandoned by a smuggler with a callous disregard for human life.

But beyond our borders, these cartels carry an outsized influence in Mexico and in developing nations in Central America. We know that cartels profit from smuggling drugs and humans across the border. They siphon oil from pipelines. They extort families and businesses and kidnap for profit.

The barbarism of these criminal cartels has led to 150,000 homicides in Mexico, alone, since 2006. They have worked their corrupting influence into the halls of government and law enforcement, hindering the people of these nations from developing and realizing the blessings of liberty for themselves.

Our Federal Government's unwillingness to control our border allows cartels to amass profits of tens of billions of dollars each year smuggling drugs and humans into our country, with a devastating toll on the most vulnerable in our Nation. Our lack of border security allows these criminal cartels to wield their corrupting influence in a way that makes positive change so difficult in these developing countries.

Unfortunately, like too many issues these days, border security has become a divisive and a partisan issue when, historically, this has had broad support. But there should be nothing partisan about ending a humanitarian and criminal crisis that is driven by cartels and enabled by our Federal Government's failure to act.

Congress has a responsibility to protect the citizens of our country and to end the humanitarian crisis on our southern border, and it is past time to reform our broken asylum system and secure the border.

Mr. PERRY. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for being part of this discussion.

Madam Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time I have remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. PERRY. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT).

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 to their home.

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.

Mr. PERRY. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for sharing his thoughts on this topic.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. DAVIDSON).

Mr. DAVIDSON of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for yielding.

Madam Speaker, our bodies should unite to stop the violent cartels and drug lords who have taken advantage of the humanitarian national security crisis on our southern border. Border security is national security, and we need to be doing everything we can to secure our southern border.

For years, our senior Border Patrol officials have made modest requests for tactical barriers. The President's request prioritizes the top 10 of 17 priority areas that Border Patrol wants to secure.

The men and women patrolling our borders put their lives on the line every day to keep us safe from terrorism, drug trafficking, sex trafficking, gunrunning, money laundering, and all sorts of dangerous crimes. They routinely encounter some of the most dangerous criminals and traffickers anywhere in the world.

They seize drugs that would have otherwise made it onto Ohio streets where we are dealing with the tragedy of this opioid crisis that has killed far too many of our friends and neighbors. They have also arrested illegal aliens who were charged and convicted of crimes, including sexual assault, kidnapping, and homicide. A significant percentage of women and girls entering the country illegally are raped.

We should be giving our personnel on the border the resources they need to get the job done. Nevertheless, millions of Americans want to participate in this great cause. They have contributed private funds and would like to give directly to our government.

That is why I introduced the Buy a Brick, Build the Wall Act, which would allow the Treasury Department to help fund this wall and make sure the resources go to the cause that so many people support. We need to unite and secure our border.

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

NEGOTIATION IS CRITICAL TO ENDING THE SHUTDOWN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LOUDERMILK) for 30 minutes.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Madam Speaker, I also want to thank my colleagues from the Freedom Caucus for the hour that they spent sharing with the American people the facts and the statistics of what is happening at our southern border because of the inaction of Congress over quite a long time.

As a historian, I love this building. I love the Capitol. I love spending time

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. No, 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, a very critical part of American history. It happened during the Second Continental Congress, when our predecessors, those who came before us, the representative body that we now represent, were faced with a very critical decision. That decision was whether to vote in favor of declaring independence against Great Britain.

There were strong advocates, very strong advocates in favor of independence. One of those was John Adams from Massachusetts. John Adams was strongly in favor of independence and spoke very passionately of voting in favor of independence. But just as strongly as John Adams was in favor of independence, you had John Dickinson from Pennsylvania who also was as strongly opposed to independence.

They continued to debate all aspects of whether they should declare independence. And, in fact, there were others who disagreed, even to the point where the first vote for independence failed.

But Dr. Benjamin Franklin understood the power of negotiating, the power of compromise, the power of bringing two sides together, and he began to negotiate. He began to bring the sides together. And by the time they took the second and final vote for independence, he had garnered enough votes to actually pass the motion to declare our independence from Great Britain.

Now, the difference between John Adams and John Dickinson wasn't that they disagreed on the problem they were facing. No, they both agreed that there were atrocities committed on 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 voted ''no'' 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.

□ 1800

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 broken because of a design flaw. 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 whatever 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 all hostage in our political 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 there 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 terrorist 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 a humanitarian crisis we have 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 today 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 that our crisis at the border 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 they were intercepting, and I identified at that time that we had a crisis at the border.

But this issue at the border goes beyond even 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 driving drunk 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.

While I was 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 they also told 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 that were going on 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.

We sat in his home that evening watching on infrared night vision cameras. You could see coyotes, those who were helping to bring illegals across into the United States, as they would congregate inside of Mexico and they would move up to where there was a physical barrier, a border wall.

I asked him: At this point, what is going to happen? Are they going to scale the barrier?

He said: No. They are just staging. All they are going to do is move a few miles down that wall to where the wall doesn't exist, and they will walk right across into the United States.

That is exactly what happened. We watched as they came into the United States, they ran to a gully, and they hid in a gully until somebody came and picked them up. By the time the Border Patrol was able to get there, they were long gone.

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 got 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 nearly two-thirds 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 is best for 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 some things that take 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.''

So we have to be able to deal with the truth, the facts. One question that I am 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 activities going on at the border, 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.

□ 1815

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 do 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—every 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 have a discussion, and to begin to negotiate 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.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 268, SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2019, AND WAIVING A REQUIREMENT OF CLAUSE 6(a) OF RULE XIII WITH RESPECT TO CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS REPORTED FROM THE COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. RASKIN, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 116–2) on the resolution (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, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

DRUGS AND ILLEGAL IMMIGRATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. STEVENS). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. RICE) for 30 minutes.

Mr. RICE of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOHO).

Mr. YOHO. Madam Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague and great friend, Mr. RICE, for allowing me this opportunity. The gentleman is truly a man of the people.

Madam Speaker, 25 days, 25 days the government has been shut down—25 days—making this the longest shutdown in U.S. history.

Why has this been so long? It is because the Democrats refuse to come to the table and negotiate a solution. Instead, they would rather bring up messaging bills that don't fund vital programs, all so that they can say they didn't support increased border security.

Well, let's take a look at the last 25 days.

On the average, 2,000 inadmissible 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. And there are proper channels.

Additionally, in December, 27,518 family unit aliens were apprehended for crossing the border illegally. If those numbers remain consistent, that means over 21,429 family unit aliens have been apprehended for illegally crossing in the last 25 days.

In fiscal 2018, 2,028 illegal aliens arrested had homicide charges. If this number remains consistent, that means 139 homicide charges for illegal aliens in the last 25 days.

Further, on an average, 300 Americans die per week from heroin, and 90 percent of that heroin in the U.S. comes through our southern border. That means, in the last 25 days, approximately 1,000 Americans have died

because of heroin illegally crossing our border.

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, we can 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 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 create 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.

□ 1830

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 and the 10th percentile, 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 flow of illegal immigrants who 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 for decades 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 U.S. 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 exploding.

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 cocaine 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 said a wall 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 the southern border that we refuse to control, I know that is amoral. 132 residents of my district 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? That is almost twice as many murders 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 given these people unimaginable power and wealth. They outrank 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 take it?

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 parts of Central and 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, amazingly, 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.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RICE of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 44 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, January 16, 2019, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. RASKIN: Committee on Rules. H. Res. 43. A resolution 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 (Rept. 116–2). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. OLSON (for himself, Mr. BEYER, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. TRONE, Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma, Mr. ALLRED, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. BABIN, and Mr. GAETZ):

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 Oversight and Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. 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 standard identification protocol for use in the tracking and procurement of biological implants by the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CALVERT (for himself, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. SIMPSON, 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. GARAMENDI (for himself, Mr. YOUNG, and Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana):

H.R. 550. 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 Financial Services.

By Mr. CALVERT:

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 designate 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. YARMUTH):

H.R. 553. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to repeal the requirement for reduction of survivor annuities 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 require annual reports on religious intolerance in Saudi Arabian educational materials, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER (for himself, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. NORTON, Mr. WELCH, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. TITUS, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. MORELLE, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. DEAN, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. KATKO, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. DELGADO, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Ms. STEFANIK, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. CROW, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. NEGUSE, and Mr. BRINDISI):

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, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, and Mr. EVANS):

H.R. 556. 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 Ways and Means.

By Mr. SOTO (for himself, Mr. SABLAN, Mrs. TORRES of California, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. ESPAILLAT):

H.R. 557. A bill to render certain military spouses eligible for adjustment of status; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG (for himself and Ms. GABBARD):

H.R. 558. A bill to direct 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. 559. 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. 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. BERGMAN (for himself, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, and Mr. DUNN):

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 for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BOST (for himself and Mr. LAWSON of Florida):

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. BROWN of Maryland (for himself, Mr. JONES, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. MAST, Mr. MOULTON, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. SUOZZI, Ms. NORTON, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. EVANS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. ROSE of New York, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. BERGMAN, Mr. COOK, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. HASTINGS, and Mr. O'HALLERAN):

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 member of the Armed Forces may provide 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. LARSON of Connecticut):

H.R. 566. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to remove the manifestation period required for the presumptions of service connection for chloracne, 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. 567. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the portion of wages and self-employment income subject to payroll taxes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DEUTCH (for himself, Ms. NORTON, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY):

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 Mrs. DINGELL (for herself, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. TONKO, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. WELCH, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. DESAULNIER, Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. ADAMS, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. BERA, Mr. BEYER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. COHEN, Mr. COOPER, Mr. CORREA, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. CRIST, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. DELBENE, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. FRANKEL, Mr. 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, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. LAMB, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. LYNCH, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. MAST, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCEACHIN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MENG, Ms. MOORE, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. PETERS, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. POCAN, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. RASKIN, Miss RICE of New York, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. RUSH, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SIRES, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. SOTO, Ms. SPEIER, and Mr. SUOZZI):

H.R. 569. A bill to protect victims of stalking from gun 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 Iranian persons that threaten the 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. LAMALFA (for himself and Mr. MCCLINTOCK):

H.R. 572. A bill to release certain Federal land in California from wilderness study, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. LUETKEMEYER (for himself, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. OLSON, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. BABIN, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. BANKS, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. WALKER, Mr. GIBBS, 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. WEBER 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:

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, and 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. MEADOWS (for himself, Mr. WALKER, Mr. HICE of Georgia, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. BUDD, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. JORDAN, and Mr. DUNCAN):

H.R. 575. A bill to provide for 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. BEATTY, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. CORREA, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. DEUTCH, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HECK, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. KILMER, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCEACHIN, Ms. MENG, Ms. MOORE, Mr. MOULTON, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. NORTON, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mr. POCAN, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. RUSH, Mr. RYAN, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. SOTO, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. TITUS, Mr. TONKO, Mrs. TORRES of California, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. VELA, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. WELCH, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. PETERS, and Mr. TED LIEU of California):

H.R. 576. A bill to expand Medicare coverage to include eyeglasses, hearing aids, and dental care; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SCHNEIDER:

H.R. 577. A bill to provide that a former Member of Congress receiving compensation as a lobbyist shall be ineligible to receive certain Federal retirement benefits or to use certain congressional benefits and services, to require each Member of Congress to post on the Member's official public website a hyperlink to the most recent annual financial disclosure report filed by the Member under the Ethics in Government Act of 1978, to prohibit the use of appropriated funds to pay for the costs of travel by the spouse of a Member of Congress who accompanies the Member on official travel, to restrict the use of travel promotional awards by Members of Congress who receive such awards in connection with official air travel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committees on Oversight and Reform, Rules, and Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. THOMPSON of California (for himself, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. PETERS, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. PANETTA, Ms. NORTON, Mr. KILMER, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. COOK, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. SIRES, Ms. LOFGREN, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. COSTA, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. KEATING, Mr. MOULTON, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. KING of New York, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, and Mr. BILIRAKIS):

H.R. 578. 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 Mare Island Naval Cemetery in Vallejo, California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TIPTON (for himself, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. LAMBORN, and Mr. GOSAR):

H.R. 579. A bill to prohibit the conditioning of any permit, lease, or other use agreement on the transfer of any water right to the United States by the Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture, 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. TIPTON (for himself, Mr. LAMBORN, 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. HOLDING:

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. HOYER:

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, 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. 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. LAMBORN, 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 Alejandra 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 1, 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 1 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 1, 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 1, 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

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 1, 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 1, 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 1, 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 IV, Section 3, Clause 2: ''The Congress shall have power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States.''

By Mr. CICILLINE:

H.R. 565.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, section 8

By Mr. COURTNEY:

H.R. 566.

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 VIII of the United States Constitution.

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 1 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 1, Section 8, Clauses 3 and 18 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. LAMALFA:

H.R. 572.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 4, Section 3, Clause 2

By Mr. LUETKEMEYER:

H.R. 573.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. MEADOWS:

H.R. 574.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 4

By Mr. MEADOWS:

H.R. 575.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section I grants that ''All legislative Powers herin granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States . . .'' Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 grants that ''The Congress shall have Power to . . . Regulate Commerce . . . Among the several States . . .'' Article 1, 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 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 Ms. 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 1, Section 8, of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. HOLDING:

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. HOYER:

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. FUDGE, Mrs. LEE of Nevada, Mr. DEFAZIO, and Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 38: Mr. STIVERS, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. GOODEN, Mr. COLE, and Mr. THORNBERRY.

H.R. 51: Mr. HORSFORD, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. CASE, and Mr. MALINOWSKI.

H.R. 93: Mr. HECK.

H.R. 95: Mr. ZELDIN, Mr. COX of California, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. GIANFORTE, Mr. WATKINS, and Mr. CARBAJAL.

H.R. 113: Mr. VAN DREW.

H.R. 114: Mr. WOODALL.

H.R. 140: Mr. LOUDERMILK.

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 Ms. CLARKE of New York.

H.R. 230: Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI and Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ.

H.R. 250: Mr. BUCSHON.

H.R. 262: Mr. RESCHENTHALER, Mr. FITZPATRICK, and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 273: Mr. PANETTA and Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 279: Ms. WATERS.

H.R. 280: Ms. NORTON and Ms. CLARKE of New York.

H.R. 296: Mr. BERGMAN, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. GREEN 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, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. DUFFY, and Mr. BYRNE.

H.R. 301: Mr. BAIRD and Mr. MOOLENAAR.

H.R. 305: Mr. HUNTER.

H.R. 316: Mr. MCCLINTOCK.

H.R. 339: Mr. SARBANES, Ms. LEE of California, Miss RICE of New York, Ms. HAALAND, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. CLARKE of New York, and Ms. TLAIB.

H.R. 365: Mr. WELCH, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 367: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. DESAULNIER, 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, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. CARBAJAL, Miss RICE of New York, and Mrs. TRAHAN.

H.R. 369: Mr. ALLEN, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. GOODEN, and Mr. GRAVES of Missouri.

H.R. 372: Mr. SHERMAN.

H.R. 374: Mr. DUNCAN.

H.R. 385: Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia.

H.R. 396: Mr. COLE.

H.R. 414: Mr. SOTO, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, and Mr. GAETZ.

H.R. 421: Mr. KILMER, Mr. SUOZZI, and Ms. SLOTKIN.

H.R. 427: Mr. NEWHOUSE.

H.R. 437: Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. OLSON, Mr. MEADOWS, and Mr. HARRIS.

H.R. 438: Mr. MCCLINTOCK.

H.R. 446: Ms. MENG and Mr. BRINDISI.

H.R. 453: Mr. JONES.

H.R. 465: Mr. DESAULNIER, Ms. NORTON, Ms. HAALAND, and Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL.

H.R. 485: Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. JONES, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. MOULTON, and Mr. KILMER.

H.R. 489: Mr. STAUBER and Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 490: Mr. HUNTER, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, and Mr. BUCSHON.

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. KAPTUR, Mr. RICHMOND, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. DESAULNIER, Ms. DELAURO, and Ms. FRANKEL.

H.R. 541: Ms. WATERS.

H.J. Res. 2: Mr. CORREA and Ms. SPEIER.

H.J. Res. 22: Mr. TAYLOR.

H.J. Res. 25: 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, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. CORREA, 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. BROWNLEY of California.

H. Res. 40: Ms. GABBARD, 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.

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 165 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JANUARY 15, 2019 No. 8

Senate

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. GRASSLEY).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

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 fountains 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 read the title of the bill for the second time.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 266) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes.

Mr. MCCONNELL. In order to place the bill on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I object to further proceedings.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection having been heard, the bill will be placed on the calendar.

STRENGTHENING AMERICA'S SECURITY IN THE MIDDLE EAST ACT OF 2019—Motion to Proceed

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I move to proceed to S. 1.

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.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper.

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 Senate action 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 and murdered countless—countless—Syrian civilians.

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 what the Democratic leader is filibustering. But a partisan motion on an unrelated foreign policy issue? Oh, he is perfectly happy to see it come right here to the floor for a vote. As I said, at least we know the score.

So here is my commitment to Israel and to Jordan and to the Syrian people: I will continue to force these cynical tactics into the light of day. Democrats may vote a fourth time—or a fifth time—to filibuster these bipartisan bills, even as they turn the Senate toward other business. But Republicans will not abandon the need for American leadership in the world.

NOMINATION OF WILLIAM BARR

Madam President, on one final matter, today our colleagues on the Judiciary Committee will begin nomination hearings for Mr. William Barr, the distinguished public servant President Trump has asked to serve as the Nation's next Attorney General.

Certainly, no one needs me to explain all of the reasons this is a vital position. The Department of Justice is charged with duties such as protecting Americans' civil rights, defending the public order to which citizens are entitled, and upholding the time-honored tradition that the United States of America is a nation governed by law. So it is the Nation's good fortune—our 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 has 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. Democrats 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 no case did even a 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.

GOVERNMENT FUNDING

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, as the Trump shutdown drags on, more and more Americans are getting hurt. Public servants have been working without pay, critical Agencies are unable to perform the functions they are supposed to perform for the American people—whether that is inspecting food supply, protecting our airports and prisons, or helping farmers and small businesses get loans. We are now approaching tax season with the IRS under severe limitations.

When will the President's ridiculous manufactured crisis come to an end?

I have three words for President Trump, Leader MCCONNELL, and our Republican Senators: Open the government.

We can debate border security. We have debated it for a month and a half. We haven't come to a conclusion. Open the government, and we can debate border security while the government is open.

Now, for weeks, as I said, we have been at a standstill. We have offered the President several ways to uncouple his demand for a border wall from a government shutdown. The President has been obstinate, insisting on a $5.7 billion wall he promised that Mexico would pay for.

The few times that his deputies—the Vice President and the Chief of Staff—have made proposals to Democrats, the President contradicted them soon thereafter. Just yesterday, the President flatly refused to consider a proposal from his close ally in the Senate, Senator GRAHAM, to open the government temporarily while we debate border security.

Sadly, neither Republicans in Congress nor the President's own staff seem willing to tell him what everyone else already knows: The President does not have the votes in either House of Congress for his expensive, ineffective wall.

The reason we have been unable to make any progress is that President Trump is not yet interested in making progress.

So there is only one person who can help America break through this gridlock: Leader MITCH MCCONNELL. For the past month, Leader MCCONNELL has been content to hide behind the President, essentially giving him a veto over what comes to the floor of the Senate. It has put him in the ridiculous position of refusing to consider legislation to reopen the government that nearly every Senate Republican has voted for—legislation that leader MCCONNELL has proudly voted for; legislation that the American people favor by a 2-to-1 margin, including nearly 40 percent of Republicans.

The American people suffering the dire consequences of this shutdown can no longer afford to wait for the President to come around. The President must be shown the will of the Congress, and I believe that if Leader MCCONNELL were to put the House-passed bills on

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 that chance. 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's desire to extend his government shutdown?

One final point here, President Trump thinks if he holds out long enough, he will win the fight with 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 as opposed to saying he likes Mueller and thinks he is doing a good job? If Mr. Barr can't say ''yes,'' that he will not interfere in any way with the Mueller investigation, he doesn't deserve the job, particularly in light of his writings.

We should expect unequivocal commitments from Barr to defend the integrity of the FBI and our Federal law enforcement officers, not vague statements that give him plenty of wiggle room to do President 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 investigation to proceed and conclude without any—underline ''any''—interference.

One last point, the expectations for Mr. Barr are even more demanding given the recent revelation that he wrote a detailed, unsolicited memo to the Justice Department criticizing the Mueller investigation, despite having no knowledge of its workings. The memo revealed that Barr holds an astonishingly broad—almost imperial—view of executive power. That should also be a serious line of inquiry for our colleagues on the Judiciary Committee.

The next Attorney General will take charge of a Justice Department that has been embroiled in near-constant chaos for 2 years at a critical moment for our democracy. The Senate should only approve an Attorney General of unimpeachable integrity and unimpeachable fidelity to the rule of law, with the strength and conviction to resist the worst impulses of this President, who, probably, when it comes to the Justice Department, has the worst impulses of any President we have ever had.

RUSSIAN SANCTIONS

Madam President, finally, on Russia sanctions, later this afternoon the Senate will move to consider a motion to proceed to a resolution of disapproval on the Treasury Department's proposal to relax sanctions on three companies owned and controlled by sanctioned Russian oligarch Oleg Deripaska. The case against the Treasury Department's proposal is strong. It fails to sufficiently limit Deripaska's stake in the three companies. It merely reduces his ownership to 45 percent. Many U.S. companies are heavily influenced by an owner who controls much less than a 45-percent share. Why didn't they reduce it to 10 or 15? But they didn't.

Treasury's plan also allows for Russian shareholders with family and business ties to Deripaska to retain shareholder interest. Considering that Deripaska's ex-wife and father-in-law control 7 percent of the company, add that to the 45, and he has total control. So Treasury does not come close to going far enough.

Beyond the weak terms of the deal, the Senate must consider that Deripaska has deep ties to President Putin and his intelligence apparatus, organized crime, and Mr. Paul Manafort, a subject of the special counsel's investigation.

It is deeply suspect that the Trump administration would propose sanctions relief for Deripaska's companies 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 sanctions relief when President Putin has not yet made any move to curtail or constrain his maligned activities around the globe?

Now, this morning, my friend from Kentucky called this a political stunt and a farce. That is appalling. After all Putin has done, this is a stunt and a farce? And why are we doing it now?

He said: Why are Democrats doing it?

Because the underlying law that allows for this resolution has a 30-day alarm clock on it. The alarm clock goes off Thursday. Democrats are not forcing this vote; the law is.

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. Whatever 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 with 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 understanding of the 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 proceeded to 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 to end this partial shutdown 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 our proposals passed exactly as we want them, 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 but 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 just heard 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.

That is a position which, 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 move.

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 Democrats to get the 60 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 workers they want to protect. 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 imperative. 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, every Senate Democrat—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 certainly a part of that solution, to include technological solutions, manpower, additional personnel, cameras, censors, 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 border fence that create 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.

The fact is, 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 115-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 we keep criminals, 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

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 I have yet to see a single step by the Democrats here in the Senate or in the House, in their leadership, a single move, 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.

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. 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 account. 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 Brad Starkey, air traffic 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 workers for their 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 of America. They laid off 176 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 professionals. We have 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 open. 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. It is Interior 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, I 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 coequal branch of government.

Last week, Senator CARDIN and I were right where we are today—here on the floor of the Senate, asking consent 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 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 it is putting 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 doubling their estimate of 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. They are getting their mortgage and rent bills. They don't say 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 payments. 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 30 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.

RUSSIA 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 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 tried to make 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 the Senator from Texas wants to speak 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's 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 with individuals who have the reputation of Oleg Deripaska, and that we maintain the sanctions on both him and his company, RUSAL.

I yield the floor to my friend the Senator from Texas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, I would say to my friend from Virginia, we both serve on the Senate Intelligence Committee, and of course we have both been intimately involved in the investigation on Russia's activities up to and including the 2016 election.

I would like to point out the hypocrisy of our colleagues across the aisle who refused to take up any legislation whatsoever, such as S. 1, which is on the floor and which would take extraordinarily positive measures to protect our most important allies in the Middle East, including Israel and Jordan. They filibustered that bill and said: We are not going to take up any legislation until the government is back open—100 percent of it.

For the past 2 weeks, the minority leader has paralyzed the work of the Senate, saying they would block the Senate from considering any legislation unrelated to government funding. A number of our colleagues have said—for example, the junior Senator from Virginia said: ''The Senate should vote on nothing else until we vote to reopen the government. Period.'' Senator MERKLEY said: ''The Senate's schedule 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 800 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 confirmation 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 trying to balance 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's. To me, that is one of the most difficult positions in the Cabinet to hold. But Mr. Barr has done it before, and I think he can do it again. He, of course, has great institutional knowledge about 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 the 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 to semi-retire, 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 and the FBI 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 restored and then maintained, 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 or anything, other 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 politicalized 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, 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 was glad 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 they 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 border can be effective when 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 detain 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 tell us 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 who has ever been 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 officers tell us they need 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. Higgerson, mentioned that the trade from Texas ports alone is valued at $300 billion per year. For the State of Texas 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 the flow of that 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 binational 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 southern 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 rumors 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 advocate 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 following Hurricane Harvey's landfall and in the nearly year and a half since, and I hope he will continue to work with all of my Texas colleagues and me as we rebuild our communities 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 Senator CORNYN lives down at 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 chairman of the Homeland Security Committee, I have had a chance to visit 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.

I am a huge advocate of border security. I think fencing makes sense in a lot of places. We have hundreds of miles of fencing, and in a lot of places, fences alongside roads make sense. We have very sophisticated surveillance equipment that can look from different platforms. We have drones, fixed-wing aircraft, helicopters, stationary towers, and mobile towers that can look down 20, 25 miles into Mexico and pick up people who are coming up from the south. Motion detectors make sense, and tunnel detectors make sense. There is 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 personnel, 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, really, 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 Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, if I could respond to my friend, the Senator 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 something. We may not want to 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 can, essentially, get placed in the United States while 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 into 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 made by 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 team completed 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 69 wins and only six losses, winning four 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 that 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. They were warm 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 Senator 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 never get tired of 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 is every citizen's 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 would 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 breaths.

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 are so fortunate to see. They were 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. I 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 throughout 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 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 speak with their voices.

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 robbed of their right to life. 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 learn to prioritize 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 all during the years that we have decreased. They have actually caught up, and, in some cases, have actually passed us.

Our men and women in uniform are outstanding representations of what is right in 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 10 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 very clear on this. 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 through about 10 years of not 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 around 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 down. 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 now 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 fiscal year 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 our Secretary of Defense 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 are 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 this 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 Senators be recognized to speak 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 of the 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 associated with a sanctions delisting, which supports longstanding U.S. sanctions policy and foreign policy toward Russia.

This agreement does nothing to change the sealed fate of Deripaska, the direct target of the sanctions. He remains sanctioned. His current assets remain blocked. The primary and secondary sanctions imposed against him dash any hope of future deals or income, either by operation of his divestiture obligations or future dividends based on his remaining shareholder interests in Rusal. His ability to transfer his shares, use his shares as collateral, or even receive cash from dividends are all effectively frozen.

The sanctions that put Deripaska on the SDN list and froze his investments in Rusal and En+ and ESE, and make him personally radioactive to future transactions with just about anyone, forced these companies to disentangle themselves from Deripaska's control and influence or to face financial devastation.

In fact, the Treasury agreement appropriately reflects how U.S. sanctions policy uses smart sanctions to change the behavior of those sanctioned to build pressure behind the ultimate goals of U.S. policy toward Putin's Russia.

The agreement itself is more akin to a deferred prosecution agreement, in that a failure in its terms can result in an immediate relisting to the SDN list, while it ensures that En+, Rusal, and ESE undertake significant restructuring and corporate governance changes to reverse the circumstances that led to their designation in the first place. These actions include reducing Deripaska's direct and indirect shareholding stakes; overhauling the composition of the relevant boards of directors that control the companies' operations and strategic direction; restricting the steps that can be taken relating to their governance; and agreeing to broad and unprecedented transparency that requires ongoing auditing, certification, and reporting requirements.

Part of keeping a smart sanctions program smart is to ensure that the world understands the U.S. sanctions architecture is fair and respects America's extraterritorial sanctions reach, and providing an off-ramp from the SDN list for those listed who can prove deserving is not only good sanctions policy but the law because if Treasury fails in its ability to render fair judgments, erstwhile petitioners for removal will simply resort to either the U.S. courts or worse, simply evasion.

In the circumstances of this case, keeping Rusal on the sanctions list could lead to a Putin nationalization of the Russian aluminum industry, which 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 wider 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, worthy of Senate approval and not a gift to the Kremlin.

Thank you.

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. 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.

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 sanctions from 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 we will not find out until we see 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 skill, expertise, and dedication 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 aluminum giant RUSAL, the Treasury Department would allow Deripaska to use a portion of his shares to pay a very sizable debt to a Russian bank called VTB. So with the deal, Deripaska's overall balance sheet significantly improves. This massive benefit to Deripaska alone is enough to question the merits of this deal.

Moreover, VTB, the Russian bank, is already on a U.S. sectoral sanctions list, related to the 2014 Russian invasion of Crimea and Eastern Ukraine. By allowing VTB, the Russian bank, to participate in this agreement, the Treasury Department is undermining our overall sanctions regime. In effect, the administration is signaling to every entity and individual that has had U.S. sanctions imposed in response to Russia's aggression against Ukraine that they can continue to undermine a sovereign nation without consequence.

Finally, this deal allows Deripaska to maintain a 44.9-percent ownership of En+. While this falls below the Treasury Department's automatic 50 percent threshold for ownership, it is still too high. Yes, perhaps Deripaska has given up control in a legal sense, a technical sense, but make no mistake—he will be the largest shareholder in En+. He will have the ability to appoint one-third of its board members, and he will continue to leverage his network of cronies to influence the conduct of this company. He also has family members who independently will have shares. At the end of the day, he will direct this company's future. I find that unacceptable. We should all find it unacceptable.

No one can deny that we debate this resolution in an increasingly dire context. On top of the indictments and pleas piling up in relation to the Trump campaign's interactions with Russian officials or efforts to cover up those interactions, court filings recently revealed that former Trump campaign chairman Paul Manafort shared polling data with Konstantin Kilimnik during the 2016 Presidential election cycle.

For years, we have known that Mr. Kilimnik has served as a key go-between for Manafort and Oleg Deripaska. He, too, has suspected ties to Russian intelligence.

These latest revelations remind us again that we have more questions than answers about the relationships between the President's associates and the Kremlin.

If that news was not disturbing enough, this past weekend, the New York Times reported that the FBI opened a counterintelligence investigation into the President, in part after he fired the FBI Director because of ''this Russia thing.'' Let that sink in. Senior

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 stunned by seeing the President's 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 and 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 the 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. With that in 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 interpreters. 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 with 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 standing up to 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—I 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 else. Now the leader on 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.

My point is this: 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—not a single 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, even when you mask them by only shutting 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. Somewhere along the line, we have to agree 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.

The truth is, everybody 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 them—meaning 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.

This oligarch, who has a huge investment in the largest aluminum company in Russia, is 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 have driven him down from 75 to 45, and we have some more things to do. They are losing their vote. I think their vote is now down to about 25 percent of the board. They have restricted

him every way they can. I am a businessman; I know how you restrict people and tie them down. This deal does that. It doesn't give them anything they don't want—it gives them a lot of what they don't want to have.

So I just want to appeal to everybody listening to this, all of my colleagues—I love all of you. We all play political jokes. We can talk about how the Democrats did this and the Republicans did that. But the fact is, we are not doing a damn thing while the American people are suffering. The TSA agents I talked to in Atlanta today were doing it out of the goodness of their hearts. A lot of the guys and ladies are not showing up for work, and there are going to be more of them.

We have the Superbowl coming to Atlanta, GA, in about 3 weeks—the biggest tourism event in the world this year. What if the largest airport in the world that is going to bring all the people to the largest football game in the world goes out of business because of the TSA strike? You will have just cost millions of dollars for the United States of America, for my home city—the city of Atlanta—and others. There are thousands of examples just like this.

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.

We need to understand what we are doing and why we are doing it. What we are doing doesn't make any sense. What does make sense is resolving to go out and solve the problem. Senator SCHUMER, Senator MCCONNELL, Senator CRAPO, and I—and all of us—should get together in a room and give the press something to really write about—of our having a meeting of 100 people who caused the problem and saying: Let's find a way to solve the problem or to at least agree to get us back to business, to at least agree to not affect the lowest income people on our payroll, because the higher income people aren't suffering. Let's get the work done. Let's get it worked out. Let's not call it a Republican shutdown or a Democratic shutdown. It is an American shutdown.

I see that Senator SCHUMER is coming. I don't usually get this riled up, CHUCK. I apologize because I am riled up a little bit.

It is just silly. I used to be able to explain anything. I was a pretty good real estate salesman for a long time. I could close a deal. I can't close this one. I had to three or four times on that Delta plane today, as I came up here, and I couldn't do it. When I listened to the answers I was giving these people—good, old American citizens—as to why we can't get the government open, I thought, if I were they, I would not vote for me either.

So let's get to work. 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.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

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.

He says it is not a Democratic shutdown or a Republican shutdown. It is a Trump shutdown. We all know it. Donald Trump has called for the shutting down of the government 25 times. He said at our meeting he is proud to shut down the government.

We Democrats do not want to shut down the government. In fact, our slogan—our watchword—is ''open up the government.'' We have a difference on border security. We are for it. You are for it. You are for something different than we are, but we are not shutting down the government, and everyone knows it. The public opinion polls know it. There are 40 percent of all Republicans, let alone Democrats and Independents, who are for the wall, and most of those people say the government shouldn't be shut down over the wall.

I know how aggravated my colleague is. I would suggest to him that the best solution is to vote for what he voted for—or the whole Republican Party did by unanimous consent—which is to open up the government. Then we can discuss our border security issues.

I yield to my dear friend.

Mr. ISAKSON. Madam President, I will follow up on the Senator's points.

We need to do what we did last year when Republicans and Democrats stayed up here for 2 weeks while the government was shut down. We worked out an immigration agreement, and we got the DACA situation fixed. The President came out for a large number of DACA improvements. We almost got there. We fell short, I think, by six votes. The leader and I were on the same side, and a lot of us in here, from both parties, were on the same side. Those are the types of answers we need. We need to push to get that done.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I thank my colleague.

There is just one difference between what happened then and what is happening now: Neither side was shutting down the government until it got its way.

I will make my statement, I guess, and wait for Leader MCCONNELL and the motion to proceed.

S.J. RES. 2

Madam President, before we take a vote on the motion to proceed on this resolution, I will make two brief points, and I know my colleagues have discussed this very well.

First, my friends the Republican leader and former Republican whip Senator CORNYN are being incredibly disingenuous to suggest this is a political stunt and to accuse Democrats of forcing this vote out of the blue. The timing of this vote was not determined by me or by Leader MCCONNELL. It was determined by the wall. The law says that we only have 30 days to disapprove of sanctions relief on Russia. This was filed right before Christmas.

I would suggest the administration and the Treasury hope to get away with it because they know how unpopular it would be to remove sanctions on Deripaska or on the companies he controls. They knew how unpopular it would be, so they snuck it in right before Christmas, right before we left. We have only 30 days, and those 30 days expire on Thursday. If we wait, those 30 days will expire—they will be gone—and we will have no opportunity. So this is no accident.

If Leader MCCONNELL and Senator CORNYN want to know why this vote is today, they should talk to the White House, because it is the one that filed this on December 21.

Second, there are serious, substantive reasons to oppose the Treasury plan. It fails to sufficiently limit Mr. Deripaska's stake in these three Russian companies. It gives Vladimir Putin exactly what he wants—sanctions relief on three major producers of aluminum and other metals. That is wrong for the country. Putin's Russia continues to run rampant over international norms, to meddle in democratic elections, and to destabilize the world. Russia has violated the sovereignty of Ukraine, has interfered in our elections and the Brexit vote, has propped up the brutal Assad regime, and has been implicated in nerve agent attacks on the soil of our closest ally. Yet the Trump administration proposes reducing sanctions on Putin and his cronies.

Show me the behavior from Vladimir Putin that warrants such relief. I can't think of any, and I will bet 90 percent of all Americans can't think of any.

Let me be clear. A vote against this resolution—a vote to not allow us to proceed—is a vote to go easy on President Putin and his oligarchs.

I understand my friend the leader, the Republican leader, will move to table the motion to proceed to the resolution. I remind my colleagues that

the timeline runs out on Thursday—48 hours from now. We have to take this vote now. I strongly urge my colleagues to vote no on the motion to table and yes on the motion to proceed.

MOTION TO PROCEED

Madam President, I move to proceed to Calendar No. 13, S.J. Res. 2.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The bill clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to the consideration of S.J. Res. 2, 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.

Mr. SCHUMER. 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 the Democrats have repeatedly blocked that important legislation.

The Democratic leader said the Senate shouldn't do any business during this partial government shutdown, 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 long 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, expelled 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.

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 malign 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 the 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.

VOTE ON 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.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 15 seconds.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Democratic leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, the leader's rhetoric belies his words. If you believe Putin is a thug, you don't vote to table this resolution.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion to table.

The yeas and nays were previously ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASSIDY). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 42, nays 57, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 4 Leg.]

YEAS—42

Alexander	Fischer	Portman
Barrasso	Graham	Risch
Blackburn	Grassley	Roberts
Blunt	Hoeven	Romney
Braun	Hyde-Smith	Rounds
Burr	Inhofe	Scott (FL)
Capito	Isakson	Scott (SC)
Cassidy	Johnson	Shelby
Cornyn	Lankford	Sullivan
Cramer	Lee	Thune
Crapo	McConnell	Tillis
Cruz	Murkowski	Toomey
Enzi	Paul	Wicker
Ernst	Perdue	Young

NAYS—57

Baldwin	Harris	Peters
Bennet	Hassan	Reed
Blumenthal	Hawley	Rosen
Booker	Heinrich	Rubio
Boozman	Hirono	Sanders
Brown	Jones	Sasse
Cantwell	Kaine	Schatz
Cardin	Kennedy	Schumer
Carper	King	Shaheen
Casey	Klobuchar	Sinema
Collins	Leahy	Smith
Coons	Manchin	Stabenow
Cortez Masto	Markey	Tester
Cotton	McSally	Udall
Daines	Menendez	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Merkley	Warner
Durbin	Moran	Warren
Feinstein	Murphy	Whitehouse
Gardner	Murray	Wyden

NOT VOTING—1

Gillibrand

The motion was rejected.

VOTE ON MOTION TO PROCEED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to proceed.

The yeas and nays were previously ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 57, nays 42, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 5 Leg.]

YEAS—57

Baldwin	Harris	Peters
Bennet	Hassan	Reed
Blumenthal	Hawley	Rosen
Booker	Heinrich	Rubio
Boozman	Hirono	Sanders
Brown	Jones	Sasse
Cantwell	Kaine	Schatz
Cardin	Kennedy	Schumer
Carper	King	Shaheen
Casey	Klobuchar	Sinema
Collins	Leahy	Smith
Coons	Manchin	Stabenow
Cortez Masto	Markey	Tester
Cotton	McSally	Udall
Daines	Menendez	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Merkley	Warner
Durbin	Moran	Warren
Feinstein	Murphy	Whitehouse
Gardner	Murray	Wyden

NAYS—42

Alexander	Crapo	Isakson
Barrasso	Cruz	Johnson
Blackburn	Enzi	Lankford
Blunt	Ernst	Lee
Braun	Fischer	McConnell
Burr	Graham	Murkowski
Capito	Grassley	Paul
Cassidy	Hoeven	Perdue
Cornyn	Hyde-Smith	Portman
Cramer	Inhofe	Risch

Roberts	Scott (SC)	Tillis
Romney	Shelby	Toomey
Rounds	Sullivan	Wicker
Scott (FL)	Thune	Young

NOT VOTING—1

Gillibrand

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 legislative 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 families and about 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, thought about them, prepared for them, and it had sunk in what an incredible responsibility they really 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 have gone in two different directions. This group of doctors is gathered around this little one, delivering this child, and watching him take his very first breath. Only seconds before that, that same little one we see there with this same group of doctors could have been destroyed—that life in the womb—and it would have been OK.

You see, in America, this moment could go two different directions at any time. This life could be there, and we could watch the decades ahead of him or, seconds before this picture was taken, when that child was still in the womb, that life could have been destroyed, and no one would have paid attention because the determination of whether this is a child or whether this is just a little lump of tissue is determined by a few seconds in a delivery room. If it is still inside the womb, it is not a child; it is just tissue. A few seconds later, when he is delivered, everyone smiles and looks at the face of this baby and says: What a beautiful child, and what a remarkable miracle that is.

How do we do that in America? How do we decide what is life and what is just tissue?

Some people would say it is only a child if we believe it is a child. If we don't believe it is a child, it is not a child; it is only tissue.

Some people say it has incredible value, and we should prepare for his or her college, and we should think and pray about his future and his spouse and what he is going to do. Some people would say it is meaningless—just flesh that can literally be put into a bag and taken to the curb. The determination is really by the mom and the dad there. They get to choose whether that is a child or whether that is tissue.

I honestly don't understand that conversation because when I look at this child with 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, but there is no difference between the two. Both of them have faces and fingers and toes and nervous systems and functioning brains and lungs. They have 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 about 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 at 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, and for some reason in our culture, we are still having a conversation about what to do with that tissue.

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 should just 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 homeless because we believe that every single life matters and that no life can just be thrown away just because one struggles with life. 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, as a culture, that every person should have respect and every person should have opportunity because of one's great potential.

We pat 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.

It 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 of the folks 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 because we understand 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 endangered species, including a $100,000 fine if you damage a golden eagle's egg, a bald eagle's egg, if you go to marine 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 because there is a common 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 other countries on this simple issue about looking at this little one and asking: 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—only four—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 that just came out today—a nationwide 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 mom. 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 stop because 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 that at 12 weeks, 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.

I would only tell you that 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. So 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. We look at the senior adults who are in the nursing homes and provide care for them. We look at the homeless person, the child who is in need of food, and that little girl who is still in the womb, and we say they all have value because the individual has importance.

I had someone who caught me and said: You know, your faith has this whole verse in the Bible that says: ''I was 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 those 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, not tissue.

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 those moments.

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 ended because I don't want to look at you.

The beginning for us, really, is to stop 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 sideshows, it is as though I have been surrounded by mirrors of hard, distorting 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 biochemical accident 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 ran 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 to turn 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, more importantly, 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 Federal Government 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 secure the border should 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 all said this. Even the Members 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, 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 $5.7 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 partial government shutdown involving the U.S. Coast Guard. I am hopeful that this could be a template for getting out of the broader partial government shutdown.

As you know, the partial government shutdown is negatively impacting Federal workers, but none—none—more so than the brave men and women of the U.S. Coast Guard. As I mentioned, they are currently the only members of the U.S. 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 on the Bering Seas, some of the roughest 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 every branch 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 servicemembers 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 doing this to members of the military.

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 Force have not been paid during a lapse in government appropriations.

Your senior leadership, including Secretary Nielsen, remains fully engaged and we 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 (CGMA) has received a $15 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 civilians are already adjusting to a missed paycheck—we are confronting this challenge together.

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 rather unique situation—very 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 this 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 servicemembers. 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, Republicans, 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 my 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 when the bill comes 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 Coast Guard gets short shrift relative to other members of the military. It is wrong, and we need to work on it together.

Why has that happened? Certainly not because they are not as heroic and dedicated and patriotic as the rest of the military. I don't think it is intentional. It is more bureaucratic. The Coast Guard falls under the Commerce Committee. The Coast Guard falls under the Homeland Security Secretary. The Marines, the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force are under the Armed Services Committee and under the Pentagon. Sometimes things just happen, whether it is retirement pay, whether it is the example of paying the military, where the Coast Guard gets treated in an unequal manner. They shouldn't. They shouldn't. We need to treat all members of the military, all five branches, the same: pay, retirement, shutdowns. Again, I don't think it is intentional, but it does happen.

I am the chairman of the subcommittee in the Commerce Committee in charge of the Coast Guard. I sit on the Armed Services Committee. I know a lot of my colleagues, Democrats and Republicans, have recognized this is a problem. The chairman of the Commerce Committee, the chairman of the Armed Services Committee have. I think we are all focused—again, bipartisan—to address some of these challenges where the Coast Guard is not treated equally among the other services, and that is just wrong. We need to start working on that, and I am going to continue to focus on that issue.

The best way we can start working on that is tonight: Fix this pay problem, which every single American knows is inequitable, knows is not fair to the men and women of the Coast Guard, but we are on the verge of a solution. Let's UC this bill tonight—we have the White House's support—and get it over to the House. At least we will take care of one issue where there is an inequality between the men and women in the other branches of the services and the Coast Guard, and then we will work to fix all the others. I am hopeful we are going to get there tonight and hopefully will solve this problem in the next 24 to 48 hours.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

GOVERNMENT FUNDING

Mr. RUBIO. Madam President, it has been an interesting start to this new Congress 2 weeks ago today, I believe—almost 2 weeks ago, this week. We are in a shutdown, and then we had a vote here a few minutes ago to disapprove of a decision made by the administration.

A lot of people would look at that, and they would say that is a sign of weakness and division. Most certainly, I don't like this shutdown. I hope we can figure a way out of it quickly. A lot of people who had nothing to do with it are being hurt. My feelings about that are strong as well. I don't think what the President is requesting is unreasonable, but the reason we have a shutdown is because, at the end of the day, 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 the reason the vote happened is we passed a 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 live within the letter and the law 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 staffing; 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 family food and medicine—the limited amounts people are getting—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 national assembly of Venezuela is the only constitutionally, democratically elected government in the country.

The statements we have made in the last week are entirely rooted in the 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 secession 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 Speaker of the House—third in the line, followed by No. 4 in line, the President pro tempore of the Senate.

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 rooting our support for 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 National Assembly.

What I come to the floor today to ask is that the administration—hopefully 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 the 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, now is the opportunity 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 country 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 tackling climate change 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 millennials 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 nonstop 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 happening. Over 3 million 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 more solar, 64 percent want more 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. Ask Americans about 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 to reduce carbon pollution and create clean energy jobs by investing in infrastructure and renewable energy and efficient buildings and transportation systems, almost 70 percent are supportive, and that includes almost 60 percent of Republicans—20 percent strongly support, and 36.8 percent support. So even the Green New Deal is a winner among Republican voters.

Ask about putting a price on carbon pollution. Why would you want to do that? Because right now, the costs of carbon pollution are put on the public. They are put on all of us. They are put on our constituents. Polluters get away with polluting for free, and the rest of us pay for the added drought and wildfire and storm damage costs. Well, more than 60 percent of registered voters support pricing carbon to reduce emissions. And if you look at Republicans, a majority of Republicans under the age of 45 also support a carbon price.

This new polling matches other polling that is on its way out or recently out that shows solid support for pricing carbon and making polluters pay for the damage they are causing—which, by the way, is also economics 101, but never mind that. We are talking about polling today.

A Monmouth University poll showed that 64 percent of Republicans now accept climate change as a problem, and a majority of Republicans support government action to combat climate change—a majority of Republicans.

An ABC News poll showed that 81 percent of Americans support cutting greenhouse gas emissions, two-thirds supported a carbon tax, and 81 percent supported tax breaks for renewable power.

These are big, strong, national majorities in favor of the kind of action we need and could do to stem the climate crisis.

A poll for Yale and George Mason Universities showed that 70 percent of registered voters, including over half of Republicans, support reducing greenhouse gas emissions regardless of what other countries do.

This poll also found majority support across both parties for U.S. participation in the Paris Agreement and overwhelming support for renewal energy among Republicans, Democrats, and Independents.

What is more, this poll found that almost three-quarters of registered voters, including a majority of Republicans, support setting strict limits on carbon pollution from coal-fired powerplants, and a majority of Republicans, Independents, and Democrats support imposing a revenue neutral carbon tax on fossil fuel companies. A majority of Republicans support imposing a revenue neutral carbon tax on fossil fuel companies.

Well, I have had a bill with Senator SCHATZ in the last several Congresses to do just that—charge a fee on the polluters for their carbon emissions and then return all the revenue raised to the American people. Several bills on the House side also price carbon pollution, and a few even had Republican cosponsors.

These bills went nowhere under Republican leadership, notwithstanding these numbers and notwithstanding public support. Why? Because the fossil fuel industry opposes them—so no hearings, no vote, no nothing.

What did get a vote in the House last year under Republican leadership? A resolution condemning carbon pricing—condemning the carbon pricing that a majority of Republican voters support—backed, of course, by the fossil fuel industry. Virtually every expert, economist, and scientist who has studied the question says that putting a price on carbon pollution is not only the right thing to do morally and economically but is necessary to keep global temperatures from climbing 2 degrees Celsius above preindustrial norms, as the scientific consensus makes clear we must do at a minimum—at a minimum. If we blow past 2 degrees, all bets are off, and the consequences of climate change may become irreversible. Even at 1.5 degrees, we are taking chances, but dozens of industry-backed front groups—this is hard to see, but this is the usual array of web-of-denial, phony-baloney front groups that have been supported, funded, and created by the fossil fuel industry so people don't think it is the fossil fuel industry committing this nonsense. They have groups with names such as ALEC, the Competitive Enterprise Institute, Americans for Tax Reform, Heartland Institute, and Institute for Liberty. These groups clean up their propaganda for them.

So here come these letters. These industry-backed front groups had one important thing going for them that the Nobel Prize-winning economists on the other side couldn't match, and that is big political money and the fossil fuel industry behind them. Groups behind this letter to Speaker RYAN received at

least $54 million from Big Oil and the Koch brothers' political network—at least $54 million. We don't know for sure because of their clandestine, dark money funding network. Likely, it is far more.

The minimum $54 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 situation stinks. The polls 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, wildfires, 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 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 nonresponse to the climate crisis. The warnings have been coming for 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 to get people to work outside, responding to emergencies, responding to fires and so forth, you had to build in a whole new staffing regime because it was so hard 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. Therefore, 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 disapproving 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, Jerry 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 ask unanimous consent that the Senate be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

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 material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RULES OF PROCEDURE OF THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

RULE 1. CONVENING OF MEETINGS

1.1. The regular meeting day of the Select Committee on Intelligence for the transaction of Committee business 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 called at any time upon the 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 notice 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 in writing of the date and time of the meeting.

RULE 2. MEETING PROCEDURES

2.1. Meetings of the Committee shall be open to the public except as provided in paragraph 5(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 majority 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 a majority vote of the 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 proxy 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. Whenever the Committee by roll call vote reports any measure or matter, the report of the Committee upon such measure or matter shall include a tabulation of the votes cast in favor of and the votes cast in opposition to such measure or 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 such legislation and oversight of programs and policies as the Committee may direct. The subcommittees shall be governed by 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 measures or recommendations shall be reported, favorably or unfavorably, from the Committee unless a majority of the Committee is actually present and a majority concur.

4.2. In any case in which the Committee is unable to reach a unanimous decision, separate views 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 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. Such 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, 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 promptly furnished 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 transcripts of the confirmation hearing unless the time limit is waived by unanimous consent of the Committee.

5.6. No nomination 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 the Chairman or the Vice Chairman to 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 memoranda, documents, 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 may be served 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 in their dealings with 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 and request the Committee to propound such question to the counsel's client or to any other witness. The counsel for the witness also may suggest the presentation of other evidence or the calling of other witnesses. The Committee may use or dispose of such questions or suggestions as it deems appropriate.

8.5. Statements by Witnesses.—Witnesses may make brief and relevant statements at the beginning and conclusion of their testimony. Such statements shall not exceed a reasonable period of time as determined by the Chairman, or other presiding members. Any witness required or desiring to make a prepared or written statement for the record of the proceedings shall file a paper and 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 office of the Committee, the 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 shall be decided by the Chairman. Upon request, the Committee may provide to a witness those parts of testimony given by that witness in executive session which are subsequently quoted or made part of a public record, at the expense of the witness.

8.8. Requests To Testify.—The Committee will consider requests to testify on any matter or measure pending before the Committee. A person who believes that testimony or other evidence presented at a public hearing, or any comment made by a Committee member or a member of the Committee staff, may tend to affect adversely that person's reputation, 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.

8.9. 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 Senate unless and until the Committee has, upon notice to all its members, met and considered the recommendation, afforded the person an opportunity to address 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 under this paragraph, the Vice Chairman shall be notified of such authorization as soon as practicable thereafter. No name of any witness shall be released if such release would disclose classified information, unless authorized under Section 8 of S. Res. 400 of the 94th Congress or Rule 9.7.

RULE 9. PROCEDURES FOR HANDLING CLASSIFIED OR COMMITTEE SENSITIVE MATERIAL

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 and Minority Staff Director. At least one 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. Classified documents and material shall be stored in authorized security containers located within the Committee's Sensitive Compartmented Information Facility (SCIF). Copying, duplicating, or removing from the Committee offices of such documents and other materials is strictly prohibited except as is necessary for the conduct of Committee business, and as provided by these Rules. All classified documents or materials removed from the Committee offices for such authorized purposes must be returned to the Committee's SCIF for overnight storage.

9.3. ''Committee sensitive'' means information or material that pertains to the confidential 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 a Committee member or staff member; (4) properly identified or marked by a Committee member or staff member who authored the document; or (5) designated as such by the Chairman and Vice Chairman (or by the Staff Director and Minority Staff Director acting on their behalf). Committee sensitive documents and materials that are classified shall be handled in the same manner as classified documents and material in Rule 9.2. Unclassified committee sensitive documents and materials shall be stored in a manner to protect against unauthorized disclosure.

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 other committee of the Senate 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 recipients advising of their responsibility 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 such information.

9.6. Access to classified information supplied to the Committee shall be limited to those Committee staff members with 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 specified in this rule. Committee members and staff do not need prior approval to disclose classified or committee sensitive information to persons in the Executive branch, the members and staff of the House 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 the information by virtue of their office); (2) for all information, the recipients of the information must have a need-to-know such information for an official governmental purpose; and (3) for all information, the Committee members and staff who provide the information must be engaged in the routine performance of Committee legislative or oversight duties. Otherwise, classified and committee sensitive information may only be disclosed to persons outside the Committee (to include any congressional committee, Member of Congress, 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 possession of the Committee 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 Select Committee on Ethics pursuant to Section 8 of S. Res. 400 of the 94th Congress. Prior to a referral to the Select Committee on Ethics pursuant to Section 8 of S. Res. 400, the Chairman and Vice Chairman shall notify the Majority Leader and Minority Leader.

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 reasonable opportunity to examine all 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 notes taken at such 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 the department, agency, office, 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 be admitted to the closed meeting except upon advance permission from the Chairman and Vice Chairman, or by the Staff Director and Minority Staff Director acting on their behalf.

RULE 10. STAFF

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 or at the request of the Committee. To the maximum extent practicable, the Committee shall rely on its full-time employees to perform all staff functions. No individual may be retained 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 be confirmed by a majority vote of the Committee. After approval or confirmation, the Chairman shall certify Committee staff appointments to the Financial Clerk of the Senate in writing. No Committee staff shall be given access to any classified information or regular access to the Committee offices until such Committee staff has received an appropriate security clearance as described in Section 6 of S. Res. 400 of the 94th Congress.

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 duties of the Committee staff shall be performed, and Committee staff personnel affairs and day-to-day operations, including security and control of classified documents and material, shall be administered under the direct supervision and control of the Staff Director. All Committee staff shall work exclusively on intelligence oversight issues for the Committee. The Minority Staff Director and the Minority Counsel shall be kept fully informed regarding all matters and shall have access to all material in the files of the Committee.

10.4. The Committee staff shall assist the minority as fully as the majority in the expression of minority views, including assistance in the preparation and filing of additional, separate, and minority views, to the end that all points of view may be fully considered by the Committee and the Senate.

10.5. The members of the Committee staff 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 staff or at 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 these rules, or in the event of the termination of the Committee, 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 media in a manner that does not divulge classified or committee sensitive information.

10.6. No member of the Committee staff shall be employed by the Committee unless and until such a member of the Committee staff agrees in writing, as a condition of employment, to abide by the conditions of the nondisclosure agreement promulgated by the Select Committee on Intelligence, pursuant to Section 6 of S. Res. 400 of the 94th Congress, and to abide by the Committee's code of conduct.

10.7. As a precondition for employment on the Committee, each member of the Committee staff must agree in writing to 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 of the termination of the Committee, in such manner as may be determined by the Senate.

10.8. 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. Within 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, acting jointly through the Staff Director and Minority Staff Director. Staff shall be assigned to such element jointly by the Chairman and Vice Chairman, and staff with the principal responsibility for the conduct of an audit shall be qualified by training or experience in accordance with accepted auditing standards.

10.10. The workplace of the Committee shall be free from illegal use, possession, sale, or distribution of controlled substances by its employees. Any violation of such policy by any member of the Committee staff shall be grounds for termination of employment. Further, any illegal use of controlled substances by a member of the Committee staff, within the workplace or otherwise, shall result in reconsideration of the security clearance of any such staff member and may constitute grounds for termination of employment with the Committee.

10.11. All personnel actions affecting the staff of the Committee shall be made free from any discrimination based on race, color, religion, sex, national origin, age, handicap, or disability.

RULE 11. PREPARATION FOR COMMITTEE MEETINGS

11.1. Under direction of the Chairman and the Vice Chairman designated Committee staff members shall brief members of the Committee at a time sufficiently prior to any Committee meeting to assist the Committee members in preparation for such meeting and to determine any matter which the Committee member might wish considered during the meeting. Such briefing shall, at the request of a member, include a list of all pertinent papers and other materials that have been obtained by the Committee that bear on matters to be considered at the meeting.

11.2. The Staff Director and/or Minority Staff Director may recommend to the Chairman and the Vice Chairman the testimony, papers, and other materials to be presented to the Committee at any meeting. The determination whether such testimony, papers, and other materials shall be presented in open or executive session shall be made pursuant to the Rules of the Senate and Rules of the Committee.

11.3. The Staff Director shall ensure that covert action programs of the U.S. Government receive appropriate consideration by the Committee no less frequently than once a quarter.

RULE 12. LEGISLATIVE CALENDAR

12.1. The Clerk of the Committee shall maintain a printed calendar for the information of each Committee member showing the measures introduced and referred to the Committee and the status of such measures; nominations referred to the Committee and their status; and such other matters as the Committee determines shall be included. The Calendar shall be revised from time to time to show pertinent changes. A copy of each such revision shall be furnished to each member of the Committee.

12.2. Measures referred to the Committee may be referred by the Chairman and/or Vice Chairman to the appropriate department or agency of the Government for reports thereon.

RULE 13. COMMITTEE TRAVEL

No member of the Committee or Committee Staff shall travel on Committee business unless specifically authorized by the Chairman and Vice Chairman. Requests for authorization of such travel shall state the purpose and extent of the trip. A full report shall be filed with the Committee when travel is completed.

RULE 14. 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 48 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. (1976)[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 and programs of the United States Government, and to submit to the Senate appropriate proposals for legislation and report to the Senate concerning such intelligence activities and programs. In 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 Nation. It is further the purpose of this resolution to provide vigilant legislative oversight over the intelligence activities of the United States to assure that such activities are in conformity with the Constitution and laws of the United States.

SEC. 2. (a)(1) 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; and

(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 President pro tempore 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)(A) The majority leader of 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.

(B) 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 chairman of the select Committee and the Minority Leader shall select a vice chairman for the select Committee. The vice chairman shall act in the place and stead of the chairman in the absence of the chairman. Neither the chairman nor the vice chairman of the select committee shall at the same time serve as chairman or ranking minority member of any other committee referred to in paragraph 4(e)(1) of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate.

(c) The select Committee may be organized into subcommittees. Each subcommittee shall have a chairman and a vice chairman 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.

(2) The Central Intelligence Agency and the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency.

(3) Intelligence activities of all other departments and agencies of the Government, including, but not limited to, the intelligence activities of the Defense Intelligence Agency, the National Security Agency, and other agencies of the Department of Defense; the Department of State; the Department of Justice; and the Department of the Treasury.

(4) The organization or reorganization of any department or agency of the Government to the extent that the organization or reorganization relates to a function or activity involving intelligence activities.

(5) Authorizations for appropriations, both direct and indirect, for the following:

(A) The Office of the Director of National Intelligence and the Director of National Intelligence.

(B) The Central Intelligence Agency and the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency.

(C) The Defense Intelligence Agency.

(D) The National Security Agency.

(E) The intelligence activities of other agencies and subdivisions of the Department of Defense.

(F) The intelligence activities of the Department of State.

(G) 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) to the extent that the activities of such successor department, agency, or subdivision are activities described 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), (5)(A), or (5)(B) of subsection (a), containing any matter otherwise within the jurisdiction of any standing committee shall, at the request of the chairman of such standing committee, be referred to such standing committee for its consideration of such matter and be reported to the Senate by such standing committee within 10 days after the day on which such proposed legislation, in its entirety and including annexes, is referred to such standing committee; and any 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 of such matter 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, is referred to such committee.

(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 on the 10th day following the day on which such proposed legislation is referred to such committee unless the Senate provides otherwise, or the Majority Leader or Minority Leader request, prior to that 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 computation any days on which the Senate is not in session.

(4) The reporting and referral processes outlined in this subsection shall be conducted in strict 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 or alterations to the text of the referred bill and its annexes, but may propose changes or alterations to the same in the form of amendments.

(c) 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.

(d) Nothing in this resolution shall be construed as amending, limiting, or otherwise changing the authority of any standing committee of the Senate to obtain full and prompt access to the product 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 such other committee or committees. In making such report, the select committee shall proceed in a manner consistent with section 8(c)(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 agency or department concerned and the intelligence activities of foreign countries directed at the United States or its interest. An unclassified version of each report may be made available to the public at 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 sources of information on which such reports are based 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 and estimates described in section 301(c) of 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 and other testimony, (8) to procure the service of individual consultants or organizations thereof, in accordance with the provisions of section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, and (9) with the prior consent of the government department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to use on a reimbursable basis the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

(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 chairman, the vice chairman or any member of the select committee designated by the chairman, and may be served by any person designated by the chairman or any member signing the subpoenas.

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 be bound by the rules of the Senate (including the jurisdiction of the Select Committee on Ethics) and of such committee as to the security of such information during and after the period of his employment or 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 shall, within the determination of such committee in consultation with the Director of National Intelligence, 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 prevent such committee from publicly disclosing any such information in any case in which such committee determines the national interest in the disclosure of such information clearly outweighs any infringement on the privacy of any person or persons.

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 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 select committee shall disclose any information, the disclosure of which requires a committee vote, prior to a vote by the committee on the question of the disclosure of such information or after such vote except in accordance with this section.

(b)(1) In any case in which the select committee votes to disclose publicly 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—

(A) first, notify the Majority Leader and Minority Leader of the Senate of such vote; and

(B) second, consult with the Majority Leader and Minority Leader before notifying the President of such vote.

(2) The select committee may disclose publicly such information after the expiration of a five-day period following the day on which notice of such vote is transmitted to the Majority Leader and the Minority Leader and the President, unless, prior to the expiration of such five-day period, the President, personally in writing, notifies the committee that he objects to the disclosure of such information, provides his reasons therefore, and certifies that the threat to the national interest of the United States posed by such disclosure is of such gravity that it outweighs any public interest in the disclosure.

(3) If the President, personally, in writing, notifies the Majority Leader and Minority Leader of the Senate and the select Committee of his objections to the disclosure of such information as provided in paragraph (2), the Majority Leader and Minority Leader jointly or the select Committee, by majority vote, may refer the question of the disclosure of such information to the Senate for consideration.

(4) Whenever the select committee votes to refer the question of disclosure of any information to the Senate under paragraph (3), the Chairman shall not later than the first day on which the Senate is in session following the day on which the vote occurs, report the matter to the Senate for its consideration.

(5) One hour after the Senate convenes on the fourth day on which the Senate is in session following the day on which any such matter is reported to the Senate, or at such earlier time as the majority leader and the minority leader of the Senate jointly agree upon in accordance with paragraph 5 of rule XVII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Senate shall go into closed session and the matter shall be the pending business. In considering the matter in closed session the Senate may—

(A) approve the public disclosure of all or any portion of the information in question, in which case the committee shall publicly disclose the information ordered to be disclosed,

(B) disapprove the public disclosure of all or any portion of the information in question, in which case the committee shall not publicly disclose the information ordered not to be disclosed, or

(C) refer all or any portion of the matter back to the committee, in which case the committee shall make the final determination with respect to the public disclosure of the information in question.

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 such 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 paragraph 5 of rule XVII of the Standing Rules of the Senate (whichever the case may be), the Senate shall immediately vote on the disposition of such matter in open session, without debate, and without divulging the information with respect to which the vote is being taken. The Senate shall vote to dispose of such matter by one or 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)(1) No information 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 under established 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 by a 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 other 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 in a closed session of the Senate.

(d) It shall be the duty of the Select Committee on Ethics to investigate any unauthorized disclosure of intelligence information by a Member, officer 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 such 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 breach of confidentiality or unauthorized disclosure by a Member, officer, or employee of the Senate, it shall report its findings to the Senate and recommend appropriate action such as censure, removal from committee membership, or expulsion from the Senate, in the case of a Member, or removal from office or employment or punishment for contempt, in the case of an officer or employee.

SEC. 9. The select committee is authorized to permit any personal representative of the President, designated by the President to serve as a liaison to such committee, to attend any closed meeting of such committee.

SEC. 10. Upon expiration of the Select 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 appropriate conditions established by it, shall be transferred to the select committee.

SEC. 11. (a) It is the sense of the Senate that the head of each department and agency of the United States should keep the select committee fully and currently informed with respect to intelligence activities, including any significant anticipated activities, which are the responsibility of or engaged in by such department or agency: Provided, That this does not constitute a condition precedent to the implementation of any such anticipated intelligence activity.

(b) It is the sense of the Senate that the head of any department or agency of the United States involved in any intelligence activities should furnish any information or document in the possession, custody, or control of the department or agency, or person paid by such department or agency, whenever requested by the select committee with respect to any matter within such committee's jurisdiction.

(c) It is the sense of the Senate that each department and agency of the United States should report immediately upon discovery to the select committee any and all intelligence activities which constitute violations of the constitutional rights of any person, violations of law, or violations of Executive orders, Presidential directives, or departmental or agency rules or regulations; each department and agency should further report to such committee what actions have been taken or are expected to be taken by the departments or agencies with respect to such violations.

SEC. 12. Subject to the Standing Rules of the Senate, no funds shall be appropriated for any fiscal year beginning after September 30, 1976, with the exception of a continuing bill or resolution, or amendment thereto, or conference report thereon, to, or for use of, any department or agency of the United States to carry out any of the following activities, unless such funds shall have been previously authorized by a bill or joint resolution passed by the Senate during the same or preceding fiscal year to carry out such activity for such fiscal year:

(1) The activities of the Office of the Director of National Intelligence and the Director of National Intelligence.

(2) The activities of the Central Intelligence Agency and the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency.

(3) The activities of the Defense Intelligence Agency.

(4) The activities of the National Security Agency.

(5) The intelligence activities of other agencies and subdivisions of the Department of Defense.

(6) The intelligence activities of the Department of State.

(7) The intelligence activities of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

SEC. 13. (a) The select committee shall make a study with respect to the following matters, taking into consideration with respect to each such matter, all relevant aspects of the effectiveness of planning, gathering, use, security, and dissemination of intelligence:

(1) the quality of the analytical capabilities of United States foreign intelligence agencies and means for integrating more closely analytical intelligence and policy formulation;

(2) the extent and nature of the authority of the departments and agencies of the Executive branch to engage in intelligence activities and the desirability of developing charters for each intelligence agency or department;

(3) the organization of intelligence activities in the Executive branch to maximize the effectiveness of the conduct, oversight, and accountability of intelligence activities; to reduce duplication or overlap; and to improve the morale of the personnel of the foreign intelligence agencies;

(4) the conduct of covert and clandestine activities and the procedures by which Congress is informed of such activities;

(5) the desirability of changing any law, Senate rule or procedure, or any Executive order, rule, or regulation to improve the protection of intelligence secrets and provide for disclosure of information for which there is no compelling reason for secrecy;

(6) the desirability of establishing a standing committee of the Senate on intelligence activities;

(7) the desirability of establishing a joint committee of the Senate and the House of Representatives on intelligence activities in lieu of having separate committees in each House of Congress, or of establishing procedures under which separate committees on intelligence activities of the two Houses of Congress would receive joint briefings from the intelligence agencies and coordinate their policies with respect to the safeguarding of sensitive intelligence information;

(8) the authorization of funds for the intelligence activities of the Government and whether disclosure of any of the amounts of such funds is in the public interest; and

(9) the development of a uniform set of definitions for terms to be used in policies or guidelines which may be adopted by the executive or legislative branches to govern, clarify, and strengthen the operation of intelligence activities.

(b) The select committee may, in its discretion, omit from the special study required by this section any matter it determines has been adequately studied by the Select Committee To Study Governmental Operations With Respect to Intelligence Activities, established by Senate Resolution 21, Ninety-fourth Congress.

(c) The select committee shall report the results of the study provided for by this section to the Senate, together with any recommendations for legislative or other actions it deems appropriate, no later than July 1, 1977, and from time to time thereafter as it deems appropriate.

SEC. 14. (a) As used in this resolution, the term ''intelligence activities'' includes (1) the collection, analysis, production, dissemination, or use of information which relates to any foreign country, or any government, political group, party, military force, movement, or other association in such foreign country, and which relates to the defense, foreign policy, national security, or related policies of the United States, and other activity which is in support of such activities; (2) activities taken to counter similar activities directed against the United States; (3) covert or clandestine activities affecting the relations of the United States with any foreign government, political group, party, military force, movement or other association; (4) the collection, analysis, production, dissemination, or use of information about activities of persons within the United States, its territories and possessions, or nationals of the United States abroad whose political and related activities pose, or may be considered by any department, agency, bureau, office, division, instrumentality, or employee of the United States to pose, a threat to the internal security of the United States, and covert or clandestine activities directed against such persons. Such term does not include tactical foreign military intelligence serving no national policymaking function.

(b) As used in this resolution, the term ''department or agency'' includes any organization, committee, council, establishment, or office within the Federal Government.

(c) For purposes of 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 supplement to its budget, 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 to the select Committee. The designated representative shall have office space and appropriate office equipment in the select Committee spaces. Designated personal representatives 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 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 constituting acquiescence by the Senate in any practice, or in the conduct of any activity, not otherwise authorized by law.

SEC. 17. (a)(1) Except as provided in subsections (b) and (c), the Select Committee shall have jurisdiction to review, hold hearings, and report the nominations of civilian individuals for positions in the intelligence community for which appointments are made by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

''(2) Except as provided in subsections (b) and (c), other committees with jurisdiction over the department or agency of the Executive Branch which contain a position referred to in paragraph (1) may hold hearings and interviews with individuals nominated for such position, but only the Select Committee shall report such nomination.

''(3) In this subsection, the term 'intelligence community' means an element of the intelligence community specified in or designated under section 3(4) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3003(4)).

''(b)(1) With respect to the confirmation of the Assistant Attorney General for National Security, or any successor position, the nomination of any individual by the President to serve in such position shall be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and, if and when reported, to the Select Committee for not to exceed 20 calendar days, except that in cases when the 20-day period expires while the Senate is in recess, the Select Committee shall have 5 additional calendar days after the Senate reconvenes to report the nomination.

''(2) If, upon the expiration of the period described in paragraph (1), the Select Committee has not reported the nomination, such nomination shall be automatically discharged from the Select Committee and placed on the Executive Calendar.

''(c)(1) With respect to the confirmation of appointment to the position of Director of the National Security Agency, Inspector General of the National Security Agency, Director of the National Reconnaissance Office, or Inspector General of the National Reconnaissance Office, or any successor position to such a position, the nomination of any individual by the President to serve in such position, who at the time of the nomination is a member of the Armed Forces on active duty, shall be referred to the Committee on Armed Services and, if and when reported, to the Select Committee for not to exceed 30 calendar days, except that in cases when the 30-day period expires while the Senate is in recess, the Select Committee shall have 5 additional calendar days after the Senate reconvenes to report the nomination.

''(2) With respect to the confirmation of appointment to the position of Director of the National Security Agency, Inspector General of the National Security Agency, Director of the National Reconnaissance Office, or Inspector General or the National Reconnaissance Office, or any successor position to such a position, the nomination of any individual by the President to serve in such position, who at the time of the nomination is not a member of the Armed Forces on active duty, shall be referred to the Select Committee and, if and when reported, to the Committee on Armed Services for not to exceed 30 calendar days, except that in cases when the 30-day period expires while the Senate is in recess, the Committee on Armed Services shall have an additional 5 calendar days after the Senate reconvenes to report the nomination.

''(3) If, upon the expiration of the period of sequential referral described in paragraphs (1) and (2), the committee to which the nomination was sequentially referred has not reported the nomination, the nomination shall be automatically discharged from that committee and placed on the Executive Calendar.''.

APPENDIX B

INTELLIGENCE PROVISIONS IN S. RES. 445, 108TH CONG., 2D SESS. (2004) WHICH WERE NOT INCORPORATED IN S. RES. 400, 94TH CONG., 2D SESS. (1976)

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 Select Committee on Intelligence a Subcommittee on Oversight which shall be in addition to any other subcommittee established by the select Committee.

(b) Responsibility.—The Subcommittee on Oversight shall be responsible for ongoing oversight of intelligence activities.

Sec. 402. Subcommittee Related to Intelligence Appropriations.

(a) Establishment.—There is established in the Committee on Appropriations a Subcommittee on Intelligence. The Committee on Appropriations shall reorganize into 13 subcommittees as soon as possible after the convening of the 109th Congress.

(b) Jurisdiction.—The Subcommittee on Intelligence of the Committee on Appropriations shall have jurisdiction over funding for intelligence matters, as determined by the Senate Committee on Appropriations.

APPENDIX C

RULE 26.5(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 may be closed to the public on a motion made and seconded to go into closed session to discuss only whether the matters enumerated in 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 relate solely to matters of committee staff personnel or internal staff management or procedure;

(3) will tend to charge an individual with crime or misconduct, to disgrace or injure the professional standing of an individual, or otherwise to expose an individual to public contempt or obloquy, or will represent a clearly unwarranted invasion of the privacy of an individual;

(4) will disclose the identity of any informer or law enforcement agent or will disclose any information relating to the investigation or prosecution of a criminal offense that is required to be kept secret in the 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 a confidential basis, other than through an application by such person for a specific Government financial or other benefit, and is required to be kept secret in order to prevent undue injury to the competitive position of such person; or

(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 in the Washington, DC, area, ultimately earning a Ph.D. in American diplomatic history from Georgetown University in

1969. He also began pursuing his own American dream by becoming a U.S. citizen, getting married, starting a family and starting a career at the Library of Congress.

Dr. Wang worked for 3 years at the State Department's Foreign Service Institute before starting at the U.S. Library of Congress. He served in several positions during his 47-year career at the Library and reached the position of head of the Chinese and Korean section in 1975, which he held until he retired. During his tenure, he expanded the library's Chinese collection from 300,000 volumes to more than 1 million. Under his guidance, the Library of Congress became a top resource for the study of China in the United States. Dr. Wang met with countless U.S. Representatives, Senators, officials, and academics to help them effectively use the Library resources.

After President Nixon traveled to China in 1972, Dr. Wang embarked on a trip to China in his role at the Library of Congress to promote library and educational exchanges. The trip was a great success, leading to future exchanges, large book acquisitions, and an increase in mutual understanding between the U.S. and China during a very delicate time when the two countries were only just beginning to establish ties.

Although the Library of Congress Chinese section was abolished and its collection integrated into the larger Asian division, the legacy of the Chinese collection and the contributions Dr. Wang made to develop this important resource still remains. His efforts over the years have helped deepen the U.S. understanding of China, something that is especially necessary today. Professor Wang continues to dedicate his time to improving U.S.-China mutual understanding as the cofounder and president of the Washington, DC-based nonprofit, the U.S.-China Policy Foundation. He also contributes his own scholarship in the field, having published multiple books and articles on U.S.-China relations.

Dr. Wang still remembers fondly his decades working at the Library of Congress. What started simply as a job turned into a career and lifelong passion. He especially enjoyed the times he met with various Members of Congress.

As we, again, face a challenging time in U.S.-China relations, the resources and information available in the Library of Congress can help in providing increasingly useful information in understanding the complex and ever-changing U.S.-China relationship.

TRIBUTE TO PATRICK NEWBOLD

Mr. BOOZMAN. Madam President, today I wish to pay tribute to Mr. Patrick Newbold for his exemplary dedication to duty and service as an Army Congressional Fellow and Congressional Budget Liaison for 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.

A native of Florida, Mr. Newbold joined the Department of Army in 2004 as an Army Materiel Command Fellow upon graduation from Bethune-Cookman University with a bachelor's degree in computer information systems. He also holds a masters of business administration from Texas A&M-Texarkana and a master's of professional studies in legislative affairs from the George Washington University.

Mr. Newbold has served in a broad range of assignments during his 15-year Army career. His assignments took him to the most strategic locations responsible for modernizing, equipping, and empowering our Army soldiers to fight and win wars; Red River Army Depot, Texarkana, TX; Redstone Arsenal, AL; the Pentagon; and the headquarters of the United States Corps of Engineers, Washington, DC. He has held many positions, thriving in supervisory positions hallmarked by his servant leadership.

In 2018, I had the privilege of working with Mr. Newbold in my capacity as the chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee Subcommittee on Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies. Mr. Newbold worked tirelessly with Members of Congress and their staffs to articulate the Army's budget positions to the appropriations committees. His professionalism, diligence and commitment to the mission are unmatched, and his work both as a fellow for Congressman SANFORD BISHOP and as a budget liaison effectively represented the U.S. Army and the Department of Defense to the U.S. Congress.

Throughout his career, Mr. Newbold has made positive impacts on the lives of soldiers, peers, and superiors. Our country has benefited tremendously from his extraordinary leadership, judgment, and passion. I join my colleagues today in honoring his dedication to our Nation and invaluable service to the U.S. Congress as an Army Congressional Liaison.

It was a genuine pleasure to have worked with Mr. Patrick Newbold over the last year. On behalf of a grateful nation, I join my colleagues today in recognizing and commending Patrick for his service to our country, and we wish him all the best as he continues his service in the U.S. Army.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

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 several 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 criminal deputy. 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 street. 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.

It is because of his long list of 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 effort to bring access to online reference and information resources for all Oklahoma libraries and schools 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 a fellow Oklahoman. Again, 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. ISAKSON. Madam President, today I am honored to recognize in the RECORD Albert M. Hodge, Jr., of Rome, GA.

Al Hodge is an economic development leader whom I have known for more than three decades, dating back to his work as chief executive officer of the Charleston Metro Chamber of Commerce in South Carolina in the 1980s. We have worked together in business, when I was in the State legislature and chairman of the State board of education, and still today in our current roles.

Al is a fellow University of Georgia bulldog, who led the Charleston chamber for 8 years, the Augusta chamber in Georgia for 8 years, and now the Rome Floyd Chamber of Commerce in northwest Georgia for what will be 21 years when he retires from the chamber business this April.

Al is not one to take credit, but his professional accomplishments tell a lot of his story not only in these communities, but also across multiple States and even internationally.

Al is the current vice chair of the Japan America Society of Georgia and, along with me, a member of the Society of International Business Fellows. He graduated from Leadership Georgia a few years after me, and he has always remained active with the organization. Al also served as a member and as vice chair of the Georgia Board of Education and multiple other education-focused boards. He is a past chairman and a current board member of the Georgia Department of Community Affairs. Al has also served as chair of Georgia's economic development professional association, the State's chamber of commerce professional association, and he has taught economic development at the U.S. Army War College, internationally with our alma mater, and other organizations.

Al is an expert in his field. He understands the countless factors that play into successful economic development, he builds coalitions to mount successful campaigns, and his work has paid off time and again.

Rome is a great community, with many leaders and good friends of mine, but in large part thanks to Al's personal investment of time and energy into his role, the community has gained more than $1.2 billion in direct investments by primary employers and the creation and retention of over 7,000 new primary jobs, not counting commercial, service, and other jobs, during his time there.

Al was an instrumental member of the coalition that built State Mutual Stadium and brought the Braves organization's Class-A ball club to the community in 2003, the Rome Braves. Thanks to his leadership, the community passed not only the Special Purpose Local Option Sales Tax—SPLOST—but also more of these initiatives 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 my 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 Hodge—who has been a true partner to Al, in addition to her own career as an artist—the very best as he retires from the chamber. I also look forward to the 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 work and we wish him all the best in his retirement.

Ted was born and raised on Vinalhaven, one of the many vibrant island communities off the coast of Maine. Like so many before him, Ted has the ocean in his blood; he spent more than three decades as the captain of two boats, the F/V *Mary Elizabeth* and F/V *Dorothy M.*, fishing for groundfish, scallops, and lobster. Ted was an early member of the Stonington Fisheries Alliance and then founded and served on the board of the Penobscot East Resource Center in Stonington, which is now the Maine Center for Coastal Fisheries. Ted also founded and directed the Zone C Lobster Hatchery in Stonington. He is the former executive director of the Maine Gillnetters Association and a member of the Maine Marine Resources Committee to Establish a Lobster Zone Management Plan.

Not only did Ted have a long career as a fisherman, but he also taught at the University of Maine and Mt. Desert Island High School, educating the next generation about chemistry, biochemistry, and environmental science. Ted has a M.S. in biochemistry with a specialty in tissue culture and 6 years of research experience; he has won numerous recognitions including the 2005 MacArthur Foundation's Genius Award, Monmouth University's 2007 ''Champion of the Oceans'' Award, and was named a visiting coastal studies scholar at Bowdoin College in 2010. In 2007, he was the Geddes W. Simpson Distinguished Lecturer at the University of Maine for his work at the intersection of science and history.

Ted's career clearly shows his passion for ensuring that the tradition of fishing is preserved for generations to come. Ted has worked to restore cod, haddock, and flounder in the eastern Gulf of Maine, working with the Maine Department of Marine Resources to conduct interviews with retired fishermen, map historical stock distributions, and publish a paper that helped provide the scientific evidence that would explain the depletion of the fish in the area.

Ted has served his community and the State of Maine for many years in so many ways, and we are lucky to call him one of our own. While we will miss 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.•

REMEMBERING BARNEY GOTTSTEIN

• Ms. MURKOWSKI. 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 and beyond.

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. Gottstein's 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 side of the business in 1990 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 engagement even more so. He was 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 Conventions.

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 he 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 behind them.

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.

H.R. 206. An act to amend the small business laws to create certain requirements with respect to the SBIR and STRR program, and for other purposes.

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.

H.R. 430. An act to extend the program of block grants to States for temporary assistance for needy families and related programs through June 30, 2019.

MEASURES 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 Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

H.R. 206. An act to amend the small business laws to create certain requirements with respect to the SBIR and STTR 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 115–44, 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, the report of a rule entitled ''Nuclear Classification and Declassification'' ((RIN1992–AA49) (10 CFR Part 1045)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 3, 2019; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–73. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 22–478, ''Neighborhood Safety and Engagement Fund Temporary Amendment Act of 2018''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–74. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 22–499, ''Access to Public Benefits Temporary Amendment Act of 2018''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–75. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 22–502, ''Parent-led Play Cooperative Temporary Amendment Act of 2018''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–76. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 22–503, ''Revised Synthesis Abatement and Full Enforcement Drug Control Temporary Amendment Act of 2018''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–77. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 22–519, ''Fiscal Year 2019 Budget Support Clarification Temporary Amendment Act of 2018''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–78. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report

on D.C. Act 22–532, ''Prevention of Child Abuse and Neglect Temporary Amendment Act of 2018''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–79. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 22–533, ''Clarification of Hospital Closure Procedure Temporary Amendment Act of 2018''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–80. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 22–492, ''Rental Housing Commission Independence Clarification Amendment Act of 2018''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–81. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 22–500, ''Advisory Neighborhood Commissions Debit Cards Amendment Act of 2018''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–82. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 22–501, ''Rental Housing Affordability Re-establishment Amendment Act of 2018''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–83. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 22–504, ''Elections Modernization Amendment Act of 2018''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–84. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 22–505, ''At-Risk Tenant Protection Clarifying Amendment Act of 2018''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–85. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 22–506, ''Access to Treatment for Anaphylaxis Act of 2018''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–86. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 22–507, ''Rebate Reform Amendment Act of 2018''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–87. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 22–508, ''Extension of Time to Dispose of 8th & O Streets N.W., Amendment Act of 2018''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–88. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 22–511, ''Ensuring Community Access to Recreational Spaces Act of 2018''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–89. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 22–512, ''Pathways to District Government Careers Amendment Act of 2018''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–90. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 22–513, ''Save Good Food Amendment Act of 2018''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–91. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 22–514, ''Interstate Insurance Product Regulation Compact Act of 2018''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–92. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 22–515, ''Trafficking Survivors Relief Amendment Act of 2018''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–93. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 22–516, ''Teachers, Police, and Firefighters Retirement Benefits Amendment Act of 2018''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–94. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 22–517, ''Service Contract Regulation Act of 2018''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–95. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 22–518, ''Bruce Robey Court Designation Act of 2018''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–96. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 22–534, ''Salary Adjustment Amendment Act of 2018''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–97. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 22–535, ''Closing of a Public Alley in Square 653, S.O. 15–26384, Act of 2018''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–98. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 22–536, ''Vacancy Increase Reform Amendment Act of 2018''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–99. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 22–537, ''Omnibus Department of For-Hire Vehicles Amendment Act of 2018''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–100. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 22–538, ''Leaf Blower Regulation Amendment Act of 2018''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–101. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 22–539, ''Daytime School Parking Zone Act of 2018''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–102. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 22–540, ''Vulnerable Population and Employer Protection Amendment of 2018''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–103. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 22–541, ''Boxing and Wrestling Commission Amendment Act of 2018''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–104. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 22–542, ''Parcel 42 Surplus Property Declaration and Disposition Approval Act of 2018''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–105. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 22–543, ''Approval of the Comcast of the District, LLC Cable Television System Franchise Act of 2018''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–106. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 22–544, ''Approval of the Starpower Communications Open Video System Franchise Act of 2018''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–107. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 22–545, ''Relocation of a Passageway Easement in Square 696 Authorization Act of 2018''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–108. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 22–546, ''Revised Transfer of Jurisdiction over U.S. Reservation 724 (Lots 896 and 897 within Square 620) and Extinguishment of Covenants Act of 2018''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–109. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 22–547, ''Fiscal Year 2019 Budget Support Clarification Amendment Act of 2018''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–110. A communication from the Director of Legislative Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Expanded Examination Cycle for Certain Small Insured Depository Institutions and U.S. Braches and Agencies of Foreign Banks'' (RIN3064–AE76) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 10, 2019; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–111. 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 ''Truth in Lending (Regulation Z)'' (RIN7100–AF25) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 9, 2019; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–112. 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 ''Consumer Leasing (Regulation M)'' (RIN7100–AF24) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 9, 2019; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–113. 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 ''Appraisals for Higher-Priced Mortgage Loans Exemption'' (RIN7100–AF26) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 9, 2019; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–114. 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 ''Federal Reserve Bank Capital Stock'' (RIN7100–AF27) 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 Depository Institutions and U.S. Branches and Agencies of Foreign Banks'' (RIN7100–AF09) 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/C(D) Rating System to Savings and Loan Holding Companies'' (Docket No. OP–1631) 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 ''Large Financial Institution Rating System; Regulations K and LL'' (RIN7100–AE82) 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–AF32) 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 ''Liquidity Coverage 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–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–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–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 Imposed on Certain Archaeological and Ecclesiastical Ethnological Material from Bulgaria'' ((RIN1515–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 Imposed on Certain Archaeological Material from Bulgaria'' ((RIN1515–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 Plan pursuant to section 4233 of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, as amended; to the Committees on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions; and Finance.

EC–124. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Fiscal Year 2015 Report to Congress on Community Services Block Grant Discretionary Activities—Community Economic Development and Rural Community Development Programs''; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–125. A communication from the Director, White House Liaison, Department of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Chief Financial Officer of the Department of Education, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 10, 2019; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–126. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Affairs, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Adjustment of Civil Penalties for Inflation'' ((RIN1212–AB45) (29 CFR Parts 4071 and 4302)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 10, 2019; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–127. A communication from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting, pursuant to law, an annual report on crime victims' rights; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–128. A communication from the Director of Regulation Policy and Management, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Per Diem Paid to States for Care of Eligible Veterans in State Homes'' (RIN2900–AO88) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 2, 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'' (RIN2900–AQ12) 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 ''Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pollock in Statistical Area 610 in the Gulf of Alaska'' (RIN0648–XF900) 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 Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Catcher Vessels Greater Than or Equal to 60 Feet Length Overall Using Pot Gear in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area'' (RIN0648–XF925) 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; Summer Flounder Fishery; Quota Transfers'' (RIN0648–XF937) 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 Herring Fishery; 2018 River Herring and Shad Catch Cap Reached for Midwater Trawl Vessels in the Mid-Atlantic/Southern New England Catch Cap Area'' (RIN0648–XG087) 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 Mackerel, Squid, and Butterfish; 2018 River Herring and Shad Catch Cap Reached for the Directed Atlantic Mackerel Commercial Fishery'' (RIN0648–XG054) 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 ''Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; Commercial Blacktip Sharks, Aggregated Large Costal Sharks, and Hammerhead Sharks in the Western Gulf of Mexico Sub-Region; Closure'' (RIN0648–XG021) 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 ''2017 Reapportionment Between Tribal and Nontribal Sectors; Widow Rockfish Reapportionment in the Pacific Whiting Fishery'' (RIN0648–BH38) 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 Penaeid Shrimp Fishery Off Georgia'' (RIN0648–XF965) 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:

By Mr. SCHUMER:

S. 115. A bill for the relief of Alemseghed Mussie Tesfamical; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. 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. BENNET,

Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CASEY, 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, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. COONS (for himself and Mr. YOUNG):

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. INHOFE, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ENZI, Ms. ERNST, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. SCOTT 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 requiring the involvement of parents in abortion decisions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Ms. HIRONO, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. CASEY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. REED, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. UDALL, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. TESTER, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. COONS, Ms. SMITH, Mr. CARPER, Ms. WARREN, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. JONES, Mr. BENNET, Mr. PETERS, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. MENENDEZ, and Mr. CARDIN):

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 the United States automotive industry and to stay the investigation into the national security effects of automotive imports until the study is completed, and for other purposes; 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 had a license terminated for cause by a State licensing board for care or services rendered at a non-Veterans Health Administration facility and to provide individuals treated 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 of 1938 to prevent employers 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. SCHATZ):

S. 126. A bill to direct 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 Indian Affairs.

By Mrs. 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 city of Vallejo, California, for the transfer of Mare Island Naval Cemetery in Vallejo, California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TESTER (for himself, Mr. WYDEN, Mrs. 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. BARRASSO, 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, Mr. ROUNDS, 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 degree of care in the case of a child who survives an abortion or attempted 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:

S. 132. A bill to establish the Commission on the State of U.S. Olympics and Paralympics; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. KING, Mr. SULLIVAN, Ms. CANTWELL, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE):

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. CASEY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. JONES):

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, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. CASEY, Mr. TESTER, Mr. BROWN, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. WARNER, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. REED, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. KING, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. LEAHY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. UDALL, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. SMITH, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BENNET, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. COONS, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. JONES, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. STABENOW, Ms. WARREN, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. KAINE, Mr. SANDERS, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. PETERS, Mr. CARDIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. SINEMA, and Mr. CARPER):

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 COSPONSORS

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.

S. 34

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 (Mrs. 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 31, United States Code, to provide for automatic continuing resolutions.

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 ordered 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 to 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. 1154) or for 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, shall be eligible for 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.

(c) DEADLINE FOR APPLICATION AND PAYMENT OF FEES.—Subsections (a) and (b) shall apply only if the application for issuance of an immigrant visa or for adjustment of status is filed by Alemseghed Mussie Tesfamical with appropriate fees not later than 2 years after 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 Secretary of State 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 the 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 by reference to 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. CASEY, 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, 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 ordered 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] persists 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 companion cases, 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 ADA to be fully realized, States must approach these decisions from a civil rights perspective.

(6) States have not consistently planned to ensure sufficient services and supports for individuals with disabilities, including those with the most significant disabilities, to enable individuals with disabilities to live in the most integrated setting. As a result, many individuals with disabilities who reside in institutions are prevented from residing in the community and individuals with disabilities who are not in institutions find themselves at risk of institutional placement.

(7) The continuing existence of unfair and unnecessary institutionalization denies individuals with disabilities 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 ensure that long-term services and supports are provided in a manner that allows individuals with disabilities to lead an independent life;

(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 and into the most integrated setting; and

(5) to establish a requirement for clear and uniform annual public 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 or 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—

(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 who receives services or supports at the setting—

(I) full access to the greater community (including access to opportunities to seek employment and work in competitive integrated settings, engage in community life, control personal resources, and receive services in the community); and

(II) access to the greater community to the same extent as access to the community is enjoyed by an individual who is not receiving long-term services or supports;

(ii) that the individual has selected as a meaningful choice from among nonresidential setting options, including nondisability-specific settings;

(iii) in which an individual has rights to privacy, dignity, and respect, and freedom from coercion and restraint;

(iv) that, as a matter of infrastructure, environment, amenities, location, services, and features, optimizes, but does not regiment, individual initiative, autonomy, and independence in making life choices, including choices about daily activities, physical environment, and persons with whom the individual interacts; and

(v) that, as a matter of infrastructure, environment, amenities, location, services, and features, facilitates individual choice regarding the provision of services and supports, and who provides those services and supports.

(B) In the case of a dwelling, a dwelling—

(i) that is owned by an individual with an LTSS disability or the individual's family member;

(ii) that is leased to the individual with an LTSS disability under an individual lease, that has lockable access and egress, and that includes living, sleeping, bathing, and cooking areas over which an individual with an LTSS disability or the individual's family member has domain and control; or

(iii) that is a group or shared residence—

(I) in which no more than 4 unrelated individuals with an LTSS disability reside;

(II) for which each individual with an LTSS disability living at the residence owns, rents, or occupies the residence under a legally enforceable agreement under which the individual has, at a minimum, the same responsibilities and protections as tenants have under applicable landlord-tenant law;

(III) in which each individual with an LTSS disability living at the residence—

(aa) has privacy in the individual's sleeping unit, including a lockable entrance door controlled by the individual;

(bb) shares a sleeping unit only if such individual and the individual sharing the unit choose to do so, and if individuals in the residence so choose, they also have a choice of roommates within the residence;

(cc) has the freedom to furnish and decorate the individual's sleeping or living unit as permitted under the lease or other agreement;

(dd) has the freedom and support to control the individual's own schedules and activities; and

(ee) is able to have visitors of the individual's choosing at any time; and

(IV) that is physically accessible to the individual with an LTSS disability living at the residence.

(4) DWELLING.—The term ''dwelling'' has the meaning given the term in section 802 of the Fair Housing Act (42 U.S.C. 3602).

(5) HEALTH-RELATED TASKS.—The term ''health-related tasks'' means specific nonacute tasks, typically regulated by States as medical or nursing tasks that an individual with a disability may require to live in the community, including—

(A) administration of medication;

(B) assistance with use, operation, and maintenance of a ventilator; and

(C) maintenance and use of a gastrostomy tube, a catheter, or a stable ostomy.

(6) INDIVIDUAL WITH A DISABILITY.—The term ''individual with a disability'' means an individual who is a person with a disability, as defined in section 3 of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12102).

(7) INDIVIDUAL WITH AN LTSS DISABILITY.—The term ''individual with an LTSS disability'' means an individual with a disability who—

(A) in order to live in the community and lead an independent life requires assistance in accomplishing—

(i) activities of daily living;

(ii) instrumental 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), (ii), or (iii); and

(B)(i) is currently in an institutional placement; or

(ii) is at risk of institutionalization if the individual does not receive community-based long-term services and supports.

(8) INSTRUMENTAL ACTIVITIES OF DAILY LIVING.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ''instrumental activities of daily living'' means one or more activities related to living independently in the community, including activities related to—

(i) nutrition, such as preparing meals or special diets, monitoring to prevent choking or aspiration, or assisting with special utensils;

(ii) household chores and environmental maintenance tasks;

(iii) communication and interpersonal skills, such as—

(I) using the telephone or other communications devices;

(II) forming and maintaining interpersonal relationships; or

(III) securing opportunities to participate in group support or peer-to-peer support arrangements;

(iv) travel and community participation, such as shopping, arranging appointments, or moving around the community;

(v) care of others, such as raising children, taking care of pets, or selecting caregivers; or

(vi) management of personal property and personal safety, such as—

(I) taking medication;

(II) handling or managing money; or

(III) responding to emergent situations or unscheduled needs requiring an immediate response.

(B) ASSISTANCE.—The term ''assistance'' used with respect to instrumental activities of daily living, includes support provided to an individual by another person due to confusion, dementia, behavioral symptoms, or cognitive, intellectual, mental, or emotional disabilities, including support to—

(i) help the individual identify and set goals, overcome fears, and manage transitions;

(ii) help the individual with executive functioning, decisionmaking, and problem solving;

(iii) 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 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) any 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 subsection (a)(2) or any other provision of this section shall be construed to preclude an individual with a disability from receiving community-based services and supports in an integrated community setting such as a grocery store, retail establishment, restaurant, bank, park, concert venue, theater, or workplace.

SEC. 4. DISCRIMINATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—No public entity or LTSS insurance provider shall deny an individual with an LTSS disability who is eligible for institutional placement, or otherwise discriminate against that individual in the provision of, community-based long-term services and supports that enable the individual to live in the community and lead an independent life.

(b) SPECIFIC PROHIBITIONS.—For purposes of this Act, discrimination by a public entity or LTSS insurance provider includes—

(1) the imposition or application of eligibility criteria or another policy that prevents or tends to prevent an individual with an LTSS disability, or any class of individuals with LTSS disabilities, from receiving a community-based long-term service or support;

(2) the imposition or application of a policy or other mechanism, such as a service or cost cap, that prevent or tends to prevent an individual with an LTSS disability, or any class of individuals with LTSS disabilities, from receiving a community-based long-term service or support;

(3) a failure to provide a specific community-based long-term service or support or a type of community-based long-term service or support needed for an individual with an LTSS disability, or any class of individuals with LTSS disabilities;

(4) the imposition or application of a policy, rule, regulation, or restriction that interferes with the opportunity for an individual with an LTSS disability, or any class of individuals with LTSS disabilities, to live in the community and lead an independent life, which may include a requirement that an individual with an LTSS disability receive a service or support (such as day services or employment services) in a congregate or disability-specific setting;

(5) the imposition or application of a waiting list or other mechanism that delays or restricts access of an individual with an LTSS disability to a community-based long-term service or support;

(6) a failure to establish an adequate rate or other payment structure that is necessary to ensure the availability of a workforce sufficient to support an individual with an LTSS disability in living in the community and leading an independent life;

(7) a failure to provide community-based services and supports, on an intermittent, short-term, or emergent basis, that assist an individual with an LTSS disability to live in the community and lead an independent life;

(8) the imposition or application of a policy, such as a requirement that an individual utilize informal support, that restricts, limits, or delays the ability of an individual with an LTSS disability to secure a community-based long-term service or support to live in the community or lead an independent life;

(9) a failure to implement a formal procedure and a mechanism to ensure that—

(A) individuals with LTSS disabilities are offered the alternative of community-based long-term services and supports prior to institutionalization; and

(B) if selected by an individual with an LTSS disability, the community-based long-term services and supports described in subparagraph (A) are provided;

(10) a failure to ensure that each institutionalized individual with an LTSS disability 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

(11) a failure to make a reasonable modification in a policy, practice, or procedure, when such modification is necessary to allow an individual with an LTSS disability to receive a community-based long-term service or support.

(c) ADDITIONAL PROHIBITION.—For purposes of this Act, discrimination by a public entity also includes a failure to ensure that there is sufficient availability of affordable, accessible, and integrated housing to allow an individual with an LTSS disability to choose to live in the community and lead an independent life, including the availability of an option to live in housing where the receipt of LTSS is not tied to tenancy.

(d) CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section—

(1) shall be construed—

(A) to prevent a public entity or LTSS insurance provider from providing community-based long-term services and supports at a level that is greater than the level that is required by this section; or

(B) to limit the rights of an individual with a disability under any provision of law other than this section;

(2) 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 using managed care techniques, as long as the use of such techniques does not have the effect of discriminating against an individual in the provision of 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) investigate and take enforcement action for violations of this Act; and

(B) enforce section 6(c).

(2) DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services, through the Administrator, 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;

(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 in violation of this Act and furthering the purposes of this Act;

(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; and

(iii) recommendations for further legislative or executive action;

(C) cooperate with, and provide grants 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;

(D) implement educational and conciliatory activities to further the purposes of this Act; and

(E) refer information on violations of this Act to the Attorney General for investigation and enforcement action under this Act.

(b) COOPERATION OF EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES.—Each Federal agency and, in particular, each Federal agency covered by Executive Order 13217 (66 Fed. Reg. 33155; relating to community-based alternatives for individuals with disabilities), 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 553 of title 5, United States Code, final regulations to carry 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 the 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 provider—

(A) ensures that individuals with LTSS disabilities receive assistance through hands-on assistance, training, cueing, and safety monitoring, including access to backup systems, with—

(i) activities of daily living;

(ii) instrumental 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), (ii), or (iii);

(B) coordinates, conducts, performs, provides, or funds discharge planning from acute, rehabilitation, 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 informal caregivers who provide services for individuals with LTSS disabilities; and

(E) ensures that individuals with all types of LTSS disabilities are able to live in the community and lead 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.

(3) PUBLIC PARTICIPATION.—

(A) PUBLIC ENTITY.—The regulations issued under this section shall require each public entity to carry out an extensive public participation process in preparing the public entity'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 consulting with individuals with LTSS disabilities, in preparing the LTSS insurance provider's self-evaluation under paragraph (5).

(C) PROCESS.—In carrying out a public participation process under subparagraph (A) or (B), a public entity or LTSS insurance provider shall ensure that the process meets the requirements of subparagraphs (A) and (C) of section 1115(d)(2) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1315(d)(2)), except that—

(i) the reference to ''at the State level'' shall be disregarded; and

(ii) the reference to an application shall be considered to be a reference to the self-evaluation or plan involved.

(4) ADDITIONAL SERVICES AND SUPPORTS.—The regulations issued under this section shall establish circumstances under which a public entity shall provide community-based long-term services and supports under this section beyond the level of community-based long-term services and supports which would otherwise be required under this subsection.

(5) SELF-EVALUATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The regulations issued under this section shall require each public entity and each LTSS insurance provider, not later than 30 months after the date of enactment of this Act, to evaluate current services, policies, and practices, and the effects thereof, that do not or may not meet the requirements of this Act and, to the extent modification of any such services, policies, and practices is required to meet the requirements of this Act, make the necessary modifications. The self-evaluation shall include—

(i) collection of baseline information, including the numbers of individuals with LTSS disabilities in various institutional and community-based settings served by the public entity or LTSS insurance provider;

(ii) a review of community capacity, in communities served by the entity or provider, in providing community-based long-term services and supports;

(iii) identification of improvements needed to ensure that all community-based long-term services and supports provided by the public entity or LTSS insurance provider to individuals with LTSS disabilities are comprehensive, are accessible, are not duplicative of existing (as of the date of the identification) services and supports, meet the needs of persons who are likely to require assistance in order to live, or lead a life, as described in section 4(a), and are high-quality services and supports, which may include identifying system improvements that create an option to self-direct receipt of such services and supports for all populations of such individuals served; and

(iv) a review of funding sources for community-based long-term services and supports and an analysis of how those funding sources could be organized into a fair, coherent system that affords individuals reasonable and timely access to community-based long-term services and supports.

(B) PUBLIC ENTITY.—A public entity, including an LTSS insurance provider that is a public entity, shall—

(i) include in the self-evaluation described in subparagraph (A)—

(I) an assessment of the availability of accessible, 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 integrated employment opportunities in the jurisdiction 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-evaluation described in subparagraph (A) on file, and may be required to produce such self-evaluation in the event of a review, investigation, or action described in section 8.

(6) ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENT FOR PUBLIC ENTITIES.—The regulations issued under this section shall require a public entity, in conjunction with the housing agencies serving the jurisdiction served by the public entity, to review and improve community capacity, in all communities throughout the entirety of that jurisdiction, in providing affordable, accessible, and integrated housing, including an evaluation of available units, unmet need, and other identifiable barriers to the provision of that housing. In carrying out that improvement, the public entity, in conjunction with such housing agencies, shall—

(A) ensure, and assure the Administrator and the Attorney General that there is, sufficient availability of affordable, accessible, and integrated housing in a setting that is not a disability-specific residential setting or a setting where services are tied to tenancy, in order to provide individuals with LTSS disabilities a meaningful choice in their housing;

(B) in order to address the need for affordable, accessible, and integrated housing—

(i) in the case of such a housing agency, establish relationships with State and local housing authorities; and

(ii) in the case of the public entity, establish relationships with State and local housing agencies, including housing authorities;

(C) establish, where needed, necessary preferences and set-asides in housing programs for individuals with LTSS disabilities who are transitioning from or avoiding institutional placement;

(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 public entity or in the public entity's jurisdiction are targeted toward affordable, accessible, integrated housing for individuals with an LTSS disability who have the lowest income levels in the jurisdiction as a priority over any other development until capacity barriers for such housing are removed or unmet needs for such housing have been met.

(7) DESIGNATION OF RESPONSIBLE EMPLOYEE.—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 entity or provider's responsibilities under this Act, including the investigation of any complaint communicated to the entity or provider that alleges a violation 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 paragraph.

(8) GRIEVANCE PROCEDURES.—The regulations issued under this section shall require public entities and LTSS insurance providers 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 submitting a self-evaluation under paragraph (5) to identify, as part of the transition plan described in paragraph (10), any other entity that is, or acts as, an agent, subcontractor, or other instrumentality of the public entity with regards to a service, support, policy, or practice described in such plan or self-evaluation.

(10) TRANSITION PLANS.—The regulations issued under this section shall require each public entity, not later than 42 months after the date of enactment of this Act, to submit to the Administrator, and begin implementing, a transition plan for carrying out this Act that establishes the achievement of the requirements of this Act, as soon as practicable, but in no event later than 12 years after the date of enactment of this Act. The transition plan shall—

(A) establish measurable objectives to address the barriers to community living identified in the self-evaluation under paragraph (5);

(B) establish specific annual targets for the transition of individuals with LTSS disabilities, and shifts in funding, from institutional settings to integrated community-based services and supports, and related programs;

(C) describe specific efforts to support individuals with LTSS disabilities to avoid unwanted institutionalization through the provision of LTSS; and

(D) describe the manner in which the public entity has obtained or plans to obtain necessary funding and resources needed for implementation of the plan (regardless of whether the entity began carrying out the objectives of this Act prior to the date of enactment of this Act).

(11) ANNUAL REPORTING.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The regulations issued under this section shall establish annual reporting requirements for each public entity covered by this section.

(B) PROGRESS ON 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 efforts described in paragraph (10).

(12) OTHER PROVISIONS.—The regulations issued under this section shall include such 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.

(c) REVIEW OF TRANSITION PLANS.—

(1) GENERAL RULE.—The Administrator shall review a transition plan submitted in accordance with subsection (b)(10) for the purpose of determining whether such 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) MODIFICATION 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 to the Administrator, and commence implementation of, such modified transition plan.

(4) INCENTIVES.—

(A) DETERMINATION.—For 10 years after the issuance of the regulations described in subsection (a), the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall annually determine whether each State, or each other public entity in the State, is complying with 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 subparagraph that the State or other public entity is complying with the corresponding transition plan, the Secretary shall make the increase described in subparagraph (B).

(B) INCREASE IN FMAP.—On making the determination described in subparagraph (A) for a public entity (including a State), the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall, as described in subparagraph (C), increase by 5 percentage points the FMAP (but shall in no event increase the FMAP above 100 percent) for the State in which the public entity is located for amounts expended by the State for medical assistance consisting of home and community-based services furnished under the 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) that—

(I) are identified by a public entity or LTSS insurance provider under subsection (b)(5)(A)(iii);

(II) resulted from shifts in funding identified by a public entity under subsection (b)(10)(B); or

(III) are environmental modifications to achieve the affordable, accessible, integrated housing identified by a public entity under subsection (b)(6)(E); and

(ii) are described by the State in a request to the Secretary of Health and Human Services for the increase.

(C) PERIOD OF INCREASE.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services shall increase the FMAP described in subparagraph (B)—

(i) beginning with the first quarter that begins after the date of the determination; and

(ii) ending with the quarter in which the next annual determination under subparagraph (A) occurs.

(D) ADDITIONAL CONDITION FOR PAYMENT.—

(i) STATE REPORT.—As a condition for the receipt of a payment based on an increase described in subparagraph (B) with respect to amounts to be expended by the State for medical assistance consisting of home and community-based services described in subparagraph (B), the State shall report to the Secretary, for the reporting year, the amount of funds expended by the State for home and community-based services (as defined in subparagraph (E)(ii)) in that year. The State shall make the report in a format developed or approved by the Secretary.

(ii) REDUCTION IN PAYMENT IF FAILURE TO 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.

(E) DEFINITIONS.—In this paragraph:

(i) FMAP.—The term ''FMAP'' means the Federal medical assistance percentage for a State determined under section 1905(b) 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 any other provision of law, including this section.

(ii) 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 PACE 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)).

(iii) REPORTING YEAR.—The term ''reporting year'' means the most recent fiscal year preceding the date of a report under subparagraph (D)(i).

(d) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in subsection (b)(10) or (c) or any other provision of this Act shall be construed to limit the rights, protections, or requirements of any other Federal law, relating to integration of individuals with disabilities into the community and enabling those individuals to live in the most integrated setting.

SEC. 7. EXEMPTIONS FOR RELIGIOUS ORGANIZATIONS.

This Act shall not prohibit a religious organization, association, or society from giving preference in providing community-based long-term services and supports to individuals of a particular religion connected with the beliefs of such organization, association, or society.

SEC. 8. ENFORCEMENT.

(a) CIVIL ACTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—A civil action for preventive relief, including an application for a permanent or temporary injunction, restraining order, or other order, may be instituted by an individual described in paragraph (2) in an appropriate Federal district court.

(2) AGGRIEVED INDIVIDUAL.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The remedies and procedures set forth in this section are the remedies and procedures this Act provides to any individual who is being subjected to a violation 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—

(i) is an individual with an LTSS disability; and

(ii) 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; NO FEES, COSTS, OR SECURITY.—Upon 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.

(4) 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 a public entity or LTSS insurance provider does not intend to comply with the provisions of this Act.

(b) 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—

(1) actual and punitive damages;

(2) immediate injunctive relief to prevent institutionalization;

(3) as the court determines to be appropriate, any permanent or temporary injunction (including an order to immediately provide or maintain community-based long-term services or supports for an individual to prevent institutionalization or further institutionalization), 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

(4) 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.

(c) ATTORNEY'S FEES; LIABILITY OF UNITED STATES FOR COSTS.—In any action commenced pursuant to this Act, the court, in its discretion, may allow the party bringing a claim or counterclaim under this Act, other than the United States, a reasonable attorney's fee as part of the costs, and the United States shall be liable for costs to the same extent as a private person.

(d) ENFORCEMENT BY ATTORNEY GENERAL.—

(1) DENIAL OF RIGHTS.—

(A) DUTY TO INVESTIGATE.—The Attorney General shall investigate alleged violations of this Act, and shall undertake periodic reviews of the compliance of public entities and LTSS insurance providers under this Act.

(B) POTENTIAL VIOLATION.—The Attorney General may commence a civil action in any

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 required 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 damages to individuals described in subsection (a)(2), when requested by the Attorney General; and

(C) may, to vindicate the public interest, assess a civil penalty against the public entity or LTSS insurance provider in an amount—

(i) not exceeding $100,000 for a first violation; and

(ii) 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 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 302(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);

(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 308(a)(1) 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 308(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. 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 city of Vallejo, California, for the transfer of Mare Island Naval Cemetery in Vallejo, California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, today I am proud to 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 Francis Scott Key, 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 with limited 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 to restore the gravestones and grounds to a respectable condition. 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 Congressman 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 NO. 4:18–CV–00167–O (N.D. TEX.)

Mr. MANCHIN (for himself, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. CASEY, Mr. TESTER, Mr. BROWN, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. WARNER, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. REED, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. KING, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. LEAHY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. UDALL, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. SMITH, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BENNET, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. COONS, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. JONES, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. STABENOW, Ms. WARREN, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. KAINE, Mr. SANDERS, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. PETERS, Mr. CARDIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. SINEMA, and Mr. CARPER) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. RES. 18

Whereas Texas, Wisconsin, Alabama, Arkansas, Arizona, Florida, Georgia, Indiana, Kansas, Louisiana, Paul LePage (Governor of Maine), Mississippi (by and through Governor Phil Bryant), Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Utah, West Virginia, and individual plaintiffs have filed suit in the United States District Court for the Northern District of Texas, arguing that 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. 1029) are 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 that provision by the Act to provide for reconciliation pursuant to titles II and V of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2018 (Public Law 115–97; 131 Stat. 2054) (commonly known as the ''Tax Cuts and Jobs Act'');

Whereas these State and individual plaintiffs also seek to strike down the entire Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act as not severable from the individual responsibility provision;

Whereas, on June 7, 2018, the Department of Justice refused to defend the constitutionality of the amended individual responsibility provision, despite the well-established duty of the Department to defend Federal statutes where reasonable arguments can be made in their defense;

Whereas the Department of Justice not only refused to defend the amended individual responsibility provision, but it affirmatively 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 2702, 2704, and 2705(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 declaring that 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 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 made by those Acts to other provisions of law, and any amendments to such provisions, including

the provisions ensuring affordable health coverage for those with pre-existing conditions.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I have 2 requests for committees to meet during today's session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today's session of the Senate:

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, January 15, 2019, at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing on the nomination of William Pelham Barr, of Virginia, to be Attorney General, Department of Justice.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, January 15, 2019, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a closed hearing.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. CASEY. I ask unanimous consent that Rahmon Ross of my staff be granted floor privileges for today's proceedings.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 16, 2019

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m., Wednesday, January 16; further, that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed; further, that following leader remarks, the Senate resume consideration of S.J. Res. 2, with the time until 12:30 p.m. equally divided between the two leaders or their designees; finally, notwithstanding the provisions of rule XXII, the cloture vote with respect to S.J. Res. 2 occur at 12:30 p.m., tomorrow, and if cloture is not invoked, S.J. Res. 2 be returned to the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MCCONNELL. If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order, following the remarks of our Democratic colleagues.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

MEDICARE

Mr. CASEY. Madam President, I rise to talk about the Medicare Program and in particular a news 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 money that 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 law.

If you look at the last 2 years, we had one-party rule in Washington—Republican President, 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 secretively but, now 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 have the benefit of skilled care 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 before 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 Republican-elected officials 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 on healthcare generally—the Affordable Care Act specifically—but also, by extension, Medicaid.

A proposal like this to block-grant Medicaid, which was proposed numerous times here 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; 50 percent 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 getting 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 your 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 is a technical term, ''messing with it.'' By saying, to some degree, under the cover of darkness—not having a debate on the floor of the House or 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 the waiver being granted—or 2 years or 5 years. 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—not only 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. We have 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 willing to fight 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 and the challenge of 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 wraparound 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 Resource Center,'' which recently 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, allowed cuts that resulted 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 representative, 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 daily; she will have to care for Rowan late in her 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 beaten back an effort to legislatively change the Medicaid Program for the worse, and 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 son or 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 10 or 15 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 who 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 of means pay for it. Let me say it bluntly: If we have to charge someone else 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 make sure this program is preserved. 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 Medicaid Program, want to strengthen it, want to make changes that are appropriate, 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 other 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 programs—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 is what some of the headlines say in the report. The first one reads ''A block grant would cap Federal Medicaid funding in order to achieve savings 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 programs deeply.''

The last two are as follows: ''Medicaid is already efficient and innovative.'' 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 provider payment rates.'' What they didn't mention there is that cuts to Medicaid would also hurt a lot of hospitals, especially 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 concludes, 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 expansion.''

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 Programs because of a block granting waiver that was granted to that particular State, but I am not too concerned about the overall number because that is impossible to predict.

Even if just one State were to be granted this kind of a waiver in implemented block grants, a lot of people in that State would lose their Medicaid. I think we should be concerned if it were one person losing Medicaid because of 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-figure millions losing that kind of coverage. Even if it were to be a much smaller number, we should be very concerned about this.

Here is another reason not to mess around with Medicaid in a way that adversely impacts people or undermines the program. I hear from a lot of politicians 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 in their communities and in their States because of the opioid crisis. It is everywhere. It is urban, rural, and suburban. It is everywhere, and it is devastating. We have never seen a public health problem like it in probably 100 years or at 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 Presiding Officer would agree. Yet here is the part they don't talk about. Sometimes the same people say, ''I really am worried 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 wonderful when they have that initiative. Yet sometimes those same Members of Congress, in the next breath, will say, ''But I want to block grant Medicaid'' or ''I want to cut or cap Medicaid'' or ''We need to cut back on what we spend on Medicaid,'' and they vote for budget after budget after budget and bill after bill to cut Medicaid.

What do you think is the No. 1 payer when it comes to the opioid crisis, the primary payer for opioid treatment and recovery? You guessed it—Medicaid.

If you are going to go down this road and talk about this program as if it were some far-off program for them, for someone else, you should look in the mirror because Medicaid is an ''us'' program, not a ''them'' program and not a program for someone far away. It is for our neighbors. It is for our friends if they have opioid addictions and can only get treatment and services mostly because of Medicaid expansion—actually, as part of the Affordable Care Act.

Medicaid itself, the core program, of course, is a program that makes sure that a child has healthcare. Even if he is of low income and his mom or his dad or the person taking care of him is not working and doesn't have employer coverage, he gets the benefit of Medicaid. Guess what. When that low-income child gets Medicaid, we all benefit. That child is more likely to grow up healthy, and he or she will be more productive and will be a stronger part of our economy. So Medicaid for low-income children or children from low-income families helps all of us. It doesn't just help that child. It is not just a nice thing to do. It is the right thing to do, but it is also very practical.

Medicaid helps people with disabilities whether they have profound disabilities or otherwise. They have to be eligible for it based upon their disabilities, but we have made a decision that that is a good thing to do for that individual and for society. The same is true of people making decisions about a loved one's going into long-term care and one's spending down one's assets, and there is usually a big gap after one spends down. Middle-class families—sometimes 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 dollars spent, it would not be entirely inaccurate 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 our 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 prescription 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 reckless, extreme ideas on Medicaid and join us—join both parties in both Houses—in trying to do something positive and constructive and American 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 12212:

To be brigadier 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 brigadier general

COL. EDWARD S. SMITH

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. ROBERT D. HARTER

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 brigadier general

COL. CHARLES M. SCHOENING

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADES INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. DAVID W. LING

To be brigadier general

COL. JOSEPH F. DZIEZYNSKI
COL. RODNEY J. FISCHER

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER ARTICLE II, SECTION 2, CLAUSE 2, OF THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION:

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) RONNY L. JACKSON

IN THE MARINE CORPS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER 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. DAVID NATHANSON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be brigadier general

COL. LEONARD F. ANDERSON IV
COL. WILLIAM E. SOUZA III

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. JULIAN D. ALFORD
BRIG. GEN. MICHAEL S. CEDERHOLM
BRIG. GEN. DENNIS A. CRALL
BRIG. GEN. KARSTEN S. HECKL
BRIG. GEN. WILLIAM M. JURNEY
BRIG. GEN. TRACY W. KING
BRIG. GEN. CHRISTOPHER J. MAHONEY
BRIG. GEN. GREGORY L. MASIELLO
BRIG. GEN. STEPHEN M. NEARY
BRIG. GEN. AUSTIN E. RENFORTH
BRIG. GEN. PAUL J. ROCK, JR.
BRIG. GEN. JOSEPH F. SHRADER
BRIG. GEN. STEPHEN D. SKLENKA

THE FOLLOWING NAMED 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 B. ANNIBALE
COL. MELVIN G. CARTER
COL. ROBERT C. FULFORD
COL. DANIEL Q. GREENWOOD
COL. JOSEPH A. MATOS III
COL. JASON L. MORRIS
COL. THOMAS B. SAVAGE
COL. DANIEL L. SHIPLEY
COL. JAMES B. WELLONS
COL. BRIAN N. WOLFORD

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

SALEH P. DAGHER
JAMAHL K. EVANS
JOSE N. MIRELES
NEVILLE A. WELCH

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

RICO ACOSTA
AGUR S. ADAMS
BRIAN A. ADAMS
MICHAEL M. AHLSTROM
CLINT W. ALANIS
ANDREW J. ALISSANDRATOS
CHRISTOPHER D. ALVINO
MARY C. ANDERLONIS
KYLE J. ANDREWS
CHARLES E. ANKLAM III
PETER E. ANKNEY
ANDREW R. APETZ
WELLINGTON C. AQUINO
ROBERT C. ARBEGAST
RICHARD M. ARBOGAST
JAMES G. ARGENTINA, JR.
PHILLIP T. ASH
KELLY R. ATTWOOD
MICHAEL J. AUBRY
AARON M. AWTRY
DOUGLAS P. BAHRNS
GLENN P. BAKER
LUCAS A. BALKE
JOHN R. BALLENGER
JOSEPH N. BARKER
JONATHAN F. BARR
PAUL R. BARRON
MATTHEW D. BARTELS
ROBERT I. BASKINS
MATTHEW J. BAUMANN
ELDON W. BECK
MATTHEW J. BECK
JOSEPH C. BEGLEY
BEAU B. BELL
BRIDGET N. BEMIS
CASEY BENEFIELD
ERIN K. BERARD
JOHN T. BIDWELL
BENJAMIN L. BLANTON
MICHAEL A. BLEJSKI
STEPHEN J. BOADA
JONATHAN C. BODWELL
MATTHEW D. BOHMAN
THOMAS E. BOLEN, JR.
AUSTIN C. BONNER
ANNE M. BRADEN
BARRET F. BRADSTREET
JONATHAN H. BRANDT
JOSHUA A. BRINDEL
JOSHUA H. BRINGHURST
MATTHEW D. BRONSON
CHAD C. BROOKS
BRANDON D. BROWN
JOSEPH T. BUFFAMANTE
JOHN A. CACIOPPO
JEFFREY J. CAHILL
BRENT J. CANTRELL
JARRAD S. CAOLA
THOMAS W. CAREY
WAYNE A. CARR, JR.
BENJAMIN C. CARRUTHERS
ERIC A. CATTO
RYAN M. CAULDER
JONATHAN I. CHAIKEN
ROCKY L. CHECCA
NEAL J. CHERAMIE, JR.
RYAN E. CHRIST
MICHAEL E. CLARK
VANESSA M. CLARK
COLE M. CLEMENTS
JOSEPH E. CLEMMEY, JR.
RICHARD M. CLONINGER
THOMAS E. COGAN IV
JOSE I. COLUNGA
JASON M. CONDON
JONATHAN R. COOK
MATTHEW P. COOK
DAVID N. CORKILL
STEPHANIE L. COTHERN
ERIC P. CRECELIUS
PAUL L. CROOM II
NELS C. DAHLGARD
JOHN A. DALBY
ANDREW D. DAMBROGI
ROBERT G. DANIELS
BRAD A. DANKS
DANA M. DARNELL
PHILLIP A. DEEBLE
ANTHONY C. DELLACOSTA III
SUZANNE M. DEMPSEY
STEPHEN E. DETRINIS
CHRISTOPHER J. DETTLE
SETH E. DEWEY
PHILLIP D. DIBELLA
JOHN B. DICKENS
MICHAEL J. DONALDSON
ALEXANDER G. DOUVAS
MATTHEW A. DOWDEN
THADDEUS V. DRAKE, JR.
CHARLES R. DRENNAN
DOUGLAS I. DUFFIN
THOMAS J. DUNN
JOSEPH C. ELSEROAD
HAROLD J. EVERHART
NATASHA M. EVERLY
PATRICK J. FAHEY
ROBERT A. FAIRLEY
TIMOTHY J. FARAG
SCOTT C. FARRAR
THOMAS C. FARRINGTON II
JOHN L. FERRITER
BENJAMIN J. FIALA
DEREK A. FILIPE
CAMERON A. FITZSIMMONS
NATHAN A. FLEISCHAKER
JASON T. FORD
CHRISTOPHER J. FORSYTHE
LUCAS S. FRANK
MAX D. FRANK
GEOFFREY J. FRANKS
RYAN J. FRANZEN
TYLER A. FREEBURG
DUNCAN A. FRENCH
JAMES R. FRIEDLEIN
KENDRICK L. GAINES
CLAYTON D. GARD III
JASON M. GARZA
ERIC P. GENTRUP
BRIAN D. GERSCHUTZ
ROBERT A. GIBSON
LYLE L. GILBERT
AARON J. GLOVER
ANDREA L. GOEMAN
RYAN R. GORDINIER
BRIAN P. GRAY
JEROME C. GRECO
JOSHUA A. GREGORY
GIDEON P. GRISSETT
JUSTIN C. GRISSOM
CLARKE P. GROEFSEMA
KYLE D. HAIRE
RHETT A. HANSEN
JOHN P. HARLEY
TODD E. HARRISON
TYLER J. HART
MARYKITT B. HAUGEN
JEREMY C. HAWKINS
BENJAMIN J. HAWTHORNE
ALEX D. HEDMAN
MATTHEW M. HEMPHILL
CHRISTINA R. HENRY
ERIC J. HENZLER
BENJAMIN R. HEREDIA
KEVIN R. HERRMANN
RONALD A. HESS
DAVID R. HILL
ROBERT J. HILLERY
ALDEN E. HINGLE III
DANIEL J. HIPOL
TYLER J. HOLT
EDWARD V. HOLTON
JOHN A. HOOKS, JR.
HENRY J. HORTENSTINE
BROCK A. HOUGHTON
TIMOTHY G. HUDSON
JAMES R. HUEFNER
RYAN M. HUNT
JAMES HUTCHINS
JONATHAN A. HUTCHISON
JASON A. HVIZDAK
JOSEPH F. IRWIN
LEIGH G. IRWIN
BELINDA L. JAROLIMEK
RICHARD A. JENNINGS
KIRK A. JOHNSON
CHARLES R. JOHNSTON
LAWRENCE O. JONES
MICHAEL L. JONES
ROBERT M. JONES, JR.
DANIEL W. KAISER
VERONICA L. KALTRIDER
CHRISTOPHER M. KAPRIELIAN
DENNIS W. KATOLIN
KEVIN M. KEENE
ERIK A. KEIM
MICHAEL R. KEMPF
SUNG G. KIM
KURTIS C. KJOBECH
SCOT G. KLEINMAN
THOMAS D. KLINE
BRADFORD L. KLUSMANN
BRET J. KNICKERBOCKER
ZACHARY M. KNIGHT
JOEL P. KNUTSON
ROMAN Y. KOSHKIN
MARK A. KOVAL
KEVIN D. KRATZER
AARON R. KRUKOW
CHRISTOPHER J. KUPKA
MICHAEL P. KUSNERAK

ARLEIGH B. LACEFIELD
BERNADETTE M. LACK
JASON A. LAMBERT
BRIAN D. LAPOINTE
ERIC H. LARSEN
CHRISTOPHER E. LARSON
JARROD P. LARSON
NATHANIEL T. LAUTERBACH
PATRICK V. LAVOIE
JARED W. LEDBETTER
BOBBY W. LEE, JR.
DOUGLAS G. LEE
RICHARD H. LEE
ROE S. LEMONS
TIMOTHY J. LEONARD
PAUL D. LOBALBO
JEFFERY D. LOOP
WILLIAM A. LORD, JR.
ALEXANDER LUGOVELAZQUEZ
THOMAS R. MACKESY
ROGELIO MAESE
TRACY A. MAESE
MATTHEW J. MAHONEY
MICHAEL W. MANOCCHIO
PETER B. MARKS
QUINCI D. MARTIN
JESSICA G. MARTZ
ROHIT Y. MASIH
ROBERT F. MAY
TIMOTHY W. MAYER
MICHAEL J. MCDONALD
GREGORY S. MCSWEEN
DAVID P. MEADOWS
CHRISTOPHER J. MELLON
DAVID A. MERLES
MELINA MESTA
JOHN R. MILLSAP
RAYMOND J. MIRENDA
NICHOLAS J. MOLDER
ROBERT B. MONDAY
JOSE L. MONTALVAN
WILSON M. MOORE
MARK D. MORGAN
RAMIN B. MOSTASHARI
TODD E. MOULDER
MICHAEL C. MROSZCZAK
CORBIN M. MURTAUGH
CHRISTOPHER J. MYETTE
CHARLES C. NASH
CHRISTOPHER C. NEAL
RICHARD P. NEIKIRK
JEREMY S. NELSON
LE E. NOLAN
JOSHUA N. NUNN
STEVEN D. NYLAND
MICHAEL J. OBRIEN
EDWARD J. OCONNELL IV
JAHN C. OLSON
MICHELLE L. OVER
BYRON J. OWEN
MATTHEW R. PASQUALI
WILLIAM J. PATRICK
JEFFREY J. PATTERSON II
MICHAEL P. PAVIS
JASON P. PELLERIN
WILLIAM P. PENDLEY
MICHAEL T. PERROTTET
MICHELLE L. PETERS
JONATHAN L. PETERSON
TROY M. PETERSON
JONATHAN J. PFUNTNER
ELIZABETH PHAM
STACIE M. PICCINICH
MICHAEL A. PIGFORD
EDUARDO J. PINALES
CHRISTOPHER F. POLIDORA
LEVI G. PORTER
SHANELLE A. PORTER
JASON W. POTTER
BENJAMIN N. PRESTON
MICHAEL M. PROCTOR
MICHAEL J. PRUDEN
CLARK T. PURCELL
ERIK C. QUIST
DONALD D. RANSOM, JR.
JASON B. RAPER
STEPHEN M. RAY
TERRANCE J. REESE
ROBERT G. REINOEHL
KELLY J. REPAIR
CHRISTOPHER B. RHINEHART
CHRISTOPHER R. RICHARDELLA
BRENT W. RICHARDSON
MATTHEW E. RICHARDSON
PAUL M. RIVERA
PHILLIP G. ROBERTS, JR.
MASTIN M. ROBESON, JR.
JOSHUA J. ROBINSON
ROBERT A. ROGERS
ALFREDO T. ROMERO II
JOSHUA R. ROSALES
CURTIS N. ROSE
CHRISTOPHER J. ROSS
JAMES F. ROUCHON
GIANOULIS ROUSSOS
SEAN H. RYBURN
ADAM R. SACCHETTI
MICHAEL R. SANDSTROM
BRYAN P. SARGENT
JOHN A. SAX
DANIEL M. SCHIERLING
KARL W. SCHLEGEL
AARON P. SCHNETZLER
DANIEL H. SCHWARTZ
GREGORY R. SCOTT
MATTHEW A. SEAVITTE
DAVID C. SEGRAVES
ARUN SHANKAR
MORRIS M. SHARBER, JR.
JAMES J. SHEASLEY
NATHAN B. SHIVELY
CURTIS I. SHREVE
MICHAEL J. SHULL
CHRISTOPHER M. SIEKMAN
KIMBERLY R. SILE
MICHAEL D. SIMON
GARY S. SLATER
MATTHEW D. SMITH
MICHAEL J. SOUZA
REBECCA G. SPAHR
JAMES W. SPARKS, JR.
JOSHUA A. SPERLING
JEFFERY L. STARR
ROLLIN A. STEELE
JEFF M. STEINKAMP
WILLIAM STEINKE
PAUL W. STEKETEE
CHRISTOPHER A. STEPHENSON
MATTHEW A. STIGER
CARRIE E. STOCKER
THOMAS J. STONA
JEFFREY I. STUDEBAKER
MARK C. SYKES
SCOTT W. SYMONS
MATTHEW G. TAVERNIER
ERIC J. TAYLOR
BJORN E. THOREEN
MARC R. TILNEY
RALPH B. TOMPKINS
JAVIER TORRES
PAUL D. TREMBLAY
CHRISTOPHER A. TRENT
CHAD E. TROYER
JULIAN M. TSUKANO
DAVID P. TUMANJAN
BRANDON H. TURNER
ANIEMA G. UTUK
SABRINA M. VILLARREAL
MICHAEL E. VINCENT
MATTHEW J. WEAVER
JOSEPH H. WELCH
RANDALL D. WHITE
RYAN D. WHITTY
ROBERT E. WICKER
ROBERT A. WILHELMSEN
ERIC M. WILLIAMS
ROBERT E. WILLIAMSON
SCOTT A. WILSON
ALLEN D. WOLD
JUSTIN M. WORTENDYKE
PAUL M. WRIGHT
WYNNDEE M. YOUNG
GREGORY J. YOUNGBERG
BRYAN W. YOUNGERS
CHRISTINA F. ZIMMERMAN

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

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 YEA 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 crews 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 dedicated in his name. 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.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF MR. GREGORY J. LUCIEN SR.

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 Mr. Gregory J. Lucien Sr., a native of New Orleans, Louisiana.

Mr. Lucien was raised in the 9th ward in New Orleans. He graduated from George Washington Carver Sr. High School. After completing high school, he moved to Lafayette, Louisiana to attend the University of Southwestern Louisiana (USL), which is now the University of Louisiana at Lafayette. While attending USL he enlisted in the United States Army Reserve. In 1990 he returned to New Orleans. Upon his return, he was hired by the Orleans Parish Sheriffs office, where he has been employed for twenty-eight years.

In 1991, Mr. Lucien was activated to serve in Operation Desert Storm. Upon completion of his duty he again returned to New Orleans and the Sheriffs office. He was promoted to Sergeant within three years and then to Lieutenant.

Mr. Lucien was eager to make an impact in his community. He joined the Zulu Social Aid and Pleasure club. In 2009, he became an associate member and the next year became a full member. Once in the Zulu club, he joined the Ambassador's Krewe. Additionally, he joined the Safety, Election, Carnival Activities and the Coronation Committees.

Mr. Lucien is an avid sports fan and was not fulfilled watching sports on television, therefore, he decided to become a high school referee. In 2012, he be came a football referee for the Louisiana High School Officials Association (LHSOA) and in 2013 a basketball referee for LHSOA.

Mr. Lucien has been married to the 2019 Zulu Ambassadress, Talana M. Suarez-Lucien, for 19 years. Their loving family consist of three children—Jasmine, Tayler, and Gregory Jr—and their first grandchild, Jaxson.

Madam Speaker, I celebrate the life and legacy of Mr. Gregory J. Lucien Sr.

CELEBRATING THE RETIREMENT OF RON POWELL

HON. PETER J. VISCLOSKY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 15, 2019

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Madam Speaker, it is with great respect and admiration that I take this time to honor Mr. Ronald Powell and to wish him well upon his retirement from his position as president of Local 881, United Food and Commercial Workers (UFCW) International Union, and as vice president of the UFCW International. Ron has devoted his life to the working men and women of the UFCW, and for his unwavering dedication, he is to be commended. Mr. Powell will be honored at a retirement celebration taking place at Gibsons Bar & Steakhouse in Oak Brook, Illinois, on Wednesday, January 23, 2019.

In 1961, Ronald Powell began his career for Local 881 when he was hired as a field representative. Due to his hard work and commitment, Ron was promoted to field staff supervisor in 1968 , and went on to become vice president/director of field operations in 1973. His career continued to thrive, and in 1983, Mr. Powell became president of Local 881. In addition, he served as vice president of the UFCW International. Currently, Ron serves as vice president of the Illinois AFL–CIO and is a trustee for the UFCW Midwest Pension and Benefits Fund. Throughout his successful career, Mr. Powell fought for the rights of union members and American workers. Under his direction, Local 881 has become a progressive leader on behalf of its members in the areas of work-site representation, membership services, benefits, communication and activities.

In addition to his successful career, Ron has dedicated much of his time and efforts to charitable endeavors for organizations including the Leukemia and Lymphoma Society, Jackson Park Hospital, Little City Foundation, and United Way of Illinois, to name a few. Mr. Powell's dedication to the community and his career is exceeded only by his devotion to his amazing family. Ron and his beloved late wife, Lois, have four amazing children, twelve grandchildren, and four great-grandchildren.

Madam Speaker, I ask that you and my other distinguished colleagues join me in commending Mr. Ronald Powell for his outstanding contributions to Local 881, and to the United Food and Commercial Workers (UFCW) International Union. Throughout my career, Ron has been a tireless advocate for working people and an even better friend. For his lifetime of leadership and tireless dedication to his community, Ron is worthy of the highest praise, and I wish him well upon his retirement.

WILLIAM PEARCE TRIBUTE

HON. SCOTT R. TIPTON

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 15, 2019

Mr. TIPTON. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize William Gordon Pearce, a Coloradoan, veteran, father, grandfather and great-grandfather who recently passed away.

Mr. Pearce was born in Kokomo, Indiana and later joined the U.S. Navy. As a member of the U.S. Navy, Mr. Pearce served this country for nearly three decades, bravely defending American freedoms during World War II, the Korean War and Vietnam. After his military service, he sailed for 20 years as a civilian as a Radio Electronics Officer in the U.S. Merchant Marines. Throughout all his years of serving his country, he had the opportunity to visit over five continents and 70 countries. One of his favorite pastimes was sharing old stories of his travels with family and friends.

Not only did Mr. Pearce have a fulfilling professional life, but a rich personal life. He is survived by his loving wife Ruth Anne, who he was married to for 49 years. He also left behind his son Jeff Pearce, daughter Julie Powell, brother-in-law John Lamb, grandchildren Scott Pearce, Elizabeth Atwood, Christopher Powell, and great-granddaughter Abigail Atwood. Of all his accomplishments, he enjoyed being around the ones he loved the most.

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.

Madam Speaker, Mr. Pearce's dedication and love of family will long be remembered. It is my privilege to acknowledge him here today, and express heartfelt 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 longstanding, Mrs. Johnnie Lee Brown Collier. Sadly, Mrs. Collier 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 34 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 that, ''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. It is men and women 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 KSU, he revived the Democrat Club, and he was invited to the White House. As an undergraduate, he also managed John Carson's successful campaign for Kent Mayor and at age 22 was named Safety Director for the City of Kent from 1966 to 1968.

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, NEOCAP, Juvenile Detention Center, Portage Country 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 kids 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 Robert 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 Secor 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 dependability 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's spark plugs 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 ''Josh'' 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 be returned to St. Augustine Seminary for further study.

Father LeDoux was ordained to the Catholic priesthood on May 11, 1957. Following ordination, he studied for four years 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 in New Orleans 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 pastorship 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 survivor's include a sister and two brothers.

Madam Speaker, I celebrate the life and legacy of Father Jerome LeDoux.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

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 doctors 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. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, today I join in paying 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 funded half the cost of 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.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. LOIS FRANKEL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 15, 2019

Ms. FRANKEL. Madam Speaker, on roll call vote 16, I was not present because I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "YEA."

On roll call vote 17, had I been present, I would have voted "YEA."

On roll call vote 18, had I been present, I would have voted "YEA."

On roll call vote 19, had I been present, I would have voted "YEA."

On roll call vote 20, had I been present, I would have voted "NAY."

On roll call vote 21, had I been present, I would have voted "YEA."

On roll call vote 22, had I been present, I would have voted "NAY."

On roll call vote 23, had I been present, I would have voted "YEA."

On roll call vote 24, had I been present, I would have voted "NAY."

On roll call vote 25, had I been present, I would have voted "YEA."

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, who often preform 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 treasured 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 granddaughters.

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.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JARED F. GOLDEN

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 15, 2019

Mr. GOLDEN. Madam Speaker, due to the inclement weather, my flight to Washington, D.C. was delayed and I was unable to vote on January 14, 2019. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on Roll Call No. 30.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF MS. ALSIE R. DUNBAR

HON. CEDRIC L. RICHMOND

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 15, 2019

Mr. RICHMOND. Madam Speaker, I rise to honor the accomplishments of Ms. Alsie R. Dunbar, a lifelong resident and native of Gonzales, Louisiana whose tireless dedication to her community should inspire us all.

Ms. Dunbar is the daughter of Allen "Jubilee" and Rhonda Dunbar. Her mother,

Rhonda, is 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 STEMS 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 as 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 Collegiate 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.

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

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 RECORD 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 so that they are made part of the official House record.

House Rule XI gives the majority party authority and the 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 bipartisanship 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. 3387, 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 this 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 to deliver 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 Republican 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 hold a single hearing 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. In fact, the Committee received letters from hospitals, doctors, and patient and advocacy groups all 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 receiving the views of the CBO on the impact of this legislation on health insurance coverage, costs, and the federal budget.

This exercise, which signaled that Committee Republicans might apply regular order sporadically 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 regulations and standards. Other Republican practices reflected in legislation acted on by the Committee, which Democrats saw and opposed, included attacks on funding and programs that promote and protect Democratic priorities, such as the Prevention and Public Health Fund.

Committee Democrats also took issue at times with bills that relied on weak justifications and policies to support Congressional action, change, or clarification to existing statutes and federal programs that would weaken environmental and consumer health, public safety, and privacy protections. These legislative measures implemented policies and amended regulations to create loopholes and other compliance safe harbors. Our Republican majority acted on legislation that rolled back environmental and other consumer health and safety protections by moving further into the future well-noticed compliance deadlines for EPA new source performance standards applying to new residential wood and hydronic heaters and forced-air furnaces as well as national emission standards for hazardous air pollutants for brick and structural clay products and clay ceramics manufacturing and power plants using coal refuse facilities under the Clean Air Act. While some of these bills and amendments were intended to provide more legal and business certainty to industry; a good deal of them extended more regulatory relief than needed to properly balance the respective interests of all actors and stakeholders.

The Committee appropriately exercised its jurisdictional discretion and prerogative at times to convene very important oversight hearings. For example, the Republican majority conducted formal oversight to raise critically important questions about Facebook's data protection and security practices and policies, and why those practices were insufficient to prohibit and prevent Cambridge Analytica from collecting and using Facebook user and other platform data to influence 2016 Presidential election voters. The Republican majority, however, suppressed its oversight duties and responsibilities to call more fervently upon the Trump Administration and the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) to appear before the Committee and explain its role in relation to the Administration's "zero tolerance" policy. As a result, the Ranking Member of the Committee, Rep. FRANK PALLONE, JR. introduced H. Res. 982, a resolution of inquiry (RoI), requesting President Trump and directing the Secretary of HHS to transmit certain information and records to the House of Representative relating to the separation of children from their parents or guardians in connection with the President's "zero tolerance" policy.

In his dissenting views to the report covering the Committee's RoI proceeding, Ranking Member PALLONE asserted that the Committee should have acted more quickly and decisively to understand and to offer its views regarding the family border separation crisis:

> My resolution of inquiry is ripe for action . . . For better, far more than worse, family unification is vital to all of [us] as individuals and to our physical and mental health and overall well-being. Regardless of one's citizenship status or the country from which they are migrating to the United States, happy and stable families are undeniably essential to becoming and staying healthy. For that reason alone, separating children from

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.

Daily Digest

Senate

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. **Pages S219–20**

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.

Pages S187–92, S192–97

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.

Pages S202–08

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. **Page S201**

By 57 yeas to 42 nays (Vote No. 5), Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to consideration of the joint resolution. **Pages S201–02**

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. **Page S208**

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.

Page S227

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 **Pages S230–31**

Messages from the House: **Page S217**

Measures Referred: **Page S217**

Executive Communications: **Pages S217–19**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S220–21**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Pages S221–27**

Additional Statements: **Pages S215–17**

Privileges of the Floor: **Page S227**

Authorities for Committees to Meet: **Page S227**

Record Votes: Two record votes were taken today. (Total—5) **Pages S201–02**

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 answer 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. **Pages H600–02**

Additional Cosponsors: **Page H603**

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). **Pages H599–H600**

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein she appointed Representative Welch to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H547**

Recess: The House recessed at 11:03 a.m. and reconvened at 12 noon. **Page H554**

Committee Elections: The House agreed to H. Res. 42, electing Members to certain standing committees of the House of Representatives. **Page H556**

Suspensions: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measures:

Federal Employee Antidiscrimination Act of 2019: 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, by a ⅔ yea-and-nay vote of 424 yeas with none voting ''nay'', Roll No. 33; **Pages H558–62, H580**

Federal Intern Protection Act of 2019: H.R. 136, to amend title 5, United States Code, to protect unpaid interns in the Federal Government from workplace harassment and discrimination; **Pages H562–63**

Inspector General Access Act of 2019: H.R. 202, to amend the Inspector General Act of 1978 relative to the powers of the Department of Justice Inspector General; **Pages H563–66**

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 **Pages H567–69**

Rejecting White nationalism and White supremacy: H. Res. 41, rejecting White nationalism and White supremacy, by a ⅔ yea-and-nay vote of 424 yeas to 1 nay, Roll No. 32. **Pages H572–78, H579–80**

Suspensions: The House failed to agree to suspend the rules and pass the following measure:

Further Additional Continuing Appropriations Act, 2019: H.J. Res. 27, making further continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2019, by a ⅔ yea-and-nay vote of 237 yeas to 187 nays, Roll No. 31. **Pages H556–58, H578–79**

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. **Pages H569–72**

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 considered as read, 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).

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE
Baird, James R., Ind., E45
Bishop, Sanford D., Jr., Ga, E45
Carter, Earl L. ''Buddy'', Ga., E43
Cheney, Liz, Wyo., E45
Costa, Jim, Calif., E43
Duncan, Jeff, S.C.., E43
Frankel, Lois, Fla., E47
Gibbs, Bob, Ohio, E46
Golden, Jared F., Me., E47
Granger, Kay, Tex., E43
Kaptur, Marcy, Ohio, E46
Lesko, Debbie, Ariz., E43
Norton, Eleanor Holmes, The District of Columbia, E47
Pallone, Frank, Jr., N.J., E48
Richmond, Cedric L., La., E44, E46, E47
Roe, David P., Tenn., E46
Ryan, Tim, Ohio, E44, E45, E47
Tipton, Scott R., Colo., E44
Visclosky, Peter J., Ind., E44
Zeldin, Lee M., N.Y., E43

Congressional Record

The *Congressional Record* (USPS 087–390). The Periodicals postage is paid at Washington, D.C. The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through the U.S. Government Publishing Office, at *www.govinfo.gov*, free of charge to the user. The information is updated online each day the *Congressional Record* is published. For more information, contact the GPO Customer Contact Center, U.S. Government Publishing Office. Phone 202–512–1800, or 866–512–1800 (toll-free). E-Mail, *contactcenter@gpo.gov*. ¶To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 979050, St. Louis, MO 63197–9000, or phone orders to 866–512–1800 (toll-free), 202–512–1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202–512–2104. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Publishing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.