



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 165

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, MAY 15, 2019

No. 81

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
May 15, 2019.

I hereby appoint the Honorable DONNA E. SHALALA to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 3, 2019, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

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

SYSTEM OF CHECKS AND BALANCES IS AT RISK

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

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, and still I rise because I love my country. And still I rise because there is a crisis that has to be addressed.

Madam Speaker, the system of checks and balances that we have instilled within our government, a system that the Framers of the Constitution devised such that there would not be a concentration of power in the

hands of the chief executive officer of the government, in fact, is to prevent a concentration of power in any aspect. There is power that is spread across the government.

There are three branches of the government. I want to focus this morning, if I may, on two—the executive and the legislative—because, Madam Speaker, this morning, as I stand before you, a proud American, I must inform all that the system of checks and balances is at risk.

It is at risk because we now have a President who does not believe that he can or will be impeached. We have a President who refuses to allow Congress to perform its constitutionally accorded oversight responsibilities.

When you have a President who does this, Madam Speaker, you lose the power of Congress. It becomes concentrated in the President. The Presidency becomes a place where power is concentrated because the President has no fear:

He doesn't believe that there are consequences for his going beyond what the Constitution allows;

He will engage in conduct that Article II, Section 4 of the Constitution would prohibit; and

He will engage in impeachable offenses because he knows that the Congress will not impeach him.

It is impeachment that is the ultimate guard against a reckless, ruthless, lawless President; and if we do not exert our authority, this President, knowing that we won't, is capable of doing things that we cannot imagine.

Madam Speaker, it is up to us, the Members of this Congress, to assure that this government continues to have the checks and balances that the Framers of the Constitution intended. If we do not, if Congress does not fulfill its responsibility, we won't have a Presidency. The power will be so concentrated that we will have a monarchy.

The Framers of the Constitution never intended for a President to just totally disregard the Congress. And notwithstanding all that might happen in the courts, notwithstanding all of the subpoenas that may be taken to court and have them litigated properly, the ultimate check on a President is Article II, Section 4 of the Constitution, and that is impeachment when he commits impeachable acts.

We have the Mueller report. It speaks for itself. And there are many constitutional scholars who have said there has been an obstruction to take place.

There are many lawyers who have worked in the Justice Department. They number hundreds now, the lawyers who have signed on, indicating that the President should be beneath the law just as everyone else is, or the law should apply to him. He shouldn't be above the law.

They are indicating that, if we don't act, we are showing the President that he is above the law. He then becomes a monarch, and we then become a weaker form of government.

So I call upon this Congress: Let us do what is expected of us. The Framers of the Constitution gave us the way. They have shown the way. We but only have to have the will, and it is worth it for us to do this because the country is at stake in the sense that the government is at risk.

Madam Speaker, I love my country.

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

RECOGNIZING LIONS CLUBS INTERNATIONAL

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I rise today to speak

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H3795

about an organization that is near and dear to my heart: the Lions Clubs International.

I am a member of my hometown organization, the Howard Area Lions Club. The Howard Area Lions Club has consistently earned the recognition as the largest Lions Club in Pennsylvania.

There are probably many factors that have led them to this, but none more significant than their commitment to the Lions Club motto, "We Serve."

The members of my club served as the chartering organization for the Howard Boy Scout Troop 353; and, in the past, I was proud to serve as Scoutmaster of that unit.

Simply put, service is of the utmost importance to the Lions. The clubs are places where individuals can join together to give their valuable time and effort to improving their communities and the world.

Where there is a need, there is a Lion. There are 1.4 million Lions around the world, 47,000 Lions Clubs in more than 200 countries. For more than 100 years, Lions have been serving humanity.

The idea of the Lions Club began in 1917. A 38-year-old Chicago business leader named Melvin Jones told members of his local business club that they should reach beyond business issues and address the betterment of their communities and the world. They agreed.

Three years later, Lions Clubs became an international organization. Melvin Jones inspired generations of people to become civic-minded individuals, dedicated to using their talents and ambitions to improve their communities without financial reward.

Melvin Jones had a personal code: "You can't get very far until you start doing something for somebody else."

Madam Speaker, service to others is what makes the Lions Clubs International such a powerful force for good in the world.

There are nearly 70 Members of Congress who are involved in service organizations, and that is why I am proud to be working with my colleague Congressman JIMMY PANETTA to establish the Congressional Service Organization Caucus. We plan to launch the caucus soon.

It will support the many operations that are dedicated to giving back to their communities. I encourage my colleagues to join because there are few gifts greater than the gift of time and service to others.

Madam Speaker, Lions Clubs International is on Capitol Hill today to raise awareness about how helpful service organizations are to communities across the Nation.

I am grateful that Lions Clubs around the globe serve millions annually, and I am so proud to be a member of an organization that not only lives up to its remarkable ideals but exceeds them time and time again.

NEWBORN SCREENING SAVES LIVES

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

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Madam Speaker, I recently introduced the Newborn Screening Saves Lives Reauthorization Act, which will continue the important work of the original bill and expand its critical programs to improve infant health across the United States. Every year, thousands of babies are born with genetic, metabolic, hormonal, and functional conditions that severely affect their development.

Fifty years ago, these rare disorders in infants would have gone undetected until symptoms appeared, often too late to provide them with the essential treatment needed to prevent lifelong disability or even death. Today, we can give newborn babies a simple blood test that can identify such life-threatening genetic illnesses before symptoms appear.

In 2008, Congress passed my original bill, which was a major step toward establishing newborn screening guidelines across the United States. Until that time, only 10 States and the District of Columbia required newborn screening for a complete panel of recommended disorders, and there was no Federal repository of information on these diseases. Today, 49 States and the District of Columbia screen for at least 31 of the 35 currently recommended core conditions.

Each year, with newborn screening, healthcare professionals identify approximately 12,000 babies who test positive for one of these rare conditions. This invaluable early detection allows for timely treatment to prevent long-term damage and severe health complications, which gives babies the opportunity to live relatively normal and healthy lives.

For thousands of mothers and families, this early and simple intervention can also reduce the emotional stress of trying to identify their baby's correct diagnosis.

Investments in newborn screening can also save up to \$1 million over a child's lifetime. This is a significant savings for American families and our financially burdened healthcare system.

While it is true that since the original passage of the Newborn Screening Saves Lives Act, significant advancements have been made in early detection and treatment, serious gaps in newborn screening remain. The Newborn Screening Saves Lives Reauthorization Act will build on the current newborn screening infrastructure and strengthen early detection of preventable disease.

To ensure the quality of laboratories involved in newborn screening, the bill reauthorizes the Centers for Disease Control grants, and it continues HRSA grants to empower parents and health professionals with education and resources to improve newborn screening.

The bill also renews the Secretary's Advisory Committee on Heritable Disorders in Newborns and Children, which maintains and updates the recommended uniform screening panel that States adopt and implement.

The bill funds research to identify new screening technologies and treatments, and a new provision in the bill commissions the National Academy of Medicine to issue recommendations to modernize newborn screening systems into the 21st century.

The Newborn Screening Saves Lives Reauthorization Act will continue to ensure that parents and health providers are knowledgeable about the value of newborn screening, and it will help ensure that infants across the United States receive comprehensive and consistent testing.

A coalition of public health groups, including the March of Dimes, the Association of Public Health Laboratories, the American College of Medical Genetics, and the National Organization for Rare Disorders, support the Newborn Screening Saves Lives Reauthorization Act. Their leadership has been critical to advance newborn screening across the United States.

Madam Speaker, newborn screening is one of the most important public health interventions of the 20th century. It is critical that, in the 21st century, we continue and strengthen the programs and research of the Newborn Screening Saves Lives Act.

I urge my colleagues to sponsor the Newborn Screening Saves Lives Reauthorization Act to enhance the lives of hundreds of infants and families each year in the United States.

RECOGNIZING ZANE MOORE OF THE BUCKS COUNTY YMCA

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

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize an individual and organization in Bucks County, Pennsylvania, working to make our community a better place.

Earlier this month, Zane Moore, the president and CEO of the YMCA of Bucks County, walked across the entire county to raise awareness of the positive impact the YMCA has on our neighbors and funding for its programs.

Last Thursday, Zane began his trek at the YMCA in Quakertown, wrapping up at the YMCA in Doylestown. He picked up on Friday where he left off, completing his journey that same day, all the way to the YMCA in Lower Bucks County in Fairless Hills.

Madam Speaker, I applaud Zane and all the local leaders who joined him along the way on his journey. We appreciate the work of the YMCA and all of its efforts to promote education, physical well-being, and recovery programs for those in our community.

□ 1015

RECOGNIZING ROTARIAN OF THE YEAR MAX ROSE

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Madam Speaker, I rise to recognize a resident of Bucks County, Pennsylvania, who was recently honored as Rotarian of the Year by the Rotary Club of Doylestown.

Last month, 24-year Rotary Club member Max Rose received this distinction at the 10th annual Four-Way Test Awards Fundraiser. During his distinguished tenure, he twice served as president of the Rotary Club of Doylestown, has been an instrumental force in the organization's youth exchange program, and has assisted greatly in local events such as the Borough Dam cleanup and the Doylestown at Dusk Car Show.

Madam Speaker, I congratulate Max on this well-deserved recognition. I also thank Rotary Club president Gail Linenberg, along with all the members of the Rotary Club of Doylestown, for their dedication and their service to our community.

RECOGNIZING STUDENTS AND FACULTY OF ST. ANDREW SCHOOL, NEWTOWN, PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize an outstanding group of students in Bucks County, Pennsylvania, who recently partnered with a local organization to comfort children who have experienced traumatic events.

At St. Andrew School in Newtown, a group of third-grade students participated in a service project in collaboration with the Newtown Quilters' Guild. Using lighthearted drawings by the students, the guild will create colorful quilts and distribute them to the Newtown Township Police Department and emergency services personnel to give to young children who have been through difficult situations.

Madam Speaker, I applaud these students and the faculty of St. Andrew School in Newtown, especially Principal Nancy Matteo and third-grade teachers Ashlyn Kalicki and Lynn Dixon.

I also thank all the members of the Newtown Quilters' Guild for their thoughtfulness, along with all the officers of the Newtown Township Police Department on this National Police Week. We appreciate all the work they do for our community.

CELEBRATING 54TH ANNIVERSARY OF HEAD START

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

Ms. WATERS. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support and celebration of the 54th anniversary of the Head Start program and the 25th anniversary of the Early Head Start program.

As a former Head Start teacher, I know how vital the program is to over 100,000 low-income children in California and the more than 1 million families across the country who rely on its essential services.

I began my journey at Head Start as an assistant teacher and later became the supervisor of parent involvement and volunteer services, helping parents participate and contribute to their children's educational experiences.

Head Start services include health screenings, nutritional education, and social support for families with children in the program. Early Head Start provides services like home visits to children at birth. Head Start even funds research and functions as a laboratory for early learning innovation.

From the moment I became involved with Head Start, I saw the potential it had to empower and uplift children and their families. Since then, I have worked hard to improve and expand Head Start so that this potential is realized and more families have an opportunity for a better life.

My role as supervisor of parent involvement and volunteer services provided me with insights into the unique and pivotal role parents play in the Head Start community.

I am so appreciative of the Head Start and Early Head Start programs in my home district in California. These programs basically provide resources and referral services, and research innovative new programs in the areas of childcare, development, and family well-being.

These programs serve tens of thousands of low-income children and their families, usually in communities like South Los Angeles, Gardena, Hawthorne, Inglewood, and Lawndale, and demonstrate Head Start's transformative potential.

I will continue to strengthen Congress' relationship with Head Start and parents and encourage more Members and families to become involved.

Since President Johnson first announced Head Start in the spring of 1965, the program and its services have reached over 32 million children. Study after study shows that providing early childhood education to children is transformative to their future academic success.

Children who joined Head Start graduated high school and attended college at higher rates than their siblings who did not participate in the program. Head Start participants consistently show substantial improvements on test scores early in life. Adults who participated in Head Start in their youth are less likely to be charged with a crime or become a teenage parent.

These programs are so much more than federally funded preschool programs for the youngest Americans. They are a lifeline for vulnerable communities and provide future generations a chance to succeed.

This critical program is our national pledge that every child, regardless of circumstances at birth, has an opportunity to achieve and excel in school and in life. There is perhaps no greater purpose for an elected official than working toward the realization of that pledge. I will never stop.

In addition to my support here in making sure that the funding continues and that it grows, I also focus on the oversight, supervision, and management of Head Start programs.

In the greater Los Angeles community, many of our delegate agencies are overseen by LACOE. This is a county organization.

I want LACOE to get more involved in keeping Head Start programs rather than shutting them down. I believe there must be a strong component that works with compliance and works with training to make sure that the programs meet all the requirements because our teachers, our assistant teachers, and our volunteers are doing the very best job they can do. Many of them need that kind of support. I am not so sure they are getting all of it, but I am going to pay even more attention to LACOE in the greater Los Angeles area to ensure that they are providing the kinds of services that strengthen Head Start programs and do the kind of outreach in the communities to make sure that our families know the availability of the Head Start programs.

I believe that Head Start has been one of the most significant programs of the overall poverty program, and I am one of its greatest supporters.

THIS HOUSE IS NOT IN ORDER

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

Mr. ZELDIN. Madam Speaker, this Chamber is going in the wrong direction in the effort to combat the BDS movement, to combat anti-Israel hate, to combat anti-Semitism.

I went through kindergarten through 12th grade, college, law school, 4 years of Active Duty. I never once experienced anti-Semitism. But now I hear countless stories all across our country and college campuses today. It is infiltrating American politics, college campuses, and the Halls of Congress.

We need to do something about it, not just send a strong message, which is important, but actually pass something with teeth to do something about it.

One of my colleagues from Michigan gave a talk last Friday, gave an interview. She was asked about her support for a one-state solution that would remove Jews from power in their own country, in Israel. Her response was that the Holocaust gives her a calming feeling because of the safe haven that the Palestinians provided to Jews.

Now, that happens to be the opposite of factually accurate. But then, if you have any problem with those words, that makes you automatically an Islamophobe and a racist idiot, according to the person who had said that.

Then the Speaker of the House is calling for us to come to the floor and apologize to Ms. TLAIK.

Well, here I am. My apology is for everyone who is insulted across America

that we passed a watered-down, spineless resolution, after countless acts of anti-Semitism by another Member, that does not name names.

I apologize to everyone across this country expecting this House to act. We failed them.

The students at the University of California who had to read the posting: "Gas them, burn them, and dismantle their power structure. Humanity cannot progress with the parasitic Jew."

The founder of BDS was blatantly anti-Semitic. Take his own words: "No Palestinian—rational Palestinian, not a sellout Palestinian—will ever accept a Jewish state in Palestine."

Or this other quote: "We are witnessing the rapid demise of Zionism, and nothing can be done to save it, for Zionism is intent on killing itself. I, for one, support euthanasia."

Or we could take this quote: "Many of the methods of collective and individual 'punishment' meted out to Palestinian civilians at the hands of young, racist, often sadistic and ever impervious Israeli soldiers . . . are reminiscent of common Nazi practices against the Jews." This is the founder of the BDS movement.

You want an apology, Madam Speaker? Well, how about the students at Berkeley who sit in the classroom and the maps that go up on the board? Where it is supposed to say Israel, it says Palestine. Or the students in Michigan whose professor refused to sign off on a letter of recommendation because the student wanted to study abroad in Israel.

This past Thursday, we had an imam give the opening prayer here before this Chamber. This imam—a simple Google search, by the way, in the vetting would have come up with the background, and it is a long list—is not just a supporter of the BDS movement but has compared the Israelis to the Nazis, called the Israelis a terrorist regime, called for a third Palestinian intifada, and posted in support of the Muslim Brotherhood.

I mentioned earlier one of my colleagues who had multiple anti-Semitic postings. One started with: "Israel has hypnotized the world, may Allah awaken the people and help them see the evil doings of Israel"; or saying that if you support Israel, then you must have been bought off by Jews; or when she said if you support the U.S-Israel relationship, then you must have pledged your allegiance to a foreign power.

You want an apology, Madam Speaker? How about the students at Warren Wilson College who had a speaker tell them Jews are doing the same thing to the Palestinians as the Nazis did to the Jews?

Students from coast to coast all across this entire country are expecting, demanding, this House to act.

Now, you could go to the Twitter account of Ms. TLAIB. You will see over the course of the last few days postings from Tamika Mallory and fellow organizer Linda Sarsour.

Tamika Mallory says that Louis Farrakhan is the "greatest of all time," Louis Farrakhan, the same guy who said: "So when they talk about Farrakhan, call me a hater, you do what they do, call me an anti-Semite. Stop it, I'm anti-Termite"; or, "Satanic Jews have infected the whole world with poison and deceit"; or what he said about Adolf Hitler of Nazi Germany, who was responsible for murdering 6 million Jewish people and millions of others, "He was a very great man."

We have Members of this Chamber who have associated themselves with Farrakhan, not just Tamika Mallory.

I mentioned Linda Sarsour. She said: "Only Jews . . . are the ones that condone violence against Arabs and are cool with mosques being attacked."

We have an issue in this Chamber, and we need to do something about it, not mask it, not empower it, not elevate it. It must be identified and crushed.

And no, Madam Speaker, I am not coming to this floor and apologizing to my colleagues who push it. I will apologize to everyone across this country of fended by the lack of action by the Speaker.

Madam Speaker, your House is not in order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair and not to a perceived viewing audience.

MOURNING THE PASSING OF R. NORMAN FRANCK

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

Mr. SMUCKER. Madam Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that I rise today to mourn the passing of Norman Franck, a fire police officer and member of the Willow Street Fire Company.

After responding to a crash this past weekend, Norman fell ill and then passed away at Lancaster General Hospital. It was a tremendous loss to our community and, certainly, even more so to his wife, Marian.

Today, we remember her in our thoughts and prayers and wish her comfort and peace in this time of mourning.

□ 1030

Norman will be remembered as a giving man, described by Willow Street Fire Company Chief Craig Rhineer as someone who would do anything for you. Norman, by the way, was also considered an authority on the history of the Willow Street Fire Company.

He lived a life in service to the community, as a member of the fire service and ambulance company since the 1980s. When he moved to Maryland, he served there at the St. Michael's Volunteer Fire Company. Then, after returning to Lancaster County, he resumed his service once again at the Willow Street Fire Company.

Even at age 81, Norman still selflessly served his community. His spirit of volunteerism, his spirit of giving, should be an example for us all.

We thank him for his years of service.

Madam Speaker, I ask everyone to join me in keeping his family and the members of Willow Street Fire Company in our prayers.

Madam Speaker, members of our volunteer fire companies are true heroes. Today, we honor Norman Franck, a hero who served in my community.

HOLD POLLUTERS ACCOUNTABLE FOR PFAS CONTAMINATION

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

Mr. ROUDA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to shed light on PFAS contamination, a crisis affecting water systems that serve upward of 19 million people across our great country.

For decades, manufacturing companies have known that these chemicals are extremely hazardous to human health, have actively taken steps to bury unfavorable research, and have used false uncertainty to fight off regulations that could help ensure public safety.

That is why I introduced H.R. 2570, the PFAS User Fee Act, to hold chemical manufacturers financially accountable for their role in this contamination crisis. These manufacturers must take responsibility for their role in this crisis and contribute to the solution.

Congress must finally hold these polluters accountable for the harm they continue to cause. The safety of our water systems and the air we breathe is at stake.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 31 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

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

PRAYER

Dr. Benny Tate, Rock Springs Church, Milner, Georgia, offered the following prayer:

Our most kind, gracious Heavenly Father, we come to You in the name of our Lord, Jesus Christ. We lift this body up to You because You admonish us to pray for kings and for all who are in authority.

I, first and foremost, lift up their spiritual lives to You, realizing we are

a spirit that has a soul, housed in a body. May each Member have spiritual peace.

I also pray for each Member relationally. The Scripture admonishes for leaders to lead a peaceable life. May the blessing of peace rest on their homes.

Lastly, I pray for them physically. Would You grant strength, health, and wisdom to each one. Lord, may every Member realize You have placed them here and acknowledge their ultimate accountability is to You.

Lord, I thank You for this great opportunity, and I pray this prayer in the name above every name, the name of our Lord and Savior, Jesus Christ.

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 gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. TAKANO led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

WELCOMING DR. BENNY TATE

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FERGUSON. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Dr. Benny Tate, whose leadership and guidance have made him an incredibly valuable member of his community in Milner, Georgia, and our Third District.

Dr. Tate has been the senior pastor of Rock Springs Church in Milner for over 25 years. In that time, when it started as a church of just 60, it has now grown to a church of over 6,000.

Through this work, Dr. Tate has also shepherded the creation of several ministries, including the Rock Springs Medical Clinic, the Rock Springs Christian Academy, the Potter's House for Women, and Impact Christian Ministries for the homeless.

Benny has been married to his wife, Barbara, for over 30 years, and they have one daughter, Savannah Abigail, who is here with him today.

I want to commend Dr. Tate for his commitment to our community. There is not a week that goes by where he isn't a welcoming part of the Third District of Georgia.

The grace and love he has shown to his parishioners and neighbors throughout his 25 years in Milner is un-

paralleled, and I am truly honored to have Dr. Benny Tate here with us today.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WE THE PEOPLE

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

Mr. TAKANO. Madam Speaker, "We the People" is a bold opening statement enshrined in our Constitution. Yet, the truth is that in most parts of our country, LGBTQ Americans are not included in "We the People."

Students in Arizona should go to school free from fear and bullying. Workers in Texas should not be afraid of being fired because of who they are. Renters in Mississippi should not be evicted because of who they love.

No person, no matter where they live in America, should face discrimination. Equality should not depend on the ZIP Code where you live. It is time to make equality for LGBTQ people the law of the land and to ensure that we, too, are part of "We the People."

I urge my colleagues to be on the right side of history and to vote "yes" on the Equality Act.

UMITA WILL HELP STATE AND LOCAL INFRASTRUCTURE RE-NEWAL

(Ms. FOXX of North Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, as the national conversation revolves around infrastructure this week, I would like to highlight H.R. 300, the Unfunded Mandates Information and Transparency Act, or UMITA, which I introduced with my Democratic colleague, Representative CUELLAR.

UMITA will further our goal of renewing our country's infrastructure by making sure that overly burdensome Federal regulations don't hinder progress on State and local levels.

State and local governments shoulder the greatest cost of infrastructure projects, and any Federal legislation to assist their efforts must account for costs of regulatory compliance. Every dollar spent on compliance with burdensome mandates is less money for the projects States and localities need.

UMITA passed with a bipartisan vote in the last four Congresses, and I call for it to be included in any comprehensive infrastructure legislation considered in this body.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE CLIMATE RESILIENCY and READINESS ACT

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

Ms. ESCOBAR. Madam Speaker, climate change is a major threat to our national security; and military leaders agree.

Last year, the Department of Defense studied 79 mission-critical bases and found that climate change threatened most of them. In the past year alone, three of our military installations suffered significant damage from natural disasters, and they are still not fully recovered.

It is clear that the scale of this challenge is great. That is why today I am introducing the Department of Defense Climate Resiliency and Readiness Act to help tackle this challenge.

By setting clear goals and ensuring regular dedicated resources, my bill gives military leaders the tools and flexibility to implement policies that work best for their missions. We will also ensure the DOD budgets for resiliency and maintains a focus on cutting-edge technologies like hybrid microgrids and additive manufacturing.

As one of the world's largest energy consumers, DOD can offer invaluable leadership toward addressing the global climate challenge, while bolstering U.S. national security; and that starts today.

WORK IN A BIPARTISAN WAY TO DEFEAT RUSSIAN ELECTION INTERFERENCE

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

Mr. GAETZ. Madam Speaker, by expanding American energy, expelling diplomats, and ensuring that the United States takes its position in the world, President Trump has been tougher on Russia than any President in a generation.

But the fact remains that the Russian military attacked the U.S. election. And so it would seem reasonable that, along with the Department of Homeland Security, the FBI, and the CIA, we would want the United States military offering the full suite of capabilities, both offensive and defensive, to combat Russian election interference.

Today, the House Armed Services Committee held a classified briefing on the U.S. military and their participation in this critical mission. I was deeply disappointed in what I learned.

The U.S. military is not sufficiently engaged or informed on critical aspects of the Russian election interference campaign. They don't even know which two Florida counties were hacked.

And when DOD sent 11 people to go work with the Department of Homeland Security to have the full suite of

authorities available to respond to Russia, they were told they weren't needed.

Russia has a whole-of-government approach to this problem, and I would urge us to work in a bipartisan way in the Defense Authorization Act to ensure that we are ready with our full authorities to defeat Russia and their efforts to interfere with our election.

HIGHLIGHTING THE STRUGGLE OF RAIL COMMUTERS IN NEW JERSEY'S SEVENTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT

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

Mr. MALINOWSKI. Madam Speaker, today I rise to highlight the struggle that rail commuters in New Jersey's Seventh District face each day.

Public transportation is vital to my State, where twice as many of us depend on it than the national average.

Right now, though, the 23,000 people who rely on the main rail line that cuts through the heart of my district, the Raritan Valley Line, are the only commuters in northern New Jersey without one-seat ride access to Manhattan during peak hours. To get to New York, they must transfer to Newark, adding at least 25 minutes to their commutes.

Now, you might ask, why am I bringing this local issue to the House? Why can't New Jersey solve it by itself?

Well, I will tell you why. Because every rail passenger trying to get to work along this economic corridor that is so vital, not just to my State, but to the economy of the United States, must squeeze through a crumbling, 110-year old bottleneck of a tunnel under the Hudson River that is owned and operated by the Federal Government, and the Federal Government won't fix it.

The Raritan Valley Line Mayor's Alliance, representing over 30 mayors, has been working to get one-seat ride. We need to do our part by passing an infrastructure bill this year that will fund the Gateway tunnel.

HEALTHCARE PRICES

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

Mrs. WAGNER. Madam Speaker, I rise to support the Payment Commission Data Act, which would make prescription drug prices more transparent, and the BLOCKING Act, which would bring generic drugs to the market faster.

I also support the Protecting Consumer Access to Generic Drugs Act, which would prohibit drug companies from delaying the entry of generic drugs into the market.

Unfortunately, Madam Speaker, Democrats have packaged these bills together with poison pills that would

prevent States from offering lower cost healthcare plans.

Democrats want to increase ObamaCare enrollment regardless of cost, but ObamaCare is not affordable for many Americans. The average monthly premium for a family of four is over \$1,500, forcing Missourians to cut housing and child care so they can pay skyrocketing premiums. It is not a solution. We must take immediate action to allow States to promote choices and affordability.

BLUE WATER NAVY VETERANS

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

Ms. SCANLON. Madam Speaker, yesterday the House passed H.R. 299, the Blue Water Navy Vietnam Veterans Act of 2019. This long overdue legislation would finally provide disability benefits to veterans who served in the territorial seas surrounding Vietnam during the Vietnam war and were exposed to Agent Orange.

This change is long overdue but, sadly, thousands of brave Vietnam veterans have already suffered the consequences of Agent Orange-related illnesses.

A longtime resident of Media, Pennsylvania, John Bury, was a 22-year veteran of the Navy and a legendary advocate for sailors sickened by Agent Orange. He, himself, survived cancer six times related to Agent Orange, and knew firsthand the challenges of navigating the VA due to his service being on ships, rather than land.

John passed away in late 2016, but his memory and service will live on. Sailors like John are heroes and deserve to be treated as such by the VA.

I urge the Senate to quickly take up this legislation and send it to the President's desk so that thousands of others like John can get the care they deserve.

□ 1215

NATIONAL DRUG COURT MONTH

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

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Madam Speaker, May is National Drug Court Month, and I rise to recognize these remarkable facilities on their 30th anniversary. Since 1989, drug courts have provided countless addicted Americans referral to treatment and a lifesaving alternative to incarceration.

When I first started Operation UNITE in my district in 2003, there were only five drug courts in the whole district of 30 counties. Today, we have one in all 30 counties, and those volunteer judges are changing more lives than ever before.

At this moment, drug courts are providing a new lease on life to 144,000 Americans around the country. Thank you to the countless professionals who

make up our 3,000 drug courts. We have got a long road ahead, but I look forward to ensuring drug courts remain a central part of that journey.

GUN SHOPS SHOULD MEET MINIMUM SECURITY REQUIREMENTS

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

Mr. MORELLE. Madam Speaker, across our Nation, we face an epidemic. In schools, in churches, on our streets, Americans are dying from gun violence.

We have a moral responsibility to do everything in our power to prevent more people from suffering the loss of a loved one to the scourge of illegal guns. That is why I have introduced the Gun Theft Prevention Act.

Last year, more than 500 gun shops were burglarized nationwide, releasing thousands of deadly weapons onto our streets and into the hands of criminals. In my district, a single gun shop was broken into twice in the same week, seven times in the span of a decade.

Yet licensed gun dealers are not required to take even the most basic precautions, like locking their doors at night, to prevent these dangerous weapons from falling into the wrong hands.

My bill requires gun shops to meet minimum security requirements, like locked cabinets and video surveillance, creates strong enforcement mechanisms, requires reporting of stolen guns, and authorizes 650 new ATF inspectors.

This is commonsense legislation that will save lives, and I will work tirelessly to ensure its passage.

PEACE OFFICERS MEMORIAL DAY

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, today is Peace Officers Memorial Day, when we pay tribute to local, State, and Federal law enforcement officers who serve and protect our communities.

Today is an extra special day for one of my constituents and his family: Sugarcreek Police Sergeant Anthony Gorman, who was shot April 4, 1997, while investigating a suspicious car in a parking lot in Franklin, Pennsylvania. He never fully recovered from his injuries.

In October of 2014, Sergeant Gorman died at the age of 72, more than 17 years after that initial gunshot. While his death was a direct consequence of the 1997 shooting, a doctor listed his cause of death as natural, which prevented him from being honored at the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial here in Washington, D.C.

His son, Christopher, then embarked on a mission to have his dad's name

memorialized. After years of research, petitions, and advocacy, it is now engraved at the East Pathway of Remembrance at section 25, line 31.

Sergeant Gorman's family was here this week for the candlelight vigil held Monday on The Mall, and thanks to Christopher Gorman's determination, his dad's name is finally where he belongs.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE
CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, May 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 May 15, 2019, at 9:39 a.m.:

That the Senate passed S. 1231.

That the Senate passed S. 1436.

Appointment:

The Senate National Security Working Group.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

CHERYL L. JOHNSON.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5, EQUALITY ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 312, MASHPEE WAMPANOAG TRIBE RESERVATION REAFFIRMATION ACT; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 987, MARKETING AND OUTREACH RESTORATION TO EMPOWER HEALTH EDUCATION ACT OF 2019

Ms. SCANLON. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 377 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 377

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 5) to prohibit discrimination on the basis of sex, gender identity, and sexual orientation, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary now printed in the bill shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) 90 minutes of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 312) to reaffirm the Mashpee

Wampanoag Tribe reservation, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Natural Resources now printed in the bill shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 3. At any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 987) to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to provide for Federal Exchange outreach and educational activities. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and amendments specified in this section and shall not exceed 90 minutes, with 60 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce and 30 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Energy and Commerce now printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 116-14 shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as the original bill for the purpose of further amendment under the five-minute rule and shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. No further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such further amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such further amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill, as amended, to the House with such further amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 1 hour.

Ms. SCANLON. Madam Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE), pending which I yield myself such time

as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Ms. SCANLON. Madam Speaker, on Tuesday, the Rules Committee met and reported a rule, House Resolution 377, providing for consideration of H.R. 5 under a closed rule, with 90 minutes of debate equally divided and controlled by the Chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

The resolution also provides for consideration of H.R. 312 under a closed rule, with 1 hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the Chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources.

Lastly, this resolution provides for consideration of H.R. 987 under a structured rule, with 90 minutes of general debate, 60 minutes equally divided and controlled by the Chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce and 30 minutes equally divided and controlled by the Chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor. Twenty-seven amendments are made in order.

Madam Speaker, we are here today to debate the rule for three important pieces of legislation: H.R. 987, H.R. 312, and H.R. 5.

H.R. 987 is the Strengthening Health Care and Lowering Prescription Drug Costs Act, a package of several bills, many of them bipartisan, that went through the House Energy and Commerce Committee under regular order. This bill combines three key bills to lower drug costs by promoting generic competition and four key bills to strengthen healthcare, reverse the sabotage of the ACA by this administration with respect to marketing and outreach, and rescind the Trump administration's efforts to promote junk plans that lack the protections of the Affordable Care Act.

The American people are justifiably demanding action by Congress to make prescription drugs more affordable. Prices are so high that recent data show 24 percent of Americans didn't fill a prescription in the past year due to high costs.

My constituents have been vocal in demanding action on drug pricing, patients like Bill, a senior with diabetes who attends my church, parents like Sarah with children who have special health needs. Folks like these need help now.

This package would lower costs by banning anticompetitive practices that large drug companies employ to keep generics off the market.

This bill will also tackle many of the reasons we have seen enrollment

through the Affordable Care Act decline in recent years.

Since coming into office, President Trump has cut paid advertising and outreach efforts for healthcare exchanges by 90 percent. This wanton political decision to cut these efforts is but one part of the administration's attempts to dismantle the Affordable Care Act.

Furthermore, lack of transparency on the part of Health and Human Services around funding levels for outreach plan enrollment rates and other vital statistics has created an information vacuum on the performance of the ACA.

Greater transparency is required in order for Congress to hold the administration accountable for its efforts to defund education and outreach for the Affordable Care Act.

Second, we have H.R. 312, the Mashpee Wampanoag Tribe Reservation Reaffirmation Act. This important bill recognizes and respects the Tribal sovereignty of the Mashpee Wampanoag, a Tribe that has inhabited New England for over 12,000 years and, in fact, welcomed the Pilgrims to the new world.

This legislation has strong bipartisan support in Massachusetts among other Tribal nations and with Tribal allies in Congress. Had President Trump not tweeted about this bill last week, it would have likely passed on suspension and been sent to the Senate for consideration. The members of this Tribe cannot wait any longer for recognition, and we need to pass this critical legislation without further delay.

Finally, Madam Speaker, this is a week that will be remembered in our history books because, at long last, this body is taking up consideration of the Equality Act. Forty-five years ago this week, the legendary Congresswoman Bella Abzug introduced the first version of the Equality Act, a bill that will give full legal protections to LGBTQ people all across our country.

This version of the Equality Act that we consider today is the result of years of careful legislative drafting and amends existing civil rights laws to provide protections from discrimination based on sexual orientation and gender identity in key areas of public life: employment, housing, credit, education, public spaces and services, federally funded programs, and jury service.

Additionally, the Equality Act updates the public spaces and services covered in current law to include retail stores, services such as banks, legal services, and transportation services. These important updates will strengthen existing protections for everyone.

The journey to this final version of the Equality Act was led by a man who is a history maker in his own right, co-chair of the LGBTQ Equality Caucus and my colleague on the Judiciary Committee, Congressman DAVID CICILLINE from Rhode Island.

□ 1230

Congressman CICILLINE worked with lawyers and advocates from the left

and the right, religious groups, and myriad civil rights groups to make sure that the language of the Equality Act achieved full legal equality while doing nothing to undermine existing civil rights protections for other marginalized groups.

The resulting bill is supported by 130 of the largest employers in the country, our largest labor unions, and hundreds of organizations, including, to name just a few, the Leadership Conference for Civil and Human Rights, the NAACP, the National Women's Law Center, the Episcopal Church, the Union for Reform Judaism, and the United Church of Christ.

Most importantly, it is supported by a clear and overwhelming majority of the American people. Seventy-one percent of Americans support legislation like the Equality Act to protect LGBTQ people against discrimination in employment, housing, and public accommodations.

Rarely does Congress have the chance to take up legislation so clearly supported by our constituents. That is probably why, since the day that Congressman CICILLINE first introduced this version of the Equality Act in 2015, it has always earned bipartisan support and currently has Republican cosponsors in both the House and the Senate.

The clear majority of both this Chamber and the American people recognize that, for far too long, LGBTQ people have faced discrimination with no Federal legal recourse. It is beyond dispute that LGBTQ people, especially transgender people and especially transgender women of color, face discrimination across this country.

This is a personal issue for me. It has been personal since my baby sister came out to me about 40 years ago.

For many people in this country, that is when the fight hits home. It gets personal when someone you love says, "This is who I am," and you know and value that person, and you will do whatever you can to make sure that your loved one can live life to the fullest, free from hate and discrimination.

I am sad to say that my home in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania is one of the 30 States that defies the will of its people by not having legal protections for LGBTQ people. The idea that my sister, someone who put her life on the line for our country when she served in the armed forces, could drive across State lines and lose protections is heartbreaking.

The Equality Act ends the patchwork of State laws and creates uniform nationwide protections. LGBTQ people won't have to worry that being transferred to another State by their employer or needing to move home to take care of ailing parents will cause them to lose civil rights protections. From sea to shining sea, LGBTQ people will have the security and stability that comes from knowing that if they face discrimination, they have legal recourse.

It is also important to note what the Equality Act does not do. The Equality Act does not impinge on religious liberty. Religious liberty is a cornerstone value of our Constitution and our country. Religious organizations are able to prefer their own members and their version of morality in hiring for religious positions such as ministers, rabbis, or schoolteachers. The Equality Act does nothing to change that.

The Equality Act clarifies what has long been held, though, that religious freedom laws do not create an exemption to civil rights laws. Just like a person can't use a claim of religious freedom to refuse to sell a house to an interracial couple, under the Equality Act, LGBTQ families will be protected from discrimination, regardless of its motivation.

Consider the stakes facing LGBTQ people too often across this country. A same-sex couple walks into a restaurant. They hired a babysitter to look after their young children and are hoping to have a relaxing night out. They are seated and looking at the menu when the manager comes over and tells them they have to leave. They are not welcome there.

This kind of insecurity and humiliation occurs on a daily basis across this country. In 30 States, the couple would have no legal recourse. Often, humiliation is just the tip of the iceberg.

Same-sex couples are far more likely to be denied housing. Qualified and high-performing transgender people are more likely to be fired from their jobs. LGBTQ young people face rejection, homelessness, and discrimination in school, denying them an education. These injuries compound and lead to poverty, homelessness, and violence.

The impact is felt hardest by transgender women of color, who confront racial discrimination, sex discrimination, and gender-identity discrimination. The intersection of these forms of discrimination can even be deadly, as it was for Shantee Tucker, a transgender woman of color from Philadelphia who was murdered last fall.

The protections provided by the Equality Act give LGBTQ people an equal chance at the American Dream. While discrimination and rejection have ended the lives of too many transgender people, many are succeeding, despite discrimination.

In Pennsylvania, Dr. Rachel Levine, a transgender woman, serves in the Governor's cabinet as secretary for health. Mara Keisling, a Pennsylvania native, is the founder and executive director of the National Center for Transgender Equality and a pioneer for civil rights protections. Danica Roem, the first transgender State legislator, serves in the Virginia House of Delegates. LaLa Zannell is fighting violence in New York City. Raffi Freedman-Gursan was the first openly transgender White House staffer. Miss Major Griffin-Gracy, who was at Stonewall, has spent her life fighting to end

the over-incarceration of transgender people. The list goes on and on.

I am proud that the House will finally act to provide Federal protections to LGBTQ people with passage of the Equality Act. The fight for equal rights is far from over, but I am proud to be part of a majority that prioritizes equal treatment for all of its citizens, regardless of whom they love.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I want to begin by thanking the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. SCANLON), my good friend, for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

We, Madam Speaker, are here today on three very different pieces of legislation, which, unfortunately, makes this a complicated rule. One of our bills concerns civil rights, one concerns healthcare, and one concerns Native Americans. I will move through each of these bills relatively quickly, and then I want to address the process we followed to get here today.

The first bill, Madam Speaker, H.R. 5, is a complicated and complex piece of legislation that would make sweeping changes to our Nation's civil rights laws, if enacted. In general, the bill adds the terms "sexual orientation" and "gender identity" to the list of protected classes under the Civil Rights Act, joining classes like race, gender, religion, and national origin.

As I noted in our hearing yesterday, most Republicans in the House will oppose this bill not because we do not believe that all people should receive equal treatment under the law but because we have real concerns about how this bill will work in practice. A term like "gender identity" has such a vague definition that even proponents of the bill do not agree on exactly what the term means.

That should cause legislators to be especially thoughtful and provide clarity about what the term means and how the law will be applied. But we have not done so here.

Republicans have raised numerous questions about how this bill will work in practice. Will female athletes in junior high, high school, and college be forced to compete in women's athletics against competitors who were born biologically male? Will female sexual assault victims be forced to share vulnerable same-sex spaces like locker rooms and dressing rooms with other individuals who were born biologically male? And since the legislation appears to allow people to define their own gender identity, will it allow people to shift back and forth between gender as it suits them?

These are not rhetorical questions. They are real concerns that we have raised, with good reason, throughout the process.

H.R. 5 is known as the Equality Act, and I know every Member of the House, Republican and Democrat, agrees with

the principle that all people should be treated equally under the law. But even as we strive toward that goal, when we are dealing with legislation of this magnitude, we must consider how the bill will work in practice.

Unfortunately, I don't think my friends in the majority have clear answers to very legitimate questions. Last night, during debate at the Rules Committee, our concerns were dismissed as we were told that the courts and administrative bureaucrats would sort out these unanswered issues. That is simply unacceptable.

Why would we want any ambiguity when it comes to a person's civil rights? We should be very clear about congressional intent, and the only way to do that is to write a law the way you intend for it to be carried out. Sadly, this bill falls well short of that certainty.

The second bill, H.R. 987, is actually seven bills: three genuinely bipartisan bills addressing prescription drug costs and four partisan and controversial bills addressing ObamaCare.

As I pointed out last night in our hearing, I don't particularly understand what the majority is trying to accomplish here. There are three bills that are all bipartisan that could easily progress to becoming law. I am even a cosponsor of one of those bills. Yet, I have to vote against the entire package because I do not support the partisan and controversial bills attached by Democrats.

Madam Speaker, at some point, the majority needs to decide if they are here to score political points or if they are here to govern. If they want to continue scoring rhetorical victories, then by all means, they should keep doing what they are doing, keep putting up partisan bills that won't go anywhere in the Senate and won't be signed into law, keep putting up messaging bills for the purpose of signaling to their primary voters, and keep spending their days engaged in show votes that won't ever improve the lives of those they were elected to represent.

If they want to govern for the American people, then the majority must move forward with real legislation that can get real support here, in the Senate, and at the White House.

We had the chance to do that with this package. The majority chose not to do so. I think that is a real missed opportunity for us, both as an institution and as a country.

Finally, the third bill, H.R. 312, the Mashpee Wampanoag Tribe Reservation Reaffirmation Act, is a matter I want to discuss at some length because I think there has been, frankly, a lot of misinformation put out about this particular piece of legislation.

The Mashpee Wampanoag is a federally recognized Tribe based in Mashpee, Massachusetts. H.R. 312 would simply reaffirm the taking of land into trust for the benefit of this Tribe.

When the Federal Government takes land into trust for a Tribe, it is reserv-

ing that land for the benefit of the Tribe and Tribal members both now and into the future. It ensures that the Tribes have a home, that they have a stable place to build communities and to marshal their resources and conduct business. It ensures that the land that was promised to Tribes, and that was held by those Tribes, in many cases for many centuries, remains in Tribal hands.

Holding land in trust is a commitment made to Tribes by the Federal Government. It affirms Tribes will continue to be able to exercise sovereignty over their own land. That is really all this issue is about today, whether or not the Mashpee Wampanoag will be able to exercise their own sovereignty over their own land.

Unfortunately, some who oppose this bill are doing so because they are viewing this issue through a purely political lens rather than what our own Constitution says about Tribal sovereignty. This isn't a bill about a particular use for the land, and it isn't a bill about particular Members of this institution or the Senate. Instead, this is a bill about keeping Federal promises to Tribes.

Our country hasn't always kept those promises, and we have an opportunity today to step up and make clear that regardless of what happened in the past, today, the Federal Government keeps its promises to Tribes, no ifs, ands, or buts.

Before I close, I would like to make a couple of points about the process this week, particularly on the Equality Act and the healthcare issue.

On the Equality Act, 35 amendments were proposed. I thought that many, if not most, of these should have been considered on the floor. Yet, in the final rule, not one amendment was made in order, and we are considering this bill under a closed rule.

The majority is choosing not to make in order many amendments that deserve our consideration on the floor, like Ms. HOLMES NORTON's amendment to clarify that Washington, D.C., residents cannot be excluded or disqualified from jury service based on sexual orientation or gender identity, or the bipartisan amendment that would restore the application of the Religious Freedom Restoration Act to this bill, or Representative JOHNSON's common-sense amendment clarifying that nothing in the act should be construed as to deny parents the right to be involved in their minor child's medical care. These are all deserving amendments that should have been heard on the floor, and yet the majority chose to make precisely none in order.

On H.R. 987, the majority went in a different direction. In total, 51 amendments were submitted to the Rules Committee, and 15 of those were sponsored by Republicans. Yet with today's rule, 27 amendments were made in order, but just one amendment was made in order that was sponsored by a Republican, along with one bipartisan

manager's amendment—one out of 15. All the remaining amendments, 92 percent of those made in order, were sponsored solely by Democrats.

Madam Speaker, I think we can do better than that.

Last week, I reminded the House that when my party was in charge of the last Congress, we went out of our way to make minority and bipartisan amendments in order. Forty-five percent of all amendments made in order in the last Congress were sponsored solely by Democrats, while a further 17 percent were bipartisan.

As of today's rule, the stats are looking much worse for the current majority. Seventy-three percent of all amendments made in order were solely sponsored by Democrats through May 14. Thirteen percent are bipartisan. Just 14 percent were sponsored by Republicans.

We had an opportunity today, particularly on H.R. 5 and H.R. 987, to take steps toward remedying this issue.

I must continue to encourage my good friend, and he is my good friend, the chairman of the Rules Committee, to work with us to make more bipartisan and minority amendments in order and to ensure that all Members, regardless of party, have an opportunity to be heard on the floor, as he has often promised.

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

□ 1245

Ms. SCANLON. Madam Speaker, I would just note that, with respect to H.R. 5, we had regular order. H.R. 5, the Equality Act, went through the Committee on the Judiciary. It had a hearing, and then we also had a markup. This is a new process, apparently, since the last Congress. And then, of course, we had the Rules hearing last night.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER).

Ms. SPEIER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania for her leadership and for the time.

Today is, indeed, a historic day. It is a day that we will say to the LGBTQ community across the land that you matter, that you count, that the Equality Act will be the new law of this country. It is a basic heralding of human decency.

America stands at a crucial crossroads in this generation's fight for civil rights. We should not have to remind our Republican colleagues that no one should ever be discriminated against because of who they are, yet here we are.

Without the explicit Federal protection provided in the Equality Act, the LGBTQ community is at risk of being marginalized, or worse, in the workplace, housing, education, and even in the military.

This administration is seeking to make our LGBTQ families and friends

not just second-class citizens, but to deny them the fundamental American rights etched into our Constitution.

Congress cannot erase hatred with legislation, but Congress has an obligation to lead, to stamp out discrimination wherever it exists.

We can and must all rise for the LGBTQ community.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield myself a few seconds to respond to my friend from Pennsylvania.

We don't consider the markup in committee a very good markup. Only four amendments were considered, none were accepted, and, frankly, a number of Members seeking recognition for amendments were not recognized. So to think that this was anything other than a train moving through a station, I think, is to mischaracterize how that particular markup worked.

With that, Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS), my very good friend, fellow member of the Rules Committee, and also a leading member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Madam Speaker, you can imagine my surprise this morning checking the email and the Health 202, an email put out by The Washington Post—The Washington Post, for crying out loud—and here is the headline: "Democrats Are Putting a Political Pothole in the Way of Bipartisan Drug Pricing Bills." They go on to say: "ObamaCare battles threaten even the most bipartisan healthcare efforts on Capitol Hill."

What a strange turn of events.

So here we have a rule today that will allow a bill to be brought to the floor where the Democrats are using bipartisan drug pricing bills to pay for partisan politics.

Look, I am on the Energy and Commerce Committee as well as the Rules Committee, so I am on the oldest and second oldest committees in the United States House of Representatives. We worked in a bipartisan manner to ensure that the BLOCKING Act, the CREATES Act, and the Protecting Consumer Access to Generic Drugs Act would deliver drug pricing solutions to Americans.

In the Rules Committee, I offered an amendment that keeps the three drug policies and uses the savings—some \$5 billion from those policies—to pay for bipartisan public health priorities.

I also introduced the standalone bill, H.R. 2700, if you are keeping score at home. This is the Lowering Prescription Drug Costs and Extending Community Health Centers and Other Public Health Priorities Act. H.R. 2700 couples the bipartisan drug pricing policies with reauthorization of programs such as community health centers, special diabetes programs, and the National Health Service Corps.

Every Republican member of the Energy and Commerce Committee is a co-sponsor of H.R. 2700, signifying the

broad Republican support for both the drug pricing and the public health priorities.

Look, it is pretty clear: You can say that it is more important to have a navigated program that would never pass any cost-benefit analysis; you can say it is more important to have an earmark for the State of New Jersey to set up an ObamaCare exchange; or you can say it is more important to reauthorize Community Health Centers.

Reauthorizations are tough. We did multiple reauthorizations in the last Congress, and they are difficult to get across the line because so many people have so many opinions.

All of these programs are going to expire in September, and we have taken no activity towards reauthorization in the Energy and Commerce Committee.

These reauthorizations, again, take a substantial amount of time. The clock is ticking, and we should act as soon as possible.

Again, unfortunately, that amendment was not made in order, but I do encourage Members to look at H.R. 2700, a good bill. For this morning, I think The Washington Post had it right.

Ms. SCANLON. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. SCANLON) for yielding me the time.

So maybe it is just me. You know, I am still suffering from trauma, having served in the minority under my Republican friends for 8 years where, routinely, we were given a process where we were almost always shut out.

In the last Congress, we had a record-breaking 103 closed rules on major bills—completely closed. You can't amend it. And they talk about all the amendments they made in order, but they don't talk about the thousands they did not make in order.

Now, look, I don't want them to feel the same way that I did in the minority. I want them to not have to go through the trauma that so many of us went through where we were routinely shut out. And that is why, when we came up with the Rules package, we did things like required that bills had to have hearings in committees of jurisdiction before they came to the Rules Committee, that they had to have markups in the committee of jurisdiction before they came to the Rules Committee.

I mean, they routinely brought legislation to the floor where committees of jurisdiction never had a hearing, never had a markup. They mysteriously appeared. They would come to the Rules Committee; they would get a closed rule; and then we were forced to vote up or down on it.

So I don't really appreciate being lectured on process. Yes, we need to do better, and, yes, I understand that my

Republican friends want more amendments in order, but let's not forget why we are here today. We are here to pass a historic civil rights bill. We are here to pass the Equality Act.

When I look at the amendments that were brought to the Rules Committee, amendment after amendment would target trans Americans and carve out ways for discrimination to continue. This is on a bill that is meant to eliminate discrimination. They were trying to enshrine discrimination. They were trying to weaken the Civil Rights Act. And, quite frankly, I think most of us felt: You know what? We are not going to allow that to happen.

That is not an appropriate use of the rules of the House, to try to take away the rights of people in this country, to try to allow discrimination to continue.

We believe too strongly in the ideals of the Civil Rights Act to risk letting it be transformed into another weapon for division and discrimination. I mean, we listened to groups like the National Urban League, the National Action Network, the NAACP, the Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights, and others that asked us to give this bill a straight up-or-down vote.

And let's be clear, Madam Speaker, a good process is about more than just amendments, as I mentioned. This bill had a hearing, and it had a markup.

On the healthcare bill that we are going to deal with, it is about lowering the cost of prescription drugs.

My friends on the other side of the aisle spent what seemed like an eternity trying to rip away healthcare protections for people, I mean, bringing up one bill after another after another to the floor that never went through regular order, that would literally take away protections from people with pre-existing conditions.

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

Ms. SCANLON. Madam Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Massachusetts an additional 1 minute.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, they did nothing to lower the cost of prescription drugs.

Then we had an election in November, and the big issue was healthcare. People didn't want to have their healthcare protections ripped away. And now, all of a sudden, they are converts, and they say they want to protect people's healthcare and expand healthcare protections.

The bottom line is this: We are not perfect all the time, and we need to do better, but I believe that we are improving the process. I look forward to working with the gentleman, the ranking member from Oklahoma, to try to find ways forward.

But on the legislation here today that we are going to consider, this is important legislation. This is historic legislation. Quite frankly, every Member of this House who wants to end discrimination in this country ought to

support the Equality Act, and every Member of this House who wants to deal with the high cost of prescription drugs ought to support that bill as well.

Madam Speaker, with that, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume for just a few minutes to respond to my good friend, the chairman. I want to tell you, there is nobody I hold in higher regard in the House of Representatives than Chairman MCGOVERN, nobody I consider a better personal friend, nobody I consider a more responsible Member.

On this, we disagree. The gentleman is right, neither side is perfect. In this case, we are going to bring attention to this amendment issue until we see results. That is precisely what my friend did when he was in the minority, and there are some times we should have listened to him and we did not.

In this case, I think the imbalance is so egregious that we are going to continue to make that case until we see a change. Maybe we won't. Hopefully we will, because I know my friend approaches this with good intentions.

Secondly, I would say this bill was so important, the Equality Act, it ought to have amendments. That is the point. That is how you build consensus. I think they are missing the opportunity to get a lot of people who would support the basic concept that they are trying to advance.

And, finally, on the drug bill, I have just got to be honest with you. When they had a chance to pass something that would work and chose to bundle it with something that they knew couldn't pass, that makes me wonder how serious they are about dealing with that problem.

But, hopefully, we will get an opportunity to deal with that again. And that is an area we know we can work together on. We have proved it in committee.

So, with that, I look forward to continuing to work with my good friend, the chairman. I know that we will occasionally have differences. That is what this is all about. We will work those differences out.

Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. HARTZLER), my very good friend, who also is a distinguished member of the House Armed Services Committee.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to this rule and to the underlying legislation, H.R. 5.

Contrary to what has just been said on the floor, this bill does not end discrimination. In fact, the Equality Act imposes top-down, government-led discrimination against all Americans who hold a differing view of human sexuality and gender.

This grossly misnamed bill punishes everyday citizens, silences free speech and viewpoint disagreements, and dis-

criminates against people of faith. In reality, this bill should be called the women's inequality act.

The policies of H.R. 5 have already been used to trample female athletics, eliminate safe spaces for women, harm children, terminate parental rights, and undermine the free exercise of religious freedom.

The legislation also provides for a universal right to abortion, compromises taxpayers' safeguards against funding abortion, and eliminates conscious protections for healthcare providers that do not want to participate in an abortion.

As a former track coach, I am deeply committed to providing women and girls with a level playing field. Title IX, however, becomes irrelevant under the women's inequality act.

Vulnerable women seeking haven in homeless women's shelters will be revictimized under H.R. 5. This is already happening.

In California, women who were sexually harassed in the shower by a biological male were threatened with expulsion from the women's shelter.

In Alaska, a women's shelter is being sued for sending a transitioning individual to the hospital instead of letting him sleep 3 feet away from rape victims.

This is absurd. Under H.R. 5, women-only spaces will be a thing of the past.

This bill also places children at risk of medical experimentation and bleak futures when they are given the right to hormone blockers and sex change operations.

□ 1300

Most children, 98 percent of boys and 88 percent of girls, who question their gender identity will grow into their birth gender after passing through puberty.

Parents who dare to oppose doctors using off-label drugs that may sterilize their child, or performing life-altering surgical procedures, will be considered abusive and neglectful. This has already happened with an Ohio couple who lost custody of their daughter.

For the first time ever, H.R. 5 waives the Religious Freedom Restoration Act, enabling unhindered government discrimination against the faith community. It also actively prohibits the religious community from partnering with the Federal Government.

Catholic schools will no longer be able to participate in the National School Lunch Program. Jewish synagogues will lose Federal grant funding to protect against terror threats, and houses of worship will lose FEMA disaster aid unless—here is the catch—they abandon their core teachings on morality, marriage, and sexuality.

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

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Missouri.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Madam Speaker, Members from both sides of the aisle,

especially those who claim to be pro-women and pro-children, need to stop this devastating legislation.

The future of women's rights, privacy, protection, and athletic potential depends on it.

Ms. SCANLON. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Mrs. TRAHAN).

Mrs. TRAHAN. Madam Speaker, I rise to offer my strong support for the rule and for H.R. 5, the Equality Act.

Recent years have brought extraordinary progress in the fight for full equality for our LGBTQ community. Like millions of others across the country, I joined with friends and family to celebrate Supreme Court rulings paving the way for same-sex couples to marry. But in the midst of these joyful and historic victories, we knew that the work was just beginning.

Though LGBTQ people could now get married, in a majority of States they could still be fired for having a picture of their spouse on their desk or kicked out of their home just for being who they are. The fact is, LGBTQ people are still at risk of discrimination across key areas of life in huge swaths of our country.

Recent national surveys of LGBTQ people show that 42 percent of lesbian, gay, and bisexual people; and 78 percent of transgender people have experienced discrimination or harassment on the job because of who they are.

Only 21 States have explicit laws barring discrimination based on sexual orientation and employment, housing and public accommodations, and only 20 States have such protections for gender identity.

The time to end this patchwork of protections once and for all is now, and to do that, we must pass this important legislation.

The promotion of fairness and justice is a hallmark of who we are as Americans. Everyone should be afforded all of the rights provided for in our Constitution and outlined in our Declaration of Independence. These rights are fundamental to all human beings, and all Americans deserve the same civil rights regardless of gender, race, and sexual orientation. We don't need to amend that.

Let's pass the rule and let's pass the Equality Act.

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

Madam Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to inform the House that if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to immediately bring up H.R. 336, the Strengthening America's Security in the Middle East Act of 2019.

This bill includes four titles, three of which passed the House last Congress, and one of which has already passed the House this Congress on suspension.

My amendment will also include three additional provisions agreed to by the Senate when they considered their version of this bill, so that what we will debate will be identical to what

the Senate passed with an overwhelming majority vote in February.

The most critical title of H.R. 336, in my opinion, is the Combating BDS Act of 2019, which will allow a State or local government to adopt measures to divest assets from entities using boycotts, disbursements, or sanctions to influence Israel's policy.

Madam Speaker, yesterday was the 71st anniversary of the founding of the State of Israel. I can think of no better way to celebrate Israel's independence, reaffirm our support for Israel, and indicate our ongoing commitment to a peaceful and more secure Middle East than to consider and pass H.R. 336 immediately.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I urge a "no" vote on the previous question, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD four letters, first, a letter from the National Partnership for Women & Families urging support; second, a letter from the Human Rights Campaign, also urging support for H.R. 5; third, a letter from the American Federation of Government Employees; and finally, a letter from several civil rights groups, all urging support for H.R. 5.

NATIONAL PARTNERSHIP
FOR WOMEN & FAMILIES,
Washington, DC, May 14, 2019.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: The National Partnership for Women & Families is a nonprofit, nonpartisan organization that has fought for decades to advance the rights and well-being of America's women and families. We work to foster a society in which workplaces are fair, equitable and family friendly; where everyone has access to quality, affordable health care, including reproductive health care; and where every person has the opportunity to achieve economic security and live with dignity.

We write to voice our strong support for the Equality Act (H.R. 5) and to urge you to vote YES on this groundbreaking legislation. We also urge you to vote NO on any motion to recommit that may be offered to undermine or alter the Equality Act or otherwise harm civil liberties.

Despite significant progress, lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and queer (LGBTQ) people still face considerable discrimination and lack necessary protections across the country. While some states have enacted laws that protect against discrimination, the patchwork nature of these protections means that millions of people continue to face harassment, exclusion and uncertainty that negatively impact their safety, their day-to-day lives, their families and their ability to participate fully in society.

Part of achieving our nation's promise of equality, dignity and fairness is ensuring that all people, regardless of sexual orientation or gender identity, have equal oppor-

tunity to succeed. No one should have access to services or doors to opportunity closed because of outdated gender stereotypes about how people should act, look or behave. This requires stronger national nondiscrimination protections based on sex, sexual orientation and gender identity.

The Equality Act is historic civil rights legislation that would amend and supplement the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and other key federal nondiscrimination laws that provide protection from discrimination on the basis of race, color, national origin or religion. This legislation would strengthen protections from discrimination on the basis of sex, and add critical new protections from discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation and gender identity. Specifically, it would provide clear, explicit protection against discrimination based on sexual orientation and gender identity in education, employment, housing, credit, federally funded programs and federal jury services. These protections are essential in ensuring that LGBTQ people have the right to live with dignity and equality.

While the primary focus of the Equality Act is on LGBTQ people, the Act would also close longstanding gaps in federal law and provide important new legal protections for all women by, for the first time, prohibiting discrimination on the basis of sex in public spaces and services and in all federally-funded activities. This means that, for example, when women experience harassment as customers in restaurants, stores, hotels, taxis or airports, there will now be a remedy. The law will also ensure that breastfeeding parents aren't excluded from or treated less favorably in public places just for feeding their children, and it will make clear that pharmacies can't refuse to fill a woman's birth control prescription.

The bill's provisions that would ensure that sex does not stand as a barrier to full participation in federally funded programs or activities will mean, for example, that a developer with a federal grant couldn't discriminate against women-owned businesses in its contracting. Women would also have new tools to challenge a police department's systematically inadequate response to sexual violence and intimate partner violence, if the police department received federal funds; and would be able to challenge denials of reproductive health care where a federally-funded entity otherwise provides comparable or comprehensive health care.

These protections against sex discrimination are a critical step forward in advancing women's equality in this country.

As a leading national women's rights organization we also feel compelled to state emphatically that the Equality Act's protections for transgender and gender nonconforming people in no way undermine the rights or protections afforded to women and do not jeopardize women's safety or their ability to participate fully or equally in sport or in any other aspect of our society. Transgender women are women, and any attempt to mischaracterize their gender identity or suggest that they are trying to "take advantage" of protected class status fundamentally misunderstands the reality of transgender people's lives and experiences. Furthermore, it causes real harm to the more than one million Americans who identify as transgender, a population already subject to high rates of violence and abuse, negative mental and physical health outcomes, and experiences with discrimination and stigmatization.

The Equality Act is a long-overdue step forward in extending civil rights protections to millions of women and LGBTQ people. Establishing clear protections is critical at a time when vulnerable communities are

under attack. The Equality Act would provide a consistent, national standard and ensure that everyone has the opportunity to live safely and with dignity, to advance at work, to provide for one's family and to thrive economically.

Sincerely,

National Partnership for Women & Families.

HUMAN RIGHTS CAMPAIGN,
Washington, DC, May 14, 2019.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the Human Rights Campaign, the nation's largest civil rights organization working to achieve lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer (LGBTQ) equality, I write to urge you to vote in favor of H.R. 5, the Equality Act, and against any Motion to Recommit. We will consider both key votes.

Everyone—including LGBTQ people—should have an opportunity to earn a living and provide a home for their families without fear of constant harassment or discrimination. The Equality Act would update our nation's existing civil rights laws to explicitly include sexual orientation and gender identity, which would finally provide consistent non-discrimination protections for LGBTQ people across key areas of life, including employment, housing, credit, education, public spaces and services, federally funded programs, and jury service. This would ensure LGBTQ people have access to the exact same protections as are currently provided under federal law based on other protected characteristics.

Currently, 30 states lack non-discrimination protections for LGBTQ people. The patchwork nature of current laws leaves millions of people subject to uncertainty and potential discrimination that impacts their safety, their families, and their day-to-day lives. In fact, two-thirds of LGBTQ Americans report having experienced discrimination. The Equality Act would provide a nationwide standard for non-discrimination protections.

The Equality Act has unprecedented support. More than 200 major corporations have endorsed the legislation, as well as more than 40 trade associations including U.S. Chamber of Commerce and the National Association of Manufacturers. Recent polling finds that a growing majority of Americans—including Republicans, Democrats and Independents—support LGBTQ non-discrimination protections and LGBTQ equality. A recent survey by PRRI found that nearly seven in 10 Americans support laws like the Equality Act. More than 500 national, state, and local organizations have endorsed the legislation, including social justice, religious, medical, and child welfare organizations.

Again, I urge you to vote in favor of the Equality Act and against any Motion to Recommit.

Thank you for your consideration. If you have any questions or need more information, please do not hesitate to reach out to me.

Sincerely,

DAVID STACY,
Government Affairs Director,
Human Rights Campaign.

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF
GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES, AFL-CIO,
Washington, DC, May 14, 2019.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the 700,000 federal and District of Columbia government employees represented by the American Federation of Government Employees, AFL-CIO (AFGE) I write to urge

you to vote yes on H.R. 5, the Equality Act. The Equality Act is long overdue legislation with bipartisan support that affirms in the United States all people should be treated equally.

Currently, it is not a violation of federal civil rights law for employers to fire, landlords to deny housing, or for schools to withhold educational opportunities from people solely because they are a member of the LGBTQ community. While some jurisdictions provide protections to the LGBTQ community, the federal government cannot remain silent in the face of continued discrimination. The Equality Act extends protections against discrimination based on sexual orientation or gender identity in employment, housing, access to public places, federal funding, credit education, and jury service. Federal workers provide services to all members of the public without discrimination and expect our nation's laws to protect all individuals in the same manner.

The Equality Act is endorsed by civil and human rights advocates, educators, the business community, and labor unions because the United States can only move forward together when all, including citizens who are LGBTQ, have full protection under the law from discrimination. Again, I urge you to vote in support of H.R. 5, the Equality Act.

Sincerely,

ALETHEA PREDEOUX,
Director, Legislative Department.

MARCH 12, 2019.

CHARLES E. SCHUMER,
Senate Minority Leader,
Washington, DC.

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR SCHUMER AND SPEAKER PELOSI: We write today to memorialize the shared agreement of African American civil rights groups regarding the importance of ensuring the protection of the provisions of core civil rights statutes e.g. the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Fair Housing Act, the Equal Credit Opportunity Act, etc., even as legislators pursue amendments to those statutes to add additional protections against discrimination. We stand in solidarity and support with our partners and colleagues in a shared commitment to ensuring that these protections are extended. But we have also collectively agreed that these efforts must not result in a weakening of the provisions and protections of our bedrock civil rights statutes, each of which represents the powerful and unrelenting demand of civil rights activists and leaders—often at risk to their own lives. While we have been gratified during our conversations with House and Senate committee leaders and bill sponsors, we regard this matter as one of such importance that we are memorializing by this letter the understanding we have shared in our conversations for efforts that may arise by individual legislators or groups during the process of advancing these bills.

The reasons for our caution and concern are, no doubt, evident to you. The current environment is one in which we have seen alarming animus and hostility to various ethnic and minority groups, as well as legal challenges to what were once regarded as unassailable civil rights legal standards. Without question we are confronting a concerted and unrelenting effort to chip away and eviscerate existing civil rights protections. This means that there are inherent dangers in opening any civil rights statutes to legislative debate and review. Thus, the efforts currently underway to extend anti-discrimination protection in our core civil rights statutes, must not be advanced without the clear and explicit agreement among sponsors,

committee leadership and party leadership that proposed amendments to our civil rights statutes will be withdrawn should efforts be introduced to weaken or diminish the existing provisions of those statutes.

Bills which are of immediate concern include, The Equality Act and the American Housing and Mobility Act; however, it is our understanding that there may be others. Below is a list of some of the safeguards/guardrails we feel must be in place if/when legislation proposing to amend civil rights statutes is introduced. Each of these have been discussed and agreed to by civil rights groups, as well as the current sponsors of the Equality Act. They include:

Establish a strong legislative record for any proposed changes to core Civil Rights statutes. This standard must be maintained; Hearings, reports, testimony, etc.

Written assurances from Party Leadership that existing protections will be preserved.

Written assurances from Sponsors that existing protections will be preserved.

Written assurances from Party Leadership that if an amendment(s) to existing protections or amendment(s) creating restrictions on any of the existing protections is advanced the bill will be pulled and no vote(s) will be taken.

Written assurances from Sponsors that if an amendment(s) to existing protections or amendment(s) creating restrictions on any of the existing protections is advanced* they will withdraw their introduction of the bill and work to have the bill pulled and no vote(s) will be taken.

A demonstrated and shared understanding from party leadership and legislative sponsors of the ability to impact the process once legislation is introduced given current political dynamics, including an explanation of the procedural path forward and the procedural path for withdrawal if that becomes necessary.

Inclusion of Congressional Findings section in every bill.

Rollout strategies which include explicit statement(s) about need to preserve existing protections and intent to withdraw the bill if existing protections are threatened in any manner.

Continue to explore standalone legislation that does not amend the existing statute(s), should this prove to be the safer course.

The history of civil rights in this country is one fraught with violence, hostility and long suffering. The fight to enforce those rights continues to this day with resistance and opposition morphing and growing. As stewards of these critical laws, we all have a responsibility and obligation to ensure that the protections they embody are preserved. We therefore want to be clear and direct in expressing our insistence that any legislation proposing to amend legacy civil rights statutes which is permitted to move forward, do so ONLY when there is a commitment and agreement to do no harm to the existing statutes and where the safeguards/guardrails outlined in this letter are put in place.

Sincerely,

SHERILYN IFILL,
President and Director-Counsel, NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund, Inc.

HILLARY O. SHELTON,
Director, Washington Bureau/SVP for Advocacy and Policy, NAACP.

REVEREND AL SHARPTON,
President and Founder, National Action Network.

MELANIE L. CAMPBELL,

*President and CEO,
National Coalition
on Black Civic Part-
icipation.*

MARC H. MORIAL,
*President and Chief
Executive Officer,
National Urban
League.*

KRISTEN CLARKE,
*President & Executive
Director, Lawyers'
Committee for Civil
Rights Under the
Law.*

VANITA GUPTA,
*President and CEO,
Leadership Con-
ference for Civil and
Human Rights.*

Ms. SCANLON. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. CARTWRIGHT).

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Madam Speaker, for nearly a decade, the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act has helped millions of Americans get the care that they need. It has allowed parents to keep their kids on their own insurance plans, and it has protected millions and millions of Americans who are living with preexisting conditions, and that piece is so important.

It means that Americans living with cancer, living with heart disease, and living with diabetes can no longer be thrown off their plans or denied coverage simply because of their medical history.

In my own State of Pennsylvania, more than 5.4 million people depend on these protections to treat their asthma, to afford their insulin, and to receive treatments for other preexisting illnesses.

Madam Speaker, I promise these families that I will keep fighting to keep them healthy, which is why this week I am voting for the Strengthening Health Care and Lowering Prescription Drugs Costs Act which will ban junk insurance plans that don't offer sufficient coverage, bring lower-priced generic prescription drugs to market more quickly, and invest in helping Americans sign up for healthcare.

That is what Democrats are focused on, moving forward, making sure seniors, veterans, and working families across our Nation have the healthcare they need. I hope the current administration will see this as an opportunity to work with our House majority in order to lower the cost of prescription medications, and I hope Republicans in Congress will join us in our mission to keep working for the people and to make sure that every American can afford their prescription medications and their healthcare.

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

Madam Speaker, in closing, I want to urge opposition to the rule. The majority has proposed three different measures today, and while I am a supporter of the bill concerning Tribal rights, I am opposed to H.R. 5 and H.R. 987, and I regret that.

Quite frankly, had the process on these bills been different, I think the vote that we would see in this Chamber would be very different today. I think, literally, a more fulsome and more open process and amendments on H.R. 5 might have unlocked dozens of additional votes for that legislation.

I think with H.R. 987 we don't have to speculate. We know three of those bills passed out of the Energy and Commerce Committee with unanimous, bipartisan support, all of them dealing with drug prices. That would have been an easy vote. We could have moved that through.

My friends could have still brought the other four matters that they cared about under a rule, brought it to the floor. They have got the votes to move it. It would have precisely the same prospects of success it is going to have in the United States Senate.

The President has already made it clear, since he issued a statement, that he is very likely to veto it if it were to make it to his desk. So why in the world we threw away an opportunity to do some good for the American people in an area where we agree, in order to advance something that we know cannot become law, is mystifying to me, to say the least.

Again, H.R. 5 is well-intentioned and designed to expand civil rights, but it also adds a term with no clear definition to our civil rights laws without regard for how it will work in practice.

H.R. 987 has four bills that are unacceptable, three bills that are eminently acceptable. I do want to close though on a positive note.

Madam Speaker, I do applaud my friends for bringing the Native American issue to fruition today. I am going to be opposing them on the rule but supporting them on that legislation. I think it was a very wise decision to put it under a rule, quite frankly, and I applaud my good friend Chairman GRIJALVA for working with my good friend Chairman MCGOVERN and making sure that that happened. This important piece of legislation, which, quite frankly, is important not just to the Tribe in question, but establishes the principle that we won't let land going into trust be taken out of trust, is very important.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the previous question, "no" on the rule, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD a list of 364 organizations endorsing the Equality Act, as well as a list of companies supporting H.R. 5 who employ over 9.8 million workers in the United States.

EQUALITY ACT

364 ORGANIZATIONS ENDORSING THE EQUALITY ACT

NATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

9 to 5, National Association of Working Women; A Better Balance; ACRIA; ADAP

Advocacy Association; Advocates for Youth; AFL-CIO; African American Ministers In Action; AIDS United; Alan and Leslie Chambers Foundation; American Association for Access, Equity and Diversity; American Association of University Women (AAUW); American Atheists; American Bar Association; American Civil Liberties Union; American Conference of Cantors.

American Counseling Association; American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees (AFSCME); American Federation of Teachers; American Humanist Association; American Medical Association; American Psychological Association; American School Counselor Association; amFAR, Foundation for AIDS Research; Anti-Defamation League; Asian Americans Advancing Justice | AAJC; Asian Pacific American Labor Alliance (APALA); Association of Flight Attendants—CWA; Athlete Ally; Auburn Seminary; Autistic Self Advocacy Network.

BALM Ministries; Bend the Arc Jewish Action; Black and Pink; Campaign for Youth Justice; Caring Across Generations; Catholics for Choice; Center for American Progress; Center for Black Equity; Center for Inclusivity; Center for Inquiry; Center for LGBTQ and Gender Studies; CenterLink: The Community of LGBT Centers; Central Conference of American Rabbis; Child Welfare League of America; Coalition of Labor Union Women.

Communications Workers of America; Community Access National Network (CANN); Consortium for Children; Council for Global Equality; DignityUSA; Disciples Justice Action Network; Disciples LGBTQ+ Alliance; Disability Rights Education & Defense Fund (DREDF); Equal Rights Advocates; Equality Federation; Estuary Space; Faith in Public Life; Family Equality Council; Feminist Majority; The Fenway Institute.

FORGE, Inc.; Forward Together; Freedom Center for Social Justice; Freedom for All Americans; Freedom to Work; Gay Men's Health Crisis (GMHC); Gender Spectrum; Generation Progress; Georgetown University Law Center—Civil Rights Clinic; Girls Inc.; GLMA: Health Professionals Advancing LGBTQ Equality; Global Justice Institute; Metropolitan Community Churches; GLSEN; Guttmacher Institute; Hadassah, The Women's Zionist Organization of America, Inc.

Harm Reduction Coalition; HealthHIV; Hindu American Foundation; Hispanic Federation; Hispanic Health Network; HIV Medicine Association; Human Rights Campaign; Human Rights Watch; Impact Fund; In Our Own Voice; National Black Women's Reproductive Justice Agenda; Indivisible; Integrity USA; Episcopal Rainbow; Interfaith Alliance; International Association of Machinists & Aerospace Workers; International Association of Providers of AIDS Care.

Japanese American Citizens League; Jewish Women International; Justice in Aging; Keshet; Labor Council for Latin American Advancement (LCLAA); Lambda Legal; Latino Commission on AIDS; LatinoJustice PRLDEF; League of United Latin American Citizens; Lesbian and Gay Veterinary Medical Association (LGVMA); LGBT Technology Partnership & Institute; Main Street Alliance; MANA, A National Latina Organization; MAZON: A Jewish Response to Hunger; Men of Reform Judaism.

Methodist Federation for Social Action; Metropolitan Community Churches; MomsRising; More Light Presbyterians; Movement Advancement Project; Muslim Advocates; Muslim Public Affairs Council; Muslims for Progressive Values; NAACP; NARAL Pro-Choice America; NASTAD (National Alliance of State & Territorial AIDS Directors); National AIDS Housing Coalition; National Alliance for Partnerships in

Equity (NAPE); National Alliance to End Sexual Violence; National Asian Pacific American Women's Forum (NAPAWF).

National Association for Female Executives; National Association of County and City Health Officials; National Association of School Psychologists; National Association of School Superintendents; National Association of Secondary School Principals; National Association of Social Workers; National Black Justice Coalition; National Center For Lesbian Rights; National Center for Transgender Equality; National Center on Adoption and Permanency; National Coalition for LGBT Health; National Coalition of Anti-Violence Programs; National Council for Occupational Safety and Health (COSH); National Council of Jewish Women; National Crittenton.

National Education Association; National Employment Law Project; National Employment Lawyers Association; National Fair Housing Alliance; National Hispanic Media Coalition; National Hispanic Medical Association; National Latina Institute for Reproductive Health; National Latinx Psychological Association; National LGBT Chamber of Commerce; National LGBTQ Task Force Action Fund; National Organization for Women; National Partnership for Women & Families; National PTA; National Queer Asian Pacific Islander Alliance (NQAPIA); National Taskforce on Tradeswomen Issues.

National Trans Bar Association; National Urban League; National Women's Health Network; National Women's Law Center; NEAT—National Equality Action Team; NETWORK Lobby for Catholic Social Justice; New Ways Ministry; NMAC; North American Council on Adoptable Children; Out & Equal Workplace Advocates; OutServe-SLDN; Oxfam America; Parity; People For the American Way; PFLAG National.

Pharmaceutical Research and Manufacturers of America; Physicians for Reproductive Health; Planned Parenthood Federation of America; Population Connection Action Fund; Positive Women's Network-USA; Pride at Work; Promundo-US; Public Justice; Rabbinical Assembly; Reconciling Ministries Network; ReconcilingWorks: Lutherans for Full Participation; Religious Coalition for Reproductive Choice; Religious Institute; RootsAction; Ryan White Medical Providers Coalition.

SafeBAE; SAGE; Secular Coalition for America; Secular Policy Institute; SER Jobs for Progress National Inc.; Service Employees International Union; Sexuality Information and Education Council of the U.S. (SIECUS); Soulforce; Southern HIV/AIDS Strategy Initiative (SASI); Stop Sexual Assault in Schools (SSAIS); SurvJustice; T'ruah: The Rabbinic Call for Human Rights; The AIDS Institute; The Episcopal Church; The Inanna Project.

The Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights; The National Coalition of Anti-Violence Programs; The National LGBTQ Workers Center; The TransLatin@ Coalition; The Trevor Project; The Tyler Clementi Foundation; The Williams Institute; Transgender Law Center; Transgender Legal Defense & Education Fund; Treatment Action Group; True Colors United; UFCW OUTreach; Ultra Violet; UMFoward; (un)common good collective; UnidosUS.

Unión = Fuerza Latinx Institute; Union for Reform Judaism; Union of Affirming Christians; Unitarian Universalist Association; Unitarian Universalist Women's Federation; United Church of Christ, Justice and Witness Ministries; United State of Women; United Synagogue of Conservative Judaism; URGE: Unite for Reproductive & Gender Equity; Voice for Adoption; Voices for Progress; Vote Common Good, Greater Things; Voto

Latino; Witness to Mass Incarceration; Women's Alliance for Theology, Ethics, and Ritual (WATER); Young Feminists & Allies: National Organization for Women's (NOW) Inaugural Virtual Chapter.

STATE AND LOCAL ORGANIZATIONS

Alaskans Together For Equality, AK.
AIDS Alabama, AL.
Equality Alabama, AL.
Arizona Coalition to End Sexual & Domestic Violence, AZ.
Equality Arizona, AZ.
9to5 California, CA.
Bienestar Human Services, CA.
California Employment Lawyers Association, CA.
California LGBTQ Health and Human Services Network, CA.
Equality California, CA.
Hollywood NOW, CA.
Latino Equality Alliance, CA.
Legal Aid At Work, CA.
LGBT Center OC, CA.
LGBT Community Center of the Desert, CA.
Missiongathering Christian Church, CA.
Religious Coalition for Reproductive Right—California, CA.
Stonewall Democratic Club, CA.
The Diversity Center of Santa Cruz County, CA.
The Los Angeles LGBT Center, CA.
The Source LGBT+ Center, CA.
9to5 Colorado, CO.
One Colorado, CO.
Out Boulder County, CO.
Rocky Mountain CARES, CO.
Triangle Community Center Inc., CT.
Asian/Pacific Islander Domestic Violence Resource Project, DC.
GLAA, DC.
The DC Center for the LGBT Community, DC.
Trans-Latinx DMV (DC, Maryland and Virginia), DC.
Whitman-Walker Health, DC.
Compass LGBTQ Community Center, FL.
Equality Florida, FL.
QLatinx, FL.
The Pride Center at Equality Park, FL.
Visibility, Inc., FL.
9to5 Georgia, GA.
Georgia Equality, GA.
Lake Oconee Community Church, GA.
The Rush Center, GA.
One Iowa, IA.
AIDS Foundation of Chicago, IL.
Arab American Family Services, IL.
Association of Latinas & Latinos Motivating Action (ALMA), IL.
Chicago Alliance Against Sexual Exploitation, Chicago Metropolitan Battered Women's Network, Life Span, & Resilience, IL.
Equality Illinois, IL.
Illinois Accountability Initiative, IL.
Pride Action Tank, IL.
Resilience, formerly Rape Victim Advocates, IL.
United Latinx Pride, IL.
Women Employed, IL.
Indiana Youth Group, IN.
End Rape on Campus, LA.
Louisiana Progress Action, LA.
Louisiana Trans Advocates, LA.
MassEquality, MA.
FreeState Justice, MD.
Gender Rights Maryland, MD.
Public Justice Center, MD.
EqualityMaine, ME.
Affirmations, MI.
Equality Michigan, MI.
Kalamazoo Gay Lesbian Resource Center, MI.
Ruth Ellis Center, Inc., MI.
Gender Justice, MN.
OutFront MN, MN.
PROMO, MO.

St. Louis Effort for AIDS, MO.
Montana Coalition Against Domestic and Sexual Violence, MT.
Charlotte Clergy Coalition for Justice, NC.
Equality North Carolina, NC.
Latinos in the Deep South, NC.
National Organization for Women Charlotte chapter, NC.
North Dakota Human Rights Coalition, ND.
OutNebraska, NE.
New Hampshire Coalition Against Domestic and Sexual Violence, NH.
Garden State Equality, NJ.
Hudson Pride Center, NJ.
Equality New Mexico, NM.
KWH Law Center for Social Justice & Change, NM.
Southwest Women's Law Center, NM.
Tewa Women United, NM.
Association of Legal Aid Attorneys (ALAA) of UAW 2325, LGBTQ+ Caucus, NY.
Brooklyn Community Pride Center, NY.
Callen-Lorde Community Health Center, NY.
Empire State Pride Agenda, NY.
Equality New York, NY.
Forefront Church NYC, NY.
Gay & Lesbian Independent Democrats (GLID), NY.
Gender Equality Law Center, NY.
LGBT Bar Association of Greater New York, NY.
LGBT Bar Association of New York, NY.
Sakhi for South Asian Women, NY.
The Volunteer Lawyers Project of Onondaga County, Inc., NY.
Theatre of the Oppressed NYC, NY.
VillageCare, NY.
Equality Ohio, OH.
Ohio Religious Coalition for Reproductive Choice, OH.
TransOhio, OH.
Freedom Oklahoma, OK.
Basic Rights Oregon, OR.
Cascade AIDS Project, OR.
Christ Church: Portland, OR.
Oregon Abuse Advocates & Survivors in Service, OR.
Mazzoni Center, PA.
Ni-ta-nee NOW (Centre County, PA), PA.
PA Religious Coalition for Reproductive Justice, PA.
The Montgomery County LGBT Business Council, PA.
PA Religious Coalition for Reproductive Justice, PA.
Washington County Gay Straight Alliance, Inc., PA.
Women's Law Project, PA.
New Voices for Reproductive Justice, PA and OH.
Women's Rights and Empowerment Network (WREN), SC.
Equality South Dakota, SD.
Tennessee Equality Project, TN.
American Association of University Women Texas (AAUW Texas), TX.
Cathedral of Hope United Church of Christ, TX.
Equality Texas, TX.
Esperanza Peace and Justice Center, TX.
Open Arms Rape Crisis Center & LGBT+ Services, TX.
Resource Center, TX.
Texas Freedom Network, TX.
The Afya Center, TX.
Transgender Education Network of Texas (TENT), TX.
Equality Utah, UT.
Diversity Richmond, VA.
Equality Virginia, VA.
Entre Hermanos, WA.
Gay City: Seattle's LGBTQ Center, WA.
Gender Justice League, WA.
Legal Voice, WA.
Oasis Youth Center, WA.
Rainbow Center, WA.

9to5 Wisconsin, WI.
 AIDS Resource Center of Wisconsin, WI.
 FAIR Wisconsin, WI.
 Wisconsin Coalition Against Sexual Assault, WI.

EQUALITY ACT

The Business Coalition for the Equality Act is a group of leading U.S. employers that support the Equality Act, which would finally guarantee explicit, permanent protections for lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender people under our existing civil rights laws.

The companies:
 Employ over 9.8 million workers in the U.S.

Have combined revenue that exceeds \$4.2 trillion.

Have operations in all 50 States:

A.T. Kearney Inc., Chicago, IL.
 Abercrombie & Fitch Co., New Albany, OH.
 Accenture, New York, NY.
 Adobe Systems Inc., San Jose, CA.
 ADP, Roseland, NJ.
 Advanced Micro Devices Inc., Sunnyvale, CA.
 Airbnb Inc., San Francisco, CA.
 Alaska Airlines, Seattle, WA.
 Alcoa Corp., Pittsburgh, PA.
 Ally Financial Inc., Detroit, MI.
 Amalgamated Bank, New York, NY.
 Amazon.com Inc., Seattle, WA.
 American Airlines, Fort Worth, TX.
 American Eagle Outfitters Inc., Pittsburgh, PA.
 American Express Global Business Travel, Jersey City, NJ.
 Apple Inc., Cupertino, CA.
 Arconic, New York, NY.
 Ascena Retail Group Inc., Mahwah, NJ.
 Aspen Skiing Company LLC, Aspen, CO.
 AT&T Inc., Dallas, TX.
 Atlassian, San Francisco, CA.
 Bain & Co. Inc./Bridgespan Group, Boston, MA.
 Bank of America Corp., Charlotte, NC.
 Bayer U.S. LLC, Whippany, NJ.
 BD, Franklin Lakes, NJ.
 Best Buy Co. Inc., Richfield, MN.
 Biogen, Cambridge, MA.
 Boehringer Ingelheim USA Corp., Ridgefield, CT.
 Booz Allen Hamilton Inc., McLean, VA.
 Boston Scientific Corp., Marlborough, MA.
 Box Inc., Redwood City, CA.
 Bristol-Myers Squibb Co., New York, NY.
 Broadridge Financial Solutions Inc., Lake Success, NY.
 Brown-Forman Corp., Louisville, KY.
 Caesars Entertainment Corp., Las Vegas, NV.
 Capital One Financial Corp., McLean, VA.
 Cardinal Health Inc., Dublin, OH.
 Cargill Inc., Wayzata, MN.
 Chevron Corp., San Ramon, CA.
 Chobani, Norwich, NY.
 Choice Hotels International Inc., Rockville, MD.
 Cisco Systems Inc., San Jose, CA.
 Citigroup Inc., New York, NY.
 Citrix Systems Inc., Fort Lauderdale, FL.
 CME Group Inc., Chicago, IL.
 CNA Financial Corporation, Chicago, IL.
 Coca-Cola Co., The, Atlanta, GA.
 Compass Bancshares Inc. (BBVA Compass), Birmingham, AL.
 Corning, Corning, NY.
 Converse Inc., Boston, MA.
 Cox Enterprises Inc., Atlanta, GA.
 CSAA Insurance Group, Walnut Creek, CA.
 Cummins Inc., Columbus, IN.
 CVS Health Corp., Woonsocket, RI.
 Danone North America, White Plains, NY.
 Darden Restaurants Inc., Orlando, FL.
 Deloitte LLP, New York, NY.
 Dell Technologies Inc., Round Rock, TX.
 Depository Trust & Clearing Corp., The, New York, NY.
 Diageo North America, Norwalk, CT.
 Dow Chemical Co., The Midland, MI.
 Dropbox Inc., San Francisco, CA.
 E.I. du Pont de Nemours and Co. (DuPont), Wilmington, DE.
 Eastern Bank Corp., Boston, MA.
 Eaton Corp., Cleveland, OH.
 eBay Inc., San Jose, CA.
 Ecolab Inc., St. Paul, MN.
 Edison International, Rosemead, CA.
 Ernst & Young LLP, New York, NY.
 Estee Lauder Companies Inc., The, New York, NY.
 Evolent Health Inc., Arlington, VA.
 Exelon Corp., Chicago, IL.
 Expedia Group, Bellevue, WA.
 Facebook Inc., Menlo Park, CA.
 First Data Corp., Atlanta, GA.
 Food Lion, Salisbury, NC.
 Gap Inc., San Francisco, CA.
 General Electric Co., Boston, MA.
 General Mills Inc., Minneapolis, MN.
 General Motors Co., Detroit, MI.
 Giant of Maryland LLC, Landover, MD.
 Gilead Sciences Inc., Foster City, CA.
 Glassdoor Inc., Mill Valley, CA.
 Google Inc., Mountain View, CA.
 Guardian Life Insurance Co. of America, The, New York, NY.
 Gusto, San Francisco, CA.
 HERE North America LLC, Chicago, IL.
 Hershey Co., The, Hershey, PA.
 Hewlett Packard Enterprise Co., Palo Alto, CA.
 Hilton Inc., McLean, VA.
 HP Inc., Palo Alto, CA.
 HSF Affiliates LLC, Irvine, CA.
 HSN Inc. St., Petersburg, FL.
 Hughes Hubbard & Reed LLP, New York, NY.
 Hyatt Hotels Corp., Chicago, IL.
 IBM Corp., Armonk, NY.
 IHS Markit Ltd., New York, NY.
 IKEA Holding US Inc., Conshohocken, PA.
 Ingersoll-Rand Company, Davidson, NC.
 Insight Enterprises Inc., Tempe, AZ.
 Intel Corp., Santa Clara, CA.
 Intercontinental Hotels Group Americas, Atlanta, GA.
 Iron Mountain Inc., Boston, MA.
 John Hancock Financial Services Inc., Boston, MA.
 Johnson & Johnson, New Brunswick, NJ.
 JPMorgan Chase & Co., New York, NY.
 Juniper Networks Inc., Sunnyvale, CA.
 Kaiser Permanente, Oakland, CA.
 Kellogg Co., Battle Creek, MI.
 Kenneth Cole Productions Inc., New York, NY.
 KPMG LLP, New York, NY.
 Lendlease Americas Inc., New York, NY.
 Levi Strauss & Co., San Francisco, CA.
 Linden Research Inc., Davis, CA.
 Lush Fresh Handmade Cosmetics, Wilmington, NC.
 Lyft Inc., San Francisco, CA.
 Macy's Inc., Cincinnati, OH.
 Marriott International Inc., Bethesda, MD.
 Massachusetts Mutual Life Insurance Co., Springfield, MA.
 Mastercard, Purchase, NY.
 Medtronic PLC, Minneapolis, MN.
 Merck, Kenilworth, NJ.
 Meredith Corp. Des Moines, IA.
 MGM Resorts International, Las Vegas, NV.
 Microsoft Corp., Redmond, WA.
 Mitchell Gold + Bob Williams, Taylorsville, NC.
 Moody's Corp., New York, NY.
 Morgan Stanley, New York, NY.
 Nationwide, Columbus, OH.
 Navient, Wilmington, DE.
 Navigant Consulting Inc., Chicago, IL.
 Netflix Inc., Los Gatos, CA.
 Nike Inc., Beaverton, OR.
 Northrop Grumman Corp., Falls Church, VA.

Nuance Communications, Burlington, MA.
 Office Depot Inc., Boca Raton, FL.
 Oracle Corp., Redwood City, CA.
 Patreon Inc., San Francisco, CA.
 Paul Hastings LLP, Los Angeles, CA.
 PepsiCo Inc., Purchase, NY.
 Pfizer Inc., New York, NY.
 Pinterest Inc., San Francisco, CA.
 PNC Financial Services Group Inc., The, Pittsburgh, PA.
 PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP, New York, NY.
 Procter & Gamble Co., Cincinnati, OH.
 Pure Storage Inc., Mountain View, CA.
 QUALCOMM Inc., San Diego, CA.
 Realogy Holdings Corp., Madison, NJ.
 Replacements Ltd., McLeansville, NC.
 Royal Bank of Canada, New York, NY.
 S&P Global Inc., New York, NY.
 Salesforce, San Francisco, CA.
 SAP America Inc., Newtown Square, PA.
 Seagate Technology plc, Cupertino, CA.
 Shire PLC, Lexington, MA.
 Shook, Hardy & Bacon LLP, Kansas City, MO.
 Shutterstock Inc., New York, NY.
 Siemens Corp., Washington, DC.
 Sodexo Inc., Gaithersburg, MD.
 Spotify USA Inc., New York, NY.
 Square Inc., San Francisco, CA.
 SurveyMonkey Inc., San Mateo, CA.
 Symantec Corp., Mountain View, CA.
 Synchrony, Stamford, CT.
 Takeda Pharmaceuticals USA Inc., Deerfield, IL.
 Target Corp., Minneapolis, MN.
 Tech Data Corp., Clearwater, FL.
 TIAA, New York, NY.
 T-Mobile USA Inc., Bellevue, WA.
 TPG Global LLC, Fort Worth, TX.
 TransUnion, Chicago, IL.
 Turner Construction Co., New York, NY.
 Twitter Inc., San Francisco, CA.
 U.S. Bancorp, Minneapolis, MN.
 Uber Technologies Inc., San Francisco, CA.
 Ultimate Software, Weston, FL.
 Under Armour Inc., Baltimore, MD.
 Unilever, Englewood Cliffs, NJ.
 United Airlines, Chicago, IL.
 United Parcel Service Inc., Atlanta, GA.
 Univision Communications Inc., New York, NY.
 Verizon Communications Inc., New York, NY.
 Visa, Foster City, CA.
 Warby Parker, New York, NY.
 WeddingWire Inc., Chevy Chase, MD.
 Wells Fargo & Co., San Francisco, CA.
 Whirlpool Corp., Benton Harbor, MI.
 Williams-Sonoma Inc., San Francisco, CA.
 Workday Inc., Pleasanton, CA.
 Wyndham Hotels & Resorts Inc., Parsippany, NJ.
 Xerox Corp., Norwalk, CT.
 Yelp Inc., San Francisco, CA.
 Yext Inc., New York, NY.
 Zillow Group, Seattle, WA.
 Zimmer Biomet Holdings Inc., Warsaw, IN.

Ms. SCANLON. Madam Speaker, today we will move forward on three pieces of legislation whose timely consideration is long overdue. We will move to protect Americans' access to health insurance; provide much-needed relief on prescription drug prices; provide Federal recognition to a Native American community; and at long last, pass the Equality Act, to remove the burden of discrimination and move us closer to a country where members of the LGBTQ community have an equal opportunity to achieve the American Dream.

The Equality Act will not be the end of our long journey towards full LGBTQ equality, but it will finally get

our laws in line with the values our country was founded upon. As was recognized in our founding documents, we must continually take steps to make our country more perfect.

Acknowledging in law the challenges facing LGBTQ people, and taking concrete action to correct them, brings us one step closer to that perfect union.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of the rule governing debate of H.R. 5, the Equality Act, and the underlying legislation.

I am proud to be an original co-sponsor of this legislation and I commend once more the tireless work of my colleague, the gentleman from Rhode Island, Mr. CICILLINE.

I was proud to stand by him at its introduction, and championed it during our hearing on the matter in this committee, the first such hearing on the matter, for which I would also like to commend the Judiciary Committee Chairman, JERRY NADLER.

Much has changed in recent years about Americans’ attitude towards members of the LGBTQ community.

While Americans can be happy that we as a society have made strides in marriage equality, there is much work to do.

Despite significant legal advances over the past several years—including marriage equality, LGBTQ Americans remain vulnerable to discrimination on a daily basis and too often have little recourse.

Fifty percent of the national LGBTQ community live in states where, though they have the right to marry, they have no explicit non-discrimination protections in other areas of daily life.

In most states, a same-sex couple can get married one day and legally denied service at a restaurant, be fired from their jobs or evicted from their apartment the next.

The Equality Act is historic legislation that says, unequivocally, that LGBTQ Americans deserve the full protections guaranteed by the landmark Civil Rights Act of 1964.

The Equality Act extends anti-discrimination protections to LGBTQ Americans with regard to employment, education, access to credit, jury service, federal funding, housing, and public accommodations.

No American should ever be treated as less than equal in the eyes of the law.

The Equality Act will guarantee that LGBTQ Americans in Texas and across the country cannot be discriminated against because of who they are or whom they love.

It is long past time for this legislation to become law and that is why I proudly joined my colleagues today to get the job done.

In some areas, federal law prohibiting sex discrimination has already been properly interpreted by federal courts and administrative agencies to include discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation or gender identity.

The Equality Act affirms these interpretations of existing law and makes the prohibition against discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation or gender identity explicit, in order to provide greater clarity to members of the public, employers, schools, businesses and others.

In areas where sex discrimination is not already prohibited, the bill amends existing law to bar discrimination on the basis of sex, as well as sexual orientation and gender identity.

The need for this legislation is all the more urgent following recent news that the Supreme Court has granted a writ of Certiorari to a trio of three cases to test the reach of the Civil Rights act to determine if they cover gay and transgendered individuals.

With the political reality on the Court as it is, this body—the House of Representatives—owes it to our constituents to ensure that critical issues related to the civil rights of our fellow citizens are handled by their elected representatives, and not left to the whims of a reconstituted Trump Court demonstrably antagonistic towards the interests of minorities.

This is why the Equality Act has the bipartisan support of Members of Congress, the strong support of the business community, and the overwhelming support of the American people—with more than 7 in 10 supporting the Equality Act.

On behalf of LGBTQ Texans and all Americans, I am proud to be one of the original co-sponsors of H.R. 5, the Equality Act.

I look forward to voting YES when it comes to the House Floor, tomorrow and working towards full enactment.

With this critical legislation, we will finally, fully end discrimination against LGBTQ Americans, and move our nation closer to fulfilling the promise of equality, opportunity and justice for every American.

In the meanwhile, I support the rule governing debate of H.R. 5 and the underlying legislation.

The text of the material previously referred to by Mr. COLE is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 377

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 4. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution, the House shall proceed to the consideration in the House of the bill (H.R. 336) 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. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment described in section 5 of this resolution shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the Majority Leader and the Minority Leader or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 5. The amendment referred to in Section 4 is an amendment to H.R. 336 to add at the end of the bill the following:

“SEC. 406. CLARIFICATION OF DEADLINE FOR REPORT ON ESTABLISHING AN ENTERPRISE FUND FOR JORDAN

“For purposes of section 205(a), the term ‘establishment of the United States Development Finance Corporation’ means the end of the transition period, as defined in section 1461 of the Better Utilization of Investments Leading to Development Act of 2018 (division F of Public Law 115–254).

“SEC. 407. FORM OF REPORT ON THE COOPERATION OF THE UNITED STATES AND ISRAEL WITH RESPECT TO COUNTERING UNMANNED AERIAL SYSTEMS

“The report required under section 123(d) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

“SEC. 408. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON WITHDRAWALS OF UNITED STATES FORCES FROM SYRIA AND AFGHANISTAN

“(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

“(1) The foreign terrorist organization al Qaeda, responsible for the attacks of September 11, 2001, maintains a presence in Afghanistan.

“(2) The Islamic State of Iraq and al Sham, better known by its acronym ISIS, flourished in the chaos unleashed by the civil war in Syria and at one point controlled extensive territory in Iraq and Syria.

“(3) Al Qaeda, ISIS, and their affiliates have murdered thousands of innocent civilians.

“(4) Al Qaeda, ISIS, and their affiliates have proven resilient and have regrouped when the United States and its partners have withdrawn from the fight against them.

“(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—Congress—

“(1) acknowledges that the United States military and our partners have made significant progress in the campaign against al Qaeda and the Islamic State of Iraq and al Sham (ISIS), and honors the contributions and sacrifice of the members of the United States Armed Forces who have served on the front lines of this fight;

“(2) recognizes the continuing threat to the homeland and our allies posed by al Qaeda and ISIS, which maintain an ability to operate in Syria and Afghanistan;

“(3) expresses concern that Iran has supported the Taliban in Afghanistan and Hizballah and the Assad regime in Syria, and has sought to frustrate diplomatic efforts to resolve conflicts in these two countries;

“(4) recognizes the positive role the United States and its partners have played in Syria and Afghanistan fighting terrorist groups, countering Iranian aggression, deterring the further use of chemical weapons, and protecting human rights;

“(5) warns that a precipitous withdrawal of United States forces from the ongoing fight against these groups, without effective, countervailing efforts to secure gains in Syria and Afghanistan, could allow terrorists to regroup, destabilize critical regions, and create vacuums that could be filled by Iran or Russia, to the detriment of United States interests and those of our allies;

“(6) recognizes that al Qaeda and ISIS pose a global threat, which merits increased international contributions to the counterterrorism, diplomatic, and stabilization efforts underway in Syria and Afghanistan;

“(7) recognizes that diplomatic efforts to secure peaceful, negotiated solutions to the conflicts in Syria and Afghanistan are necessary to long-term stability and counterterrorism efforts in the Middle East and South Asia;

“(8) acknowledges the progress made by Special Representative Khalilzad in his efforts to promote reconciliation in Afghanistan;

“(9) calls upon the Administration to conduct a thorough review of the military and diplomatic strategies in Syria and Afghanistan, including an assessment of the risk that withdrawal from those countries could strengthen the power and influence of Russia and Iran in the Middle East and South Asia and undermine diplomatic efforts toward negotiated, peaceful solutions;

“(10) requests that the Administration, as part of this review, solicit the views of Israel, our regional partners, and other key troop-contributing nations in the fight against al Qaeda and ISIS;

“(11) reiterates support for international diplomatic efforts to facilitate peaceful, negotiated resolutions to the ongoing conflicts in Syria and Afghanistan on terms that respect the rights of innocent civilians and deny safe havens to terrorists;

“(12) calls upon the Administration to pursue a strategy that sets the conditions for the long-term defeat of al Qaeda and ISIS, as well as the protection of regional partners and allies, while ensuring that Iran cannot dominate the region or threaten Israel;

“(13) encourages close collaboration between the Executive Branch and the Legislative Branch to ensure continuing strong, bipartisan support for United States military operations in Syria and Afghanistan; and

“(14) calls upon the Administration to certify that conditions have been met for the enduring defeat of al Qaeda and ISIS before initiating any significant withdrawal of United States forces from Syria or Afghanistan.

“(C) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed as a declaration of war or an authorization of the use of military force.”

SEC. 6. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 336.

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of adoption of the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 228, nays 189, answered “present” 1, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 205]
YEAS—228

Adams	Courtney	Gottheimer
Aguilar	Cox (CA)	Green (TX)
Allred	Craig	Grijalva
Axne	Crist	Haaland
Barragán	Crow	Harder (CA)
Bass	Cuellar	Hastings
Beatty	Cunningham	Hayes
Bera	Davidson (KS)	Heck
Beyer	Davis (CA)	Higgins (NY)
Bishop (GA)	Davis, Danny K.	Hill (CA)
Blumenauer	Dean	Himes
Blunt Rochester	DeFazio	Horn, Kendra S.
Bonamici	DeGette	Horsford
Boyle, Brendan	DeLauro	Houlahan
F.	DelBene	Hoyer
Brindisi	Delgado	Huffman
Brown (MD)	Demings	Jackson Lee
Brownley (CA)	DeSaulnier	Jayapal
Bustos	Deutch	Jeffries
Butterfield	Dingell	Johnson (GA)
Carbajal	Doggett	Johnson (TX)
Cárdenas	Doyle, Michael	Kaptur
Carson (IN)	F.	Kelly (IL)
Cartwright	Engel	Kennedy
Case	Escobar	Khanna
Casten (IL)	Eshoo	Kildee
Castor (FL)	Españillat	Kilmer
Castro (TX)	Evans	Kim
Chu, Judy	Finkenauer	Kind
Cicilline	Fletcher	Kirkpatrick
Cisneros	Foster	Krishnamoorthi
Clark (MA)	Frankel	Kuster (NH)
Clarke (NY)	Fudge	Lamb
Clay	Gabbard	Langevin
Cleaver	Gallego	Larsen (WA)
Clyburn	Garamendi	Larson (CT)
Cohen	Garcia (IL)	Lawrence
Connolly	Garcia (TX)	Lawson (FL)
Cooper	Golden	Lee (CA)
Correa	Gomez	Lee (NV)
Costa	Gonzalez (TX)	Levin (CA)

Levin (MI)	Panetta	Sires	Williams	Womack	Yoho
Lewis	Pappas	Slotkin	Wilson (SC)	Woodall	Young
Lieu, Ted	Pascarell	Smith (WA)	Wittman	Wright	Zeldin
Lipinski	Payne	Soto			
Loeb sack	Perlmutter	Spanberger			
Lofgren	Peters	Speier			
Lowenthal	Peterson	Stanton			
Lowe y	Phillips	Stevens			
Luján	Pingree	Suozzi			
Luria	Pocan	Takano			
Lynch	Porter	Thompson (CA)			
Malinowski	Pressley	Thompson (MS)			
Maloney,	Price (NC)	Titus			
Carolyn B.	Quigley	Tlaib			
Maloney, Sean	Raskin	Tonko			
Matsui	Rice (NY)	Torres (CA)			
McAdams	Rose (NY)	Torres Small			
McBath	Rouda	(NM)			
McCollum	Roybal-Allard	Trahan			
McEachin	Ruiz	Trone			
McGovern	Ruppersberger	Underwood			
McNerney	Rush	Van Drew			
Meeks	Sánchez	Vargas			
Meng	Sarbanes	Veasey			
Moore	Scanlon	Vela			
Morelle	Schakowsky	Velázquez			
Moulton	Schiff	Viscosky			
Mucarsel-Powell	Schneider	Wasserman			
Murphy	Schrader	Schultz			
Nadler	Schrier	Waters			
Napolitano	Scott (VA)	Watson Coleman			
Neal	Scott, David	Welch			
Neguse	Serrano	Wexton			
O'Halleran	Sewell (AL)	Wild			
Ocasio-Cortez	Shalala	Wilson (FL)			
Omar	Sherman	Yarmuth			
Pallone	Sherrill				

NAYS—189

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

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—1
Richmond
NOT VOTING—13
Abraham
Aderholt
Brooks (IN)
Cummings
Davis, Rodney
Higgins (LA)
Johnson (LA)
Keating
Norcross
Pence
Roby
Ryan
Swalwell (CA)

□ 1341

Messrs. TURNER, PALAZZO, MULLIN, and DIAZ-BALART changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. LARSON of Connecticut, SCOTT of Virginia, and Mrs. BUSTOS changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

Mr. RICHMOND changed his vote from “nay” to “present.”

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 229, nays 188, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 206]
YEAS—229

Adams	Davidson (KS)	Hoyer
Aguilar	Davis (CA)	Huffman
Allred	Davis, Danny K.	Jackson Lee
Axne	Dean	Jayapal
Barragán	DeFazio	Jeffries
Bass	DeGette	Johnson (GA)
Beatty	DeLauro	Johnson (TX)
Bera	DelBene	Kaptur
Beyer	Delgado	Keating
Bishop (GA)	Demings	Kelly (IL)
Blumenauer	DeSaulnier	Kennedy
Blunt Rochester	Deutch	Khanna
Bonamici	Dingell	Kildee
Boyle, Brendan	Doggett	Kilmer
F.	Doyle, Michael	Kim
Brindisi	F.	Kind
Brown (MD)	Engel	Kirkpatrick
Brownley (CA)	Escobar	Krishnamoorthi
Bustos	Eshoo	Kuster (NH)
Butterfield	Españillat	Lamb
Carbajal	Evans	Larsen (WA)
Cárdenas	Finkenauer	Larson (CT)
Carson (IN)	Fletcher	Lawrence
Cartwright	Foster	Lawson (FL)
Case	Frankel	Lee (CA)
Casten (IL)	Fudge	Lee (NV)
Castor (FL)	Gabbard	Levin (CA)
Castro (TX)	Gallego	Levin (MI)
Chu, Judy	Garamendi	Lewis
Cicilline	Garcia (IL)	Lieu, Ted
Cisneros	Garcia (TX)	Lipinski
Clark (MA)	Golden	Loeb sack
Clarke (NY)	Gomez	Lofgren
Clay	Gonzalez (TX)	Lowenthal
Cleaver	Gottheimer	Lowe y
Clyburn	Green (TX)	Luján
Cohen	Grijalva	Luria
Connolly	Haaland	Lynch
Cooper	Harder (CA)	Malinowski
Correa	Hastings	Maloney
Costa	Hayes	Carolyn B.
Courtney	Heck	Maloney, Sean
Cox (CA)	Higgins (NY)	Matsui
Craig	Hill (CA)	McBath
Crist	Himes	McCollum
Crow	Horn, Kendra S.	McEachin
Cuellar	Horsford	McGovern
Cunningham	Houlahan	McNerney

Meeks	Raskin	Stanton	Johnson (LA)	Ryan	Walker
Meng	Rice (NY)	Stevens	Pence	Swalwell (CA)	Weber (TX)
Moore	Richmond	Suozi	Roby	Thompson (PA)	
Morelle	Rose (NY)	Takano			
Moulton	Rouda	Thompson (CA)			
Mucarsel-Powell	Roybal-Allard	Thompson (MS)			
Murphy	Ruiz	Ruiz			
Nadler	Ruppersberger	Tlaib			
Napolitano	Rush	Tonko			
Neal	Sánchez	Torres (CA)			
Neguse	Sarbanes	Torres Small			
Norcross	Sarbanes	(NM)			
O'Halleran	Schakowsky	Trahan			
Ocasio-Cortez	Schiff	Trone			
Omar	Schneider	Underwood			
Pallone	Schrader	Van Drew			
Panetta	Schrier	Vargas			
Pappas	Scott (VA)	Veasey			
Pascarella	Scott, David	Vela			
Payne	Serrano	Velázquez			
Perlmutter	Sewell (AL)	Visclosky			
Peters	Shalala	Wasserman			
Peterson	Sherman	Schultz			
Phillips	Sherrill	Waters			
Pingree	Sires	Watson Coleman			
Pocan	Slotkin	Welch			
Porter	Smith (WA)	Wexton			
Pressley	Soto	Wild			
Price (NC)	Spanberger	Wilson (FL)			
Quigley	Speier	Yarmuth			

NAYS—188

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

NOT VOTING—14

Abraham	Brooks (IN)	Davis, Rodney
Aderholt	Cummings	Higgins (LA)

Johnson (LA)	Ryan	Walker
Pence	Swalwell (CA)	Weber (TX)
Roby	Thompson (PA)	

□ 1350

So the resolution was agreed to.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPORT ON H.R. 2740, DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2020

Ms. DeLAURO, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 116-62) on the bill (H.R. 2740) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Union Calendar and ordered to be printed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1, rule XXI, all points of order are reserved on the bill.

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

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 962, the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under guidelines consistently issued by successive Speakers, as recorded in section 956 of the House Rules and Manual, the Chair is constrained not to entertain the request unless it has been cleared by the bipartisan floor and committee leaderships.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, lives are literally hanging in the balance. I urge the Speaker to immediately schedule this important bill.

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

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.

REAFFIRMING AUTHORITY OF SECRETARY OF INTERIOR TO TAKE LAND INTO TRUST FOR INDIAN TRIBES

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the

bill (H.R. 375) to amend the Act of June 18, 1934, to reaffirm the authority of the Secretary of the Interior to take land into trust for Indian Tribes, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 375

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

SECTION 1. AUTHORITY REAFFIRMED.

(a) REAFFIRMATION.—Section 19 of the Act of June 18, 1934 (commonly known as the “Indian Reorganization Act”; 25 U.S.C. 5129), is amended—

(1) in the first sentence—
(A) by striking “The term” and inserting “Effective beginning on June 18, 1934, the term”; and

(B) by striking “any recognized Indian tribe now under Federal jurisdiction” and inserting “any federally recognized Indian Tribe”; and

(2) by striking the third sentence and inserting the following: “In said sections, the term ‘Indian tribe’ means any Indian or Alaska Native tribe, band, nation, pueblo, village, or community that the Secretary of the Interior acknowledges to exist as an Indian tribe.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect as if included in the Act of June 18, 1934 (commonly known as the “Indian Reorganization Act”; 25 U.S.C. 5129), on the date of the enactment of that Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) and the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GRIJALVA. 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 under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, 10 years ago, the Supreme Court handed down what is known as the Carcieri decision. In that decision, the Court determined that trust land acquisition under the Indian Reorganization Act of 1934 only applies to Tribes that were under Federal jurisdiction in 1934.

Mr. Speaker, up until 2009, the Department of the Interior, under both Republican and Democratic administrations, had consistently construed that the IRA authorizes the placement of land into trust for any Tribe so long as the Tribe is federally recognized at the time of the trust application.

The decision overturned 75 years of agency practice, both Democratic and Republican administrations, and created a two-tiered system for trust land acquisition. This also opened up the Tribes to frivolous lawsuits on land

that they had held in trust for years, sometimes decades.

While this has been great for lawyers and their firms, it is detrimental to the health of a Tribe. The money to defend these lawsuits could, instead, be used to provide and improve the lives of their members.

We have had to pass standalone bills for individual Tribes on a piecemeal basis to protect their lands, and we should, since these Tribal lands are under direct assault right now. We must also address this going forward so that other Tribes do not find themselves in the same dire straits.

Passage of H.R. 375 will restore clarity and stability for all federally recognized Tribes by ensuring they are all treated equally, regardless of date of recognition.

Let's not forget history and the decimation of Tribes and their homeland by the hand of the Federal Government. It has taken almost a century for us to even attempt to undo the damage we inflicted upon the indigenous peoples of this Nation.

This work is not complete. We are still federally acknowledging Tribes to this day. We are still striving to return merely a portion of the land back to Tribes. To say that Tribes that were recognized after 1934 are somehow inferior to Tribes that were recognized by 1934 is dangerously ignorant of history.

H.R. 375, introduced by Representative COLE of Oklahoma, is short, simple, and to the point. It will amend the IRA to ensure that all federally recognized Tribes are treated equally, regardless of their date of recognition.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE), the sponsor of this bill.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the distinguished ranking member, for yielding time.

I want to thank both my friends, the chairman and the ranking member, for their help in bringing this legislation to the floor. It could not have happened without both of their assistance.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 375, legislation that would amend the Indian Reorganization Act of 1934 and reaffirm the authority of the Secretary of the Interior to take land into trust for Indian Tribes.

Between the passage of the Dawes Act in 1887 and the passage of the Indian Reorganization Act in 1934, the Indian landmass in the United States shrank by 86 million acres.

□ 1400

Since the enactment of the Indian Reorganization Act, the Department of the Interior has taken back approximately 9 million acres of land into trust status. Tribes have used their trust lands to build community facilities such as schools, health centers, and housing that serve their Tribal members. This land is also used for

Tribal enterprises and promotes economic development in communities that are often underserved and poverty-stricken.

In 2009, the Supreme Court of the United States overturned long-existing precedent in its decision on the *Carcieri v. Salazar* case. The Supreme Court ruled specifically that the Secretary's authority to hold land in trust under the Indian Reorganization Act was limited only to recognized Tribes "now under Federal jurisdiction," with the word "now" meaning June 18, 1934, the date of the enactment of the Indian Reorganization Act.

Previously, lower courts have viewed the word "now" as the instant when the Secretary invoked trust acquisition authority. However, the Supreme Court reversed the lower court ruling on the interpretation that the term "now under Federal jurisdiction" in section 19 of the Indian Reorganization Act was to be interpreted. It found that the phrase refers only to those Tribes that were under Federal jurisdiction of the United States when the Indian Reorganization Act was enacted in 1934.

As a result of the *Carcieri* decision, the Secretary of the Interior may no longer use the Indian Reorganization Act to acquire trust land for any post-1934 Tribe without specific authorization from Congress. Because the Secretary has acquired lands in trust for dozens of Tribes recognized after 1934, the *Carcieri* ruling calls into question the validity of the trust status of such lands and jeopardizes their immunity from State and local taxation and regulatory jurisdiction.

Many Tribes have been forced into court to defend the status of their trust land, costing them millions of dollars and compromising their investments and jurisdiction.

H.R. 375 would amend the Indian Reorganization Act and clarify the language the Supreme Court ruled against by striking "the term," which I have previously referenced, and inserting the words "effective beginning on June 18, 1934, the term." It would also amend the statute language from "any recognized Indian Tribe now under Federal jurisdiction" to "any federally recognized Indian Tribe."

The modest changes clarify that the Secretary does have authority to take land into trust for any Tribe that the Federal Government has recognized.

As a member of the Chickasaw Nation and co-chair of the Native American Caucus, I commend the Natural Resources Committee for favorably marking up this legislation and this body for moving forward with the passage of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on H.R. 375.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire, first of all, if the gentleman from Arizona has any speakers. I do have several.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, we have one speaker.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this opportunity to be here. I also appreciate Mr. COLE for his work on this particular issue and the time he has put in over the last decade in trying to find a *Carcieri* fix.

That 2009 Supreme Court made the decision, but it actually opened up more questions than it provided solutions and answers in the process.

In the years since that decision, the Democrats, when they controlled the House, the Senate, and the White House, did not find a solution. Republicans, when we were in the same situation, didn't find a solution either, probably because there is even a bigger question than what was decided in this particular case. That bigger question is one that is extremely complex and grave, and it indicates the complexity of this particular issue.

Lands taken into trust by Tribes definitely have a benefit and an advantage to the Tribe, but it also has an impact on the counties and local governments where this trust issue is taking place.

Let's be clear that, prior to *Carcieri*, the fee-to-trust process was broken and fraught with conflicts. In fact, many will still argue that even today, the current Bureau of Indian Affairs process provides very limited incentives for any community or stakeholder to be partners in this process. As a result, we are often left with conflict and political turmoil and accusations and re-creations on the local level.

Some areas of local government, especially the California State Association of Counties, have been repeatedly asking us to try to come up with a reform to the overall process because the process impacts taxes and zoning in communities where these trust lands are acquired.

Local governments, States, and stakeholders who have some kind of role to play in this area, should they have a seat at the table? Should they be consulted? Should they have some kind of input? Yes, obviously.

Should they have a veto in the process? I don't think so.

Where we draw that line to ensure that there is consultation, so you ensure that people have a voice in the process, that is the underlying question. That is the complex question.

During markup of this bill, Mr. HUFFMAN from California and Mr. GOSAR from Arizona entered into a colloquy. They actually had a discussion, one of the few times a committee did what a committee is supposed to do, talking about the need to come up with some kind of variance to this underlying issue that is not necessarily the crux of the 2009 decision. But how do we come up with this process?

If this bill is going to go all the way to the Senate and ultimately become law, we need some help in finding a solution to the bigger issue of how much

consultation should take place and who should have their voices heard in the overall process, a process that does not happen right now.

There is a pathway to solve these problems. We can address Carcieri or we can move forward to prevent future litigation that has plagued the land-in-trust process. The Tribes and every stakeholder in this process deserve as much.

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GALLEGRO), my colleague and chair of the Subcommittee for Indigenous Peoples of the United States.

Mr. GALLEGRO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 375 introduced by my friend Representative COLE from Oklahoma.

H.R. 375 is a simple, straightforward fix to a problem that has caused chaos and uncertainty in Indian Country for a decade.

Ten years ago, the Supreme Court handed down what is now known as the Carcieri decision. In that decision, the Court determined that eligibility for trust land acquisition under the Indian Reorganization Act of 1934 only applies to Tribes that were federally recognized as of 1934.

The acquisition of trust land for the benefit of Indian Tribes is absolutely essential to Tribal self-determination, economic development, and protection of Tribal homelands. The Carcieri decision created an unfair, impractical, two-tiered system for Tribes that wanted to engage in this essential function of Tribal sovereignty.

H.R. 375 simply amends the IRA to ensure that all federally recognized Tribes are treated equally, regardless of the date of recognition.

The Carcieri decision and its consequences harken back to the Federal Government's shameful history of oppression in Native communities. The decimation of Tribes and their homeland by the Federal Government is well documented. For centuries, we ignored their treaties and systematically stripped them of their land. It has taken almost a century for us to even begin to undo the damage we have inflicted on indigenous peoples.

Mr. Speaker, that work is nowhere near done. To this day, we are still federally recognizing tribes that the government tried to destroy. We are still striving to return merely a small portion of ancestral land back to Tribes so they can have homelands to call their own.

In order to continue to undo the harm we have done, we must end this system of haves and have-nots for trust land acquisition. We must level the playing field and alleviate the catastrophic consequences this decision has had in Indian Country.

We must pass H.R. 375, the clean Carcieri fix. If we do not, this administration will continue to strip trust

land from Tribes like the Mashpee Wampanoag Tribe, which is the subject of another bill on the floor today. Tribes will continue to suffer needlessly, once again at the hands of the Federal Government.

Indian Country has been clamoring for this clean, simple fix for a decade, and we cannot make them wait any longer.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR).

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, I thank Ranking Member BISHOP for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to the current form of H.R. 375.

In 1988, Congress enacted the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act, or IGRA, with the intent to restrict casinos to Tribes' original reservations. H.R. 375 reverses a major 2009 Supreme Court decision, and the bill would lead to future abuses of IGRA.

The bill gives unelected bureaucrats a blank check to take any land in trust without respect for impacted communities, including other Tribes. More importantly, H.R. 375 allows reservation shopping and for lands to be taken into trust for off-reservation casinos in places where States, local governments, and other Tribes oppose such action.

H.R. 375 will result in a flood of new off-reservation casinos that cause harm to States and local communities. Many of these casino locations that are nowhere near Tribes' historic reservations will be handpicked by gambling investors and Washington bureaucrats.

If H.R. 375 passes, all Tribes would have to do in order to get land taken into trust and open off-reservation casinos is to show that they are federally recognized by the Department of the Interior.

In the Natural Resources Committee markup of this bill, the gentleman from the Second District of California, Mr. HUFFMAN, and I engaged in a productive debate on this bill. We both agreed to try to find common ground on which to respond to my concerns about off-reservation casino abuse and the valid concerns brought to the committee by State and county governments. Bringing H.R. 375 up via suspension this week and not allowing any amendments prohibits us from making good on that agreement.

H.R. 375 should have been amended prior to being brought to the floor to address these bipartisan concerns.

Taking land into trust divests the affected State and local governments of jurisdiction. When land is taken into trust, for example, the Tribe will not pay any applicable taxes on the land, but the county or city in which the land is located might nonetheless be required to supply the Tribe with county and city services, and non-Tribal residents will pay for it. At least consultation should be a minimum.

The bill as currently drafted therefore increases the power of an unelected bureaucracy to divest non-consenting State and local governments of jurisdiction over their land. This, by itself, is a great cause of concern.

Let's be clear about H.R. 375 and how a bill of this scope and magnitude deserves more careful consideration than is being given here today.

Currently, there are almost 600 recognized Tribes in the United States, about 240 of which have gaming operations. H.R. 375 removes the dam that provided some restraint on the number of Tribal casinos and would be a dramatic departure from existing Federal law that has been in place for almost a century.

Before voting on this bill, I hope Members all understand that H.R. 375 will open the floodgates to off-reservation Tribal casinos all over the United States. If H.R. 375 passes, all federally recognized Tribes will be eligible to receive land in trust and potentially open off-reservation casinos. This includes any Tribe recognized by the Department of the Interior that was ineligible to receive land in trust and/or was denied land in trust prior to H.R. 375.

According to the National Indian Gaming Commission fact sheet, as of 2016, approximately 329, or 58 percent, of the recognized Tribes had no gaming operations.

President Trump opposes H.R. 312 and with good reason. That bill gives land in trust and a casino to a single Tribe that is otherwise ineligible to receive those benefits, as well as reverses Federal court and Interior decisions. But H.R. 375 does all that and more.

Instead of giving land in trust to only one Tribe, it lets an unelected bureaucracy give whatever land it wants to all recognized Tribes. Thus, the same concerns that exist with respect to H.R. 312, which we will be talking later about, exist at an even greater level with respect to H.R. 375.

The purpose of considering bills under suspension is to dispose of non-controversial measures expeditiously, but H.R. 375 has controversy written all over it.

H.R. 375 has ridden alongside H.R. 312 largely unnoticed, and no one has pointed out two crucial facts: one, that it exists as a contingency plan in case its sister bill, H.R. 312, fails; and two, that its effect would be national rather than local.

H.R. 375 and H.R. 312 are two heads of the same snake, one large, one small. Senator WARREN, regardless, will get her casino if either bill passes.

□ 1415

Further, passage of H.R. 375 will allow for new off-reservation casinos to be opened in your States and communities and for land to be ripped away from local jurisdictions without recourse.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Ranking Member BISHOP for the opportunity to

speak on this important issue. I urge all Members to vote “no” on H.R. 375. Send it back to get consultation, at least, put in.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY).

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for his assistance, for his leadership on this important issue, and for the time.

Mr. Speaker, this debate has been 10 years in the making for Indian Country. A decade ago, a Supreme Court ruling created unnecessary confusion in the interpretation and application of the Indian Reorganization Act of 1934.

This bill, H.R. 375, would clarify the ensuing confusion. Among other things, it would ensure the IRA applies to all Native American Tribes recognized by the Federal Government, regardless of their date of recognition.

For the last 10 years, the unnecessary confusion has caused uncertainty for Tribes seeking recognition and recognized lands, has halted economic development projects on Tribal lands, and has resulted in costly and protracted litigation.

Members and staff on both sides of the aisle deserve significant recognition for getting us to where we are today. But, in particular, Chairman GRIJALVA, Representative MCCOLLUM, and Representative COLE have been extraordinary. I thank them for their incredible leadership on Tribal issues, and their perseverance in pursuing a clean Carcieri fix.

I am honored to have the opportunity to speak on this. I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to engage in a colloquy with the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA).

If we, indeed, are going to be serious about a legislative solution to Carcieri, then we need to work out some kind of compromise that could pass both Houses of Congress and be signed by the President.

I have been encouraged by the debate not only on the floor here, but also in our committee, regarding the need to consult with affected parties before land is taken into trust.

Mr. Speaker, I ask Mr. GRIJALVA whether he will commit to work with us on this type of legislation to solve this underlying problem as this bill moves forward?

Mr. GRIJALVA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, when a Tribe applies to have land taken into trust through the Department of the Interior, local concerns are already strongly considered, even more so when the land is located away from existing reservation lands.

However, I do recognize there is a desire from some Members on both sides

of the aisle to work on stand-alone legislation that would codify some of the process.

I agree with the gentleman's statement about veto abilities. Any provision which would give counties or local governments veto power over trust land decisions is, frankly, a nonstarter. Local input is vital to these decisions and should be taken into account. However, Tribal consultation is solely the responsibility of the Federal Government, as is any final decision on transferring land into trust.

And I think because of the national implications of the question of trust land and the role that communities, i.e., counties and municipalities, would play, I think there is a need to somehow accommodate a level of Tribal consultation, because they are going to be the most affected party by any decision that is made.

With that said, I do commit, Mr. Speaker, to looking at any proposal on the issue and to work moving forward if it is to the betterment of all the stakeholders and I would assist the legislation in its final passage.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I appreciate the gentleman's commitment and I appreciate the comments that he will be there.

There is this bigger question that needs to be answered. Where we draw the line is a matter that still needs some kind of discussion, I recognize that.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a brilliant letter from me to Chairman GRIJALVA on this particular issue.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES,
Washington, DC, May 6, 2019.

Hon. RAÚL GRIJALVA,
Chairman, Committee on Natural Resources,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: It is frustrating that the Democrat Leadership has scheduled H.R. 375, legislation to reverse *Carcieri v. Salazar*, under suspension one week after the committee markup of the bill. It disregards what I believe was a bipartisan agreement to work on an amendment to the bill to improve consultation between the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) and states and counties to mitigate the impacts of taking land in trust in their jurisdictions. The *Carcieri* decision created vast uncertainty over the fee-to-trust process for tribes and impacted stakeholders. I voted for H.R. 375 in committee as a display of my support for resolving *Carcieri*. My support for the bill's advancement is contingent upon the inclusion of reasonable safeguards on BIA's powers.

During markup on H.R. 375, Messrs. Huffman and Gosar discussed a mutual, bipartisan desire to respond to long-standing state and local concerns. The California State Association of Counties (CSAC), in a letter submitted for the markup record, reiterated the counties' "longstanding, valid concerns" they have with a fee-to-trust process conducted under a "fundamentally flawed regulatory framework" and they also submitted proposals to resolve these problems. I can attest that many counties in Utah share these same concerns.

Mr. Huffman explained that he found himself in partial agreement with CSAC's position, and that there should be "meaningful

good faith consultation" with local governments. While saying the Gosar amendment went too far, Mr. Huffman expressed a willingness to "continue collaborating on this issue" to "come up with something that would at least codify that good faith consultation part of a better process."

Bringing the bill to the Floor this Wednesday is not a sign that such collaboration is being taken seriously by Democrat Leadership nor is it a pragmatic approach to resolving *Carcieri* for the benefit of Indian Country.

The fee-to-trust system is broken because of a provision of a 1934 law that has not been updated since that law's enactment. Realistically, H.R. 375 offers an opportunity through which to fix it. Moving forward without reasonable consultation safeguards on BIA's authority will undermine successful resolution of *Carcieri*.

It was our hope that after debate on the bill during markup you'd allow Messrs. Huffman and Gosar, and other interested Members (on and off the Committee), an opportunity to explore solutions with H.R. 375's sponsor, Mr. Tom Cole. We need to work on a compromise bill that solves the underlying issues and can become law.

Sincerely,

ROB BISHOP,
Ranking Member.

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, for 10 years, the Carcieri decision has caused anxiety and confusion in Indian Country, creating dangerous legal ambiguities related to Indian trust lands.

Today, we can finally end all that. We can remove the ambiguity and uncertainty, and finally offer Tribal nations peace of mind that their lands are protected.

Mr. Speaker, I urge swift passage of H.R. 375, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RUIZ). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 375.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

MASHPEE WAMPANOAG TRIBE RESERVATION REAFFIRMATION ACT

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 377, I call up the bill (H.R. 312) to reaffirm the Mashpee Wampanoag Tribe reservation, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 377, the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Natural Resources, printed in the bill, is adopted, and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 312

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 “Mashpee Wampanoag Tribe Reservation Reaffirmation Act”.

SEC. 2. REAFFIRMATION OF INDIAN TRUST LAND.

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—*The taking of land into trust by the United States for the benefit of the Mashpee Wampanoag Tribe of Massachusetts as described in the final Notice of Reservation Proclamation (81 Fed. Reg. 948; January 8, 2016) is reaffirmed as trust land and the actions of the Secretary of the Interior in taking that land into trust are ratified and confirmed.*

(b) *APPLICATION.*—*Notwithstanding any other provision of law, an action (including an action pending in a Federal court as of the date of enactment of this Act) relating to the land described in subsection (a) shall not be filed or maintained in a Federal court and shall be promptly dismissed.*

(c) *APPLICABILITY OF LAWS.*—*All laws (including regulations) of the United States of general applicability to Indians or nations, Indian Tribes, or bands of Indians (including the Act of June 18, 1934 (25 U.S.C. 5101 et seq.)), shall be applicable to the Tribe and Tribal members, except that to the extent such laws and regulations are inconsistent with the terms of the Intergovernmental Agreement, dated April 22, 2008, by and between the Mashpee Wampanoag Tribe and the Town of Mashpee, Massachusetts, the terms of that Intergovernmental Agreement shall control.*

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill, as amended, shall be debatable for 1 hour, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources.

The gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to insert extraneous material on H.R. 312.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 312, the Mashpee Wampanoag Tribe Reservation Reaffirmation Act, will reaffirm the trust status of Mashpee’s Tribal land and protect the Tribe from further attacks on its land and its sovereignty.

The Mashpee relationship with the Federal Government is one of the oldest in the United States. In fact, their ancestors are the ones who welcomed the pilgrims who landed at Plymouth Rock, as well as the people who aided those pilgrims through hard times in 1621, in what we now refer to as the “First Thanksgiving.”

Like many Tribes, the Mashpee were intentionally and systematically rendered landless, through no fault of

their own. They fought long and hard over the years to reestablish both their Tribe and their land base.

The Tribe first petitioned the Federal Government for recognition in 1978. Finally, after 30 years, the Bush administration extended formal recognition to the Tribe in 2007. However, they still remained landless.

This was remedied in 2015, when the Department of the Interior took approximately 320 acres into trust to serve as the Tribe’s reservation lands. The two parcels that compose the 320 acres are both within the Tribe’s historic and ancestral homelands.

The Tribe constructed a government center on the land, which includes their schools, courtrooms and multipurpose room, as well as a medical clinic facility. And they broke ground on a gaming facility that would eventually bring in much-needed revenue for Tribal operations and programs.

However, in 2016, a group of Taunton residents, backed by an out-of-state commercial gaming company, filed a Carciari suit in federal court to challenge the Department of the Interior’s action.

Initially, the executive branch defended the decision to create the Mashpee reservation. However, in May 2017, the Department of Justice, under the Trump administration, inexplicably withdrew from the litigation and is no longer defending the status of the Tribe’s land.

Then, in September 2018, the Department of the Interior issued its first Carciari decision in which it refused to reaffirm its own authority to confirm the status of the Tribe’s lands into trust. The effect of this decision cannot be overstated. For the first time in this century, a Tribe was stripped of its sovereign rights to its land. It would mark the first time since the dark days of the termination era that the United States acted to disestablish an Indian reservation and render a Tribe landless.

These attacks on the reservation and on the Tribe’s very status have been devastating. The legal uncertainty that has been imposed by these events is forcing the Tribe to borrow thousands of dollars every day just to keep its government running, resulting in devastating cuts to essential services, and massive layoffs of Tribal members.

This is completely unacceptable. We cannot idly stand by as Tribal people are once again harmed by yet another action by the Federal Government. Let’s be honest, the Federal Government has done a terrible job of living up to its moral and legal obligations to Indian Country.

Housing, education, healthcare, and basic needs often go unmet in Tribal lands. These are not extras or handouts to Tribal people. It is part of a trust responsibility, enshrined in numerous treaties, court rulings, and laws.

But the needs still need to be met, despite the Federal Government’s failings. So how do Tribes attempt to

make up for that shortfall? By utilizing their land for economic development, including gaming.

Economic development on Tribal lands is vital to the prosperity of a Tribe and the ultimate goal of self-determination and self-reliance. We have seen it numerous times across the Nation: Tribes using those dollars to fund their programs, construct housing and health clinics, and take care of the needs of their people.

The Mashpee Tribe should not be hindered from economic development on their land solely because the State of Rhode Island wants to protect its own State-run gaming interest.

H.R. 312 is widely supported in Indian Country, with letters of support from over 50 individual Tribes and pan-Tribal organizations.

Additionally, the bill has strong support, including from the cities of Taunton and Mashpee, the Chambers of Commerce of both cities, the State of Massachusetts, numerous Members of the Massachusetts State House and State Senate, the Mayflower Society, and many local businesses and business leaders.

Passage of H.R. 312 will protect the Mashpee Tribe’s reservation lands and make clear that the Tribe is entitled to be treated the same way as other federally recognized Tribes.

Mr. Speaker, I urge its adoption, and I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1430

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume in strong opposition to H.R. 312.

H.R. 312 is contrary to the view of the Department of the Interior. It contradicts a Supreme Court decision and aims to reverse Federal court decisions on this matter in order to build a massive 400,000-square-foot, off-reservation gaming complex for the benefit of Genting, a foreign Malaysian gaming company.

H.R. 312 creates two reservations for the Mashpee Tribe of Massachusetts:

One reservation will be the town of Mashpee, the Tribe’s historic reservation lands. No casino will be allowed within the geographical boundaries of the town of Mashpee.

The other reservation is, oddly, 50 miles away from Mashpee, in the city of Taunton. This site is not part of the Tribe’s historic reservation and was selected by the Tribe and Genting for a billion-dollar casino project because of its proximity to the Providence, Rhode Island, casino market, 20 miles distant.

There is no reason for the second reservation, other than to build an off-reservation casino 50 miles away from the Mashpee Tribe, where they currently reside. In fact, the new off-reservation casino will be only 20 miles from the New England Patriots’ football stadium and, again, 50 miles from the Mashpees’ historic reservation.

In 1988, Congress enacted the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act, with the intent to restrict casinos to Tribes’ original reservations. By placing land in

trust for the Mashpee Tribe for gaming in Taunton, H.R. 312 creates an off-reservation casino, which is inconsistent with congressional intent. This is often called reservation shopping, and it is an abuse of the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act.

The Tribe's lawyers knew that reservation shopping was a political headache, so they went to the bureaucrats within the BIA to obtain the two reservations through administrative action. RedState recently reported:

No one is more desperate for H.R. 312 to succeed than Genting Malaysia. If the casino doesn't come through, the Tribe doesn't have to pay Genting back the over half a billion dollars it borrowed.

H.R. 312 is a financial bailout for Genting. The Tribe is swamped with a \$500 million-plus debt to Genting, and there is no way the Tribe can ever pay this back and still make enough money to sustain itself. Genting, therefore, will be the real owner of the project, not the Tribe.

This kind of arrangement where the creditor practically controls the financial future of a debtor Tribe is contrary to the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act, which requires every Tribal casino to be 100 percent tribally owned.

At the committee hearing on this bill, counsel for the Governor of Rhode Island testified that H.R. 312 will cause the State significant harm with regards to revenues for education, infrastructure, and social programs and is contrary to the limitations contained in the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act.

Moreover, the American Principles Project also reported on the ties between convicted lobbyist Jack Abramoff and the Mashpee Wampanoag Tribe, stating:

The expansive Abramoff investigation uncovered major corruption within the Mashpee Wampanoag Tribe. Its chief, Glenn Marshall, pled guilty in 2009 to multiple Federal charges, including embezzling Tribal funds and campaign finance violations committed while working with Abramoff to secure the Federal recognition of the Tribe in 2007.

For my Republican colleagues: The bill was opposed by 10 of the 13 voting Republicans during the committee markup, including the ranking member, ROB BISHOP; President Trump tweeted that he opposed the bill and urged Republicans to do the same; House Minority Whip STEVE SCALISE also sent an email recommending Members vote "no" on H.R. 312. Do you really want to vote for ELIZABETH WARREN's top Tribal priority?

For my Democratic colleagues: Representatives CICILLINE and LANGEVIN strongly oppose this bill, and it is opposed by the Democratic Governor of Rhode Island. The bill is also "strenuously opposed" by other federally recognized Tribes in Massachusetts.

For Members on both sides of the aisle: Do you really want your name tied to a Tribe that only received Federal recognition in 2007 as a result of shady lobbying by Jack Abramoff? Do you really want to vote for a \$500 million bailout for a former gaming corporation?

In short, H.R. 312 authorizes an off-reservation casino, bails out a foreign corporation from major financial problems of its own making, reverses the judgment of a Federal court, and contradicts the Supreme Court ruling.

Wow, all in one breath.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members on both sides of the aisle to vote against H.R. 312, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KEATING), the sponsor of the legislation.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding, and I thank the chairman for all his hard work on this bill and so many others that are related to this.

I also want to thank the Natural Resources subcommittee chair and ranking member, Mr. GALLEGO and Mr. COOK.

I want to thank my colleague from Massachusetts who has worked so hard and is a cosponsor, Mr. KENNEDY.

I also want to give particular thanks to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE) for his support and also voice my strong support for H.R. 375, the bill that was just debated that is well thought out, well worked through—over a decade—and well worth the support of everyone here.

Mr. Speaker, the Mashpee Wampanoag Tribe has resided in southern New England for more than 12,000 years. To not have their land federally recognized is simply a disgrace.

We have seen them in our history books, in historical paintings, in iconic murals. They are the Tribes that welcomed the Pilgrims for the first Thanksgiving. This President even put them in his own Thanksgiving proclamation just last year. He recognized them.

Tragically, like so many Native Americans, the Mashpee Wampanoag Tribe has lived through centuries of injustice, the latest of which this House is debating today.

For years, I have worked personally with the Tribe as they have used hard-earned Federal recognition to provide adequate housing, jobs, job training, and essential services, including native language learning, early childhood education.

And this is important. We all know, in my region, the plague of the opioid epidemic, through Cape Cod, in that region. The incidence of overdose for the Wampanoag Tribe is 400 times. I will repeat that, 400 times more, the number of overdoses for that Tribe. I have worked with them and will continue to work with them, if they are in existence, to try and help them deal with this scourge.

The Mashpee Wampanoag Tribe is also a Tribe that, as you look at the landscape for Tribes around the country, is suffering so many things that other Tribes are—the uncertainty of their status.

And this is the Tribe, I think, that best shows the inequities that are involved in these types of recognition.

I will just say, I introduced this bill last Congress when we first heard rumors that the Department of the Interior was going to, for the first time, reverse the position of the previous administration and refuse to defend the Mashpee Wampanoag's right to their historic land. They are the only Tribe that has received recognition and then had it taken away from them.

Now the Tribe's reservation is hanging by a thread, and they have been left to defend their land on their own. This is an existential threat.

Without support from Congress, it will be nearly impossible for the Mashpee to engage in any kind of true self-government because they won't own their own land: no economic development, no Tribal headquarters, no elder housing, no pre-K programs. It means being treated as a second-class Tribe with no future.

Bipartisan legislation to help a Tribe like the Mashpee would normally pass the House without issue. Just 2 weeks ago, we passed a parallel Republican-led bill for a Tribe in California without a single Member objecting—not a peep from the other side. President Obama signed a bill like this into law in 2014, and, importantly, President Trump did the same just last year.

Sadly, although the substance of H.R. 312 is noncontroversial, the tactics employed by the bill's few opponents are not. Throughout this process, we have seen gross mischaracterization and outright lying for personal and financial gain.

My Republican colleague, ranking member in the Rules Committee, a member of the Chickasaw Nation, a Republican from Oklahoma and an expert on these issues, said last night at the Rules meeting, never has he seen such misinformation about a simple bill, to the point of being scurrilous.

This is not about gaming. It is not about picking winners and losers. It is simply about a Tribe's rightful place in its native land. That is all.

Mr. Speaker, I believe in the best in this institution. I believe that many of us in Congress are here to lead. We are here to debate issues on their merits; we are here to find common ground when we might otherwise disagree; and we are here to set an example to show the American people what is right. Yet what we have seen happen to the Mashpee bill in the past week reflects the worst. No low seems too low.

Where is the bottom?

We have seen the President, through his tweets, trying to sink an entire Native American Tribe in the name of special interests, dirty lobbying, and outright bigotry.

The cast of characters behind the scenes spewing information is revealing: a rightwing lobbyist, Trump loyalist; a Trump campaign operative who worked for convicted felon and Trump campaign manager Paul Manafort; individuals with financial interests that

are counter to the Tribe, including two former Trump Plaza Casino officials and a major financier with both casino and National Enquirer interests.

Cultural warfare to benefit bank accounts, corrupt intent for personal gain, all in the form of a racist tweet. And some Members of this body are eager to let him get away with it. But not me, not my cosponsors, and not the majority of this House.

I still believe this House has an opportunity today to do what is right. We can show the Native American people that we will stand up for them, that after nearly 250 years since our country's founding we would not be where we are without them. They deserve that dignity; they deserve that respect; and they deserve that sovereignty for their historic homeland.

Mr. Speaker, let's be on the right side of history today. Vote "yes" and save the Mashpee Wampanoag Tribe.

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

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, I want to make sure that my colleagues on the other side understand that, as the city of Mashpee, no one has any problems, but it is the city of Taunton that is part of the problem, and that is where we have the gist. So I caution them to watch their rhetoric.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE).

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding. It is a very generous gesture when we have a different point of view on the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 312, the Mashpee Wampanoag Tribe Reservation Reaffirmation Act.

Mashpee Wampanoag people have lived in the Massachusetts area for thousands of years. In fact, our shared Thanksgiving tradition highlights a celebration of Pilgrims and Indians breaking bread together over the first colonial holiday, and it is the Mashpee who sat at the table.

In 2007, the Mashpee Wampanoag Tribe was federally recognized. Mr. Speaker, 8 years later, the Bureau of Indian Affairs approved the decision to take land into trust on behalf of the Mashpee for a reservation. The Tribe was then able to provide services directly to its citizens, become eligible for Federal programs, and explore economic opportunities.

Shortly after, in 2016, the Mashpee's reservation decision was challenged in court by plaintiffs stating that, because the Tribe was federally recognized after 1934, the Department of the Interior could not take land into trust on behalf of a Tribe. This decision stems from the 2009 Supreme Court decision, *Carcieri v. Salazar*. It is an example of why that law needs to be fixed.

In 2018, the administration issued a decision that would take the Mashpees' reservation out of trust. This marked

the first time since the termination era that a Tribe has lost their trust land.

Frankly, from my standpoint, Mr. Speaker, an attack on trust land anywhere threatens trust land everywhere, so I am very happy to be working with my good friend, Mr. KEATING, on H.R. 312. It is a bipartisan bill, and it is necessary. It will reaffirm the trust status of the Mashpee reservation.

The local elected officials with jurisdiction over the land are supportive of the bill, as is the State's entire congressional delegation, as is the Republican Governor of the State.

Mr. Speaker, a "yes" vote on this bill will right a wrong. It is a vote for local control. It is a vote for Tribal sovereignty, and it brings the Mashpee land back into trust. It marks another important step in our shared American journey.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the bill.

□ 1445

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

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in strong opposition to H.R. 312, the Mashpee Wampanoag Tribe Reservation Reaffirmation Act. This bill will allow the Mashpee Tribe to open a massive off-reservation casino right on the border of Rhode Island and Massachusetts, nearly 40 miles away from their historic Tribal lands in Cape Cod.

The Mashpee Wampanoag Tribe became federally recognized in 2007. Under the Indian Reorganization Act, the United States Department of the Interior is only allowed to take land into trust for Tribes recognized before 1934.

In 2009, the U.S. Supreme Court confirmed this Federal standard in the *Carcieri v. Salazar* decision. In 2015, the U.S. Department of the Interior ignored the Indian Reorganization Act and the U.S. Supreme Court's ruling and took land into trust for the Mashpee Tribe.

A year later, the residents of Taunton, Massachusetts, sued and won in U.S. district court to stop the casino from being built in their town. The district court ruled that the Department of the Interior should not have taken land into trust for the Mashpee Tribe and instructed the Department to conduct a further review of the Tribe's eligibility.

After reviewing the Mashpee Tribe's application last year, the U.S. Department of the Interior rejected the Tribe's claim based on the finding that the Tribe was not under Federal jurisdiction in 1934, which meant the Department lacked authority under Federal law to take land into trust on their behalf.

Today's bill would reverse this final decision of the Federal court and the

Department of the Interior and disregard the U.S. Supreme Court precedent in allowing the Tribe to build an off-reservation casino in Taunton, Massachusetts.

If H.R. 312 passes today, it would be the first time—I repeat, the first time—Congress ever reversed a final Federal court ruling that determined a Tribe did not meet the Federal standard to have land taken into trust by the U.S. Department of the Interior.

The impact of this bill would be disastrous and would open a floodgate for Tribes to come to Washington to hire the biggest lobbyists they can to get their carve-out from Congress.

Do we really want to go down this road? Does Congress want to be in the business of picking winners and losers? That is exactly what this bill does.

The Tribal land system shouldn't depend on which Tribes hire the most expensive lobbyists. Instead, it should be based on fairness under our law and applied equally.

Instead of this bill directly benefiting the Tribe, as some have suggested, the bill will bail out Genting, the Malaysian hedge fund that is financing this deal. Even if this bill passes today and the Mashpee build a casino, it is very unlikely, according to all the experts, that the Mashpee casino will ever be profitable for the Tribe because they owe Genting a half-billion dollars.

Proponents of this bill have argued that Congress is the last hope for the Mashpee Tribe and that they will go bankrupt without this casino, but Genting Malaysia has already written off the half-billion dollars it gave to the Tribe as a loss on its financial statements. If today's bill fails, the Mashpee Tribe does not need to pay back this money because, under the agreement with Genting, it is contingent on the casino being built. The debt is erased.

Regardless of what happens with this bill today, the Mashpee Tribe will still be a federally recognized Tribe and will continue to receive Federal benefits.

Mr. Speaker, I started off opposing this bill because of the damage it would do to Rhode Island's economy. The casino in Rhode Island generates over \$300 million in economic activity and is responsible for thousands of jobs in Rhode Island. I am very proud of my fierce defense for my State, and putting an off-reservation casino on the border will have a significant, negative impact on Rhode Island.

But the more I learned about this legislation, the more I realized the dangerous precedent this bill would set if it became law. H.R. 312 would reverse a Federal court ruling, undermine the Indian Reorganization Act, ignore a U.S. Supreme Court ruling, and reject the 2018 decision by the U.S. Department of the Interior. Most perniciously, it is a special deal for a single Tribe, and that is just wrong.

I stand here in opposition to this bill not only because of the impact on my

State, and not because I am unsympathetic to the challenges the Tribe faces, but this legislation will continue their exploitation by a powerful foreign entity.

I urge my colleagues to defeat this bill, and I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island so that we may have a quick colloquy.

As the gentleman made mention, it was locals in Taunton that actually sued; is that true?

Mr. CICILLINE. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. CICILLINE. Yes.

Mr. GOSAR. Does the gentleman think that the court in which they sued had any of the information skewed in front of it, in front of their jurisdiction?

Mr. CICILLINE. I am not aware of the information they had.

Mr. GOSAR. All this information that we are hearing, that is myth versus fact; is that true?

Mr. CICILLINE. Again, I don't know about the legal proceedings. I know that the litigation was begun by the people in the local community.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for engaging in the colloquy, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to address a point that was brought up during the debate on this bill, that the Mashpee Tribe will not lose its Federal recognition if H.R. 312 does not pass. That is true. We have never stated the Federal recognition was in jeopardy.

What we are talking about, which is fundamental to the survival of the Tribe, is destroying a Tribe's sovereign government. That is really what is at stake.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY), another sponsor of this legislation.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for moving this critical piece of legislation forward and for shepherding it to the House floor today.

I thank my colleague and friend, Congressman KEATING, for his advocacy on behalf of the Mashpee Wampanoag Tribe, which calls both of our districts home.

Nearly four centuries ago, the Mashpee Wampanoag Tribe opened their homes and their lands to the Pilgrims who sailed to our shores. That same welcoming spirit survives in their ancestors who live in Massachusetts today.

That is why I am proud to have the Wampanoag people call my district their home. They have planted their roots deeply in Massachusetts, and they see a future of self-determination and prosperity in the city of Taunton.

But I am ashamed of how our Nation has treated them in the 398 years since

they shared their precious resources with those strangers, not to mention the generations before them that called the region home for nearly 12,000 years.

I am ashamed of how our Nation has treated many Native people throughout our history and how we have taken their land, silenced their voices, poisoned their water, and disrupted their culture. We have dismissed their very humanity.

It is that shame that leaves us here today with a decision to make. Today, as this House debates this bill, the Mashpee Wampanoag Tribe is on the verge of dissolution. An unjust Supreme Court decision, followed by a reversal by the Department of the Interior to take the Tribe's land into trust, has left the Tribe with no other options. They are without access to critical Federal funds to support their public services, including health centers and schools.

The question today is, do we allow this to become a closing chapter in the story of an indigenous people who put their faith and trust into strangers? Do we allow a legal loophole to define American citizens out of existence?

Or do we begin to right the wrongs of our past? Do we begin to march down a path of justice and equality and hope for the Native people whose dreams for this country outlive our very democracy?

To me, that choice is simple. It is a matter of right and wrong, of correcting a historical injustice that has perpetrated for far too long. It would simply put the Mashpee Tribe on equal footing with all other federally recognized Native American Tribes.

I want to take a minute, Mr. Speaker, to rebut some of the arguments made by our colleagues.

One, that this is an off-reservation development: There is no reservation. There is nothing to be off-reservation. I cannot imagine that the argument actually is that, for a Tribe that called thousands of acres home, you are going to say they can only represent one small portion of that and not have two facilities. That can't possibly be how the U.S. Government is dictating what Tribal lands can be today of an area they called home for 12,000 years.

Two, my colleagues argued that this overrules a court decision. The last time I checked, that is what Congress does. We write laws. The courts interpret them. They strike down laws all the time. We write them again. That is in the Constitution. That is inherent in our responsibilities, in our obligation. The actual court decision, if you read it, indicates that Congress has the inherent power to do exactly what we are doing, 100 percent.

Three, our colleagues referenced the Gun Lake decision and the Gun Lake legislation. Gun Lake was a response to a decision by the Supreme Court as well, 100 percent.

We have heard allegations of lobbyists. The lobbyist for our colleagues in Rhode Island for their casinos is mar-

ried to a communications official in the White House. You can't possibly be saying that there is some issue here with Federal lobbying that is not directly and 100 percent in line with lining their own pockets for the opposition to this bill.

They said that the Tribe is about to go bankrupt. The Tribe is about to go bankrupt, but all of a sudden, the Tribe doesn't owe the financiers money. Which one is it?

Next, Federal benefits, they are saying that all the Federal benefits will remain. That ignores the Federal benefits that come with Federal recognition of reservations: the Indian Business Development Program, Financial Assistance and Social Services, employment assistance for adult Indians, vocational training for adult Indians, educational contracts under the Johnson-O'Malley Act, food distribution programs on the Indian reservation, Tribal transportation programs, Bureau of Justice Assistance Tribal justice system grants, treatment as a State under the Clean Water Act, treatment as a State under the Clean Air Act, exercise of Special Domestic Violence Criminal Jurisdiction. All of those are contingent on this bill today.

A dangerous precedent is going to be set. The dangerous precedent that is going to be set is that Massachusetts residents legalized gambling. The Tribe went through a compact with the State that was approved. They went through a referendum with the people of Taunton that was approved nearly 60-40 that townspeople in Taunton want this bill. They want this development.

It is a billion dollars for a working-class community. The folks who don't are, yes, a few residents of that community whose lawsuit has been financed by a rival casino developer to end this project so they can build a different one down the road.

They say that this is too close to the Rhode Island border. There is an existing casino in Rhode Island that recently started 500 yards from the Massachusetts border. You cannot be serious about this.

There is no argument, other than greed, that comes back to why anyone should vote against this bill. This is about the recognition of a sovereign nation that welcomed strangers to their land 400 years ago and helped us celebrate our first Thanksgiving, and the ability of our Federal Government to recognize them for who they are. If nothing else, this Tribe deserves that.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN).

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I hope that I won't take the whole 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 312, the Mashpee Wampanoag Tribe Reservation Reaffirmation Act.

This bill will have enormous impacts on my home State of Rhode Island. The

intent of this bill is to allow for the construction of a new casino resort near the State line between Rhode Island and Massachusetts, which would rival the existing casinos in our State.

The Twin River Casino Hotel and the Tiverton Casino Hotel of Rhode Island generate \$300 million each year, representing the State's third largest source of funding. These dollars support vital education and infrastructure programs in Rhode Island. Rhode Island would suffer tremendously if H.R. 312 became law.

Beyond the economic damage that would occur to Rhode Island, the precedent that would be set by this bill is fundamentally unfair. The bill would overturn a 2018 decision by the U.S. Department of the Interior, and it would reverse a 2016 ruling by the U.S. District Court for the District of Massachusetts.

If Congress grants the Mashpee Tribe this exception, then other Native American Tribes would seek individual relief. Congress would be creating an unbalanced patchwork process for Tribes to put land into trust. Such a system would be based on lobbying, not on firm principles or deliberative rule-making.

□ 1500

The process to take Tribal lands into trust is complex and requires careful consideration of the interests of our indigenous peoples in conjunction with local communities. We know this complexity firsthand in Rhode Island, as the Supreme Court decision *Carcieri v. Salazar* directly concerned our State.

But the solution is to create a uniform standard for the whole country, not a haphazard process wherein Congress chooses winners and losers, again, based on lobbying. This is why I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill. The bill creates evident harms to our State revenues in Rhode Island, but it also represents a slipshod way of addressing the very real issues of how Tribes have land taken into trust.

My friends in the Massachusetts delegation insist that this issue be handled with alacrity. I respectfully disagree. The urgency they express is grounded in the dollars and cents of gaming development, money loaned on the promise of casino riches. Those loans may have been imprudently granted, but we cannot allow imprudent financial dealings to force our hand.

Rather than rush a Tribe-specific loophole, I ask my colleagues to vote "no" on H.R. 312 and to, instead, update the Indian Reorganization Act to make this process more transparent and fair. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) has 10 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR) has 15 minutes remaining.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KEATING).

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I have been around here a little while, and I have never heard so many people from Arizona really concerned about anything that is going on in Rhode Island. For that matter, I haven't heard many people in Rhode Island that concerned about what is happening in Massachusetts.

But this is what it is about, I guess. It is not what it is about to me. It is not what it is about to our cosponsors. I know it is not what it is about to Mr. KENNEDY. I know it is not what it is about to the chairman of this committee.

I am puzzled. People are saying this is a circumvention dealing with gaming. This bill isn't about gaming. Let me bring it back into focus, but let me just address one thing first.

I am puzzled because this Tribe went through the State process. This wasn't a circumvention. They went through the Commonwealth of Massachusetts' process for deciding gaming institutions. The State decided this. Congress isn't deciding this. The Commonwealth of Massachusetts decided this. They created an area in southeastern Massachusetts along with two other areas in the State where this would be located.

So I have got news for the people in Rhode Island: They can do their best to kill this bill and destroy this Tribe, but it is still going to get a casino because the State of Massachusetts said so.

So now that I am through just pointing out what this bill isn't about, let me just make the last point about what it is about.

It is about justice. It is about doing the right thing. It is about taking a Tribe that, through its whole history, has lost all of its land even though it did occupy that land where it is in Taunton, where it occupies it now.

This is about doing the right thing, and it is a disgrace in this Congress that politics, special interests, lobbying, and conflicts have taken over this debate. Let's do the right thing. This is part of our history. We wouldn't be here where we are without this Tribe. Let's respect that. Let's pass this bill.

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

Mr. Speaker, the rhetoric coming from the other side is hot and heavy like I don't know what I am talking about with Native American Tribes when I have lived my whole life in association with Tribes. So let's get through some of the false myths that are out here that continually are being talked about.

Now, the myth is that Congress has done this for other Tribes, i.e., we have heard about the Gun Lake Tribe.

Fact: That is false. This will be the first time, as my colleague from Rhode Island said, that Congress would overturn a Federal Court decision where the court ruled that the Tribe did not

meet the Federal standard to have land taken into trust, a State-recognized Tribe.

Myth: The Tribe is facing extinction unless Congress acts.

That would be false. The Mashpee Tribe will not lose its Federal recognition and will continue to receive Federal benefits and funding even if H.R. 312 does not pass. Further, if this is not solely about a casino, then my amendment should have been considered and adopted in committee. The amendment was a compromise that would have secured a reservation for the Mashpee for all purposes but not gaming.

Myth number three: H.R. 312 is not a casino giveaway nor a case of reservation shopping.

Fact: It is both. There is no reason for the second reservation other than to build an off-reservation casino 50 miles away from where the Mashpee Tribe currently resides. If this weren't solely about a casino, then my amendment would have also been adopted in committee.

Myth: The two tracts of land in the town of Mashpee and the city of Taunton both are sites within the Tribal historical territories. My colleague from Massachusetts actually alluded to this.

That would be false. The Mashpee Tribe will build a massive, 400,000-square-foot, off-reservation casino away from their Tribal land on the border. That would be Taunton, Rhode Island.

In 1988, Congress passed the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act with the intent to restrict casinos to Tribes' original reservations. By placing land in trust for gaming in Taunton 50 miles away from the Tribe's historic reservation—he also brought that point up, that it wasn't their traditional land—what Congress intended in the Gaming Regulatory Act would be severely harmed.

Myth: This bill has nothing to do with approving a specific casino project.

Fact: We actually heard it again from the other side. If that were the case, then my amendment would have been made in order and received votes or deemed adopted at the committee level. The amendment would have secured a reservation for the Mashpee Tribe for any nongaming purposes.

These may include, but not be limited to, the construction and operation of Tribal government facilities and infrastructure, housing, a hospital, a school and library, a museum, a community center, assisted living for Tribal elders, business development, natural resources management, the Tribe's exercising its government jurisdiction over Tribal members, and many other Tribal uses.

The next myth is that H.R. 312 is not a bailout.

H.R. 312 is not a bailout? In fact, the Malaysian hedge fund, Genting Malaysia, that is underwriting the casino—yes, underwriting this casino.

The Mashpee Tribe will not receive a penny of revenue from the casino for many years, if ever, because of the massive size of the \$500 million-plus debt they have incurred to Genting. Genting, therefore, will be the real owner of the project, not the Tribe.

This kind of arrangement where the creditor practically controls the financial future of a debtor Tribe is contrary to the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act, which requires every Tribal casino to be 100 percent tribally owned.

The last myth: The Mashpee Tribe will go bankrupt if H.R. 312 does not pass.

Fact: The Mashpee Tribe will only be required to repay its debt to the Malaysian company underwriting the deal if H.R. 312 is enacted and the casino is approved.

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Kansas (Ms. DAVIDS).

Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this bill. I have heard a lot of rhetoric today about the role of Congress and the role of the administration in recognizing or not recognizing Tribal lands, Tribal governments, reservations, and the ability of Tribes to participate in whatever kind of economic development they so desire.

I have also heard a lot of talk and discussion. I am pleased to hear talk and discussion on this House floor about the need to make sure that Tribes are recognized, that Tribal sovereignty is recognized, and that this government needs to do right by Native people and indigenous people to this land.

But the basis for support of this bill today is not necessarily rooted in whether or not we are doing the "right thing." Congress has a duty to properly exercise our plenary power over interactions with Tribal people and with Tribal governments. The Constitution gives Congress plenary power over interactions with Indian Tribes. What is at stake here today is how Congress and the Federal Government are going to continue to interact with Indian Tribes.

Tribes don't need Congress Members' sympathy. What Tribes need is for us to properly exercise our duty. This bill does that. This bill exercises Congress' proper power to recognize a Tribe, to recognize Tribal reservation lands, and it has nothing to do with what happens afterwards.

This bill wouldn't abrogate or alter the application of the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act or any other piece of legislation. This bill would simply do exactly what Congress' job is to do: recognize the Federal-Tribal relationship that exists and the Tribal lands that are properly held in trust and should be held in trust for an Indian Tribe. That is what we are doing right now.

All the talk and discussion about other pieces of legislation that might

be called into question after this bill is passed should be debated later. That has nothing to do with what this specific bill applies to.

Our role here is very simple. We have got to recognize the Mashpee Tribe's reservation. We have got to recognize their sovereignty and their self-determination.

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

Mr. Speaker, I just want to address Congress' intent, under article I, section 8.

As I said before, the Mashpee reservation of the city of Mashpee is not of consequence. It is the area outside of their previous homeland of Taunton that is of discussion. That is only the aspect here. What has happened here is the bypassing of protocol and law that actually causes the problem.

So let me give you a little bit of background about why I have this problem.

We had seen previous abuse in the past where the off-reservation land was taken in a trust against the will of States, compacts, and local communities for the sole purpose of building new casinos.

This was certainly the case of the Tohono O'odham Nation right in Arizona when they acted against the fellow Tribes, the State of Arizona, and the general public to open an off-reservation casino in Glendale, despite agreeing to a voter-approved compact not to build any more casinos in the Phoenix metro area until the compact was renegotiated. Litigation discovery and audio recordings affirm this shameful conspiracy implemented by the Tohono O'odham.

I am concerned that this bill as written will encourage future abuse in that regard and allow for more off-reservation casinos to be built against the objections of local communities.

Furthermore, there is no CBO score for this bill. There is no committee report that I have seen. We are pushing this bill through that has no chance of being signed into law without amendment and without knowing the full ramifications of this legislation.

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time to close.

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

Let's go back to some more of the myths.

The Mashpee Tribe will lose its Federal recognition and benefits if H.R. 312 does not pass.

Once again, that is false. The Mashpee Tribe will not lose its Federal recognition and will continue to receive Federal benefits and funding even if H.R. 312 does not pass.

Here is the next myth. It was the intent of Congress for all Tribes to have land and trust under the IRA of 1934 regardless of when the Tribes obtained Federal recognition.

Fact: That is not what the Supreme Court said in *Carcieri v. Salazar*. The

Supreme Court said that the Tribal aspect of the IRA of 1934 does not authorize the Secretary of the Interior to place land in trust for Tribes that were not under Federal jurisdiction on the date of enactment of IRA, or 1934.

Fact: There is no evidence that Congress, in 1934, thought that off-reservation gaming would turn into the controversial mess it has become today.

Myth: After a Federal judge struck down the Obama administration's second definition of Indian analysis, the Trump administration chose not to defend the decision.

Fact: The Trump administration chose not to defend the decision because the judge said it was "not even close," and the Obama administration had not used this analysis in any other Tribe's trust land case. It was used once only for the Mashpee. The Court remanded the matter back to Interior for an examination under the same "first definition of Indian" analysis used for all other Tribes.

In applying the Obama administration's analysis used for all other Tribes, the Trump administration determined the Mashpee did not qualify, and yet Tribes blame the Trump administration for something the Obama administration could have done years ago but chose not to.

□ 1515

Could the fate of a billion-dollar casino be the reason why the Obama administration bent the rules? I wonder.

H.R. 312 doesn't amend the IRA. It doesn't amend any law. Rather, H.R. 312 declares the Obama action struck down by the U.S. district court to be lawful and proper. The bill also orders the court to dismiss the lawsuit concerning the casino property and to prohibit the filing of any future lawsuit over it.

Mr. Speaker, we constantly see over and over again, the problem with H.R. 312 is it is once again being rushed to the floor.

I want to reference a letter from Eagle Forum and highlight, basically, their reservations.

"This bill is a deceptive plan to undermine the Federal Government's decision to deny the Mashpee Tribe land for a new casino. The Mashpee Tribe has previously engaged in questionable financial and lobbying dealings. They are currently \$450 billion in debt to Genting, a foreign Malaysian gaming company, because of this project.

"The Tribe has no way of paying the company back, which means Genting will be the true owner of this project. Taxpayers should not be responsible for the bailout of their irresponsible dealings."

Down further it goes:

"Just the issue of gambling alone has been devastating to families across the United States, especially among Native Americans."

Further down it goes:

"For these reasons, we urge you to vote 'no' on H.R. 312, Mashpee

Wampanoag Tribe Reservation Reaffirmation Act.”

I also want to reference Americans for Limited Government:

“The House of Representatives should reject H.R. 312, the Senator ELIZABETH WARREN-led attempt to punch piecemeal holes through the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act. This isn’t about the ability of Tribes using land that is part of their long-established heritage for casino development, but, instead, it is about whether Congress should place gambling institutions on unrelated land based upon proximity to urban areas.

“If Senator WARREN and her benefactors wish to change the Indian gaming laws, they should introduce wholesale reforms rather than turning the existing law into Swiss cheese for nothing more than investor pecuniary interests.

“Rick Manning, President, Americans for Limited Government.”

We actually have our opposition to 312:

I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on 312, the Mashpee Wampanoag Tribe Reservation Reaffirmation Act, when it comes before the House today.

H.R. 312 is contrary to the view of the Department of the Interior, contradicts a Supreme Court decision, and aims to reverse Federal court decisions on this matter in order to build a massive, 400,000-square-foot, off-reservation gaming complex for the benefit of Genting, a foreign Malaysian gaming company.

The bill forever strips the Federal Government of its jurisdictions over this Tribal casino and overturns a well-reasoned decision from a Federal judge.

H.R. 312 also provides a massive tax shelter for Genting by shielding the land—and the casino on it—from taxation and State regulation.

The bill creates two reservations for the Mashpee Tribe of Massachusetts, one reservation which we have no problem with, in the town of Mashpee, the Tribe’s historic reservation lands. No casino will be allowed within the geographical boundaries of the town of Mashpee.

The other reservation will be 50 miles away from Mashpee in the city of Taunton. This site is not part of the Tribe’s historic reservation and was selected by the Tribe and Genting for a billion-dollar casino project because of its proximity to the Providence, Rhode Island, casino market, 20 miles away.

In 1988, Congress enacted the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act with the intent to restrict casinos to Tribes’ original reservations.

By placing land in trust for gaming in Taunton, H.R. 312 creates an off-reservation casino, which is inconsistent with congressional intent. This is often called “reservation shopping,” and it is an abuse of the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act.

The Tribe’s lawyers knew that reservation shopping was a political headache, so they went to the previous administration to obtain the two reservations through administrative action.

Once again, the Federal judge, however, ruled that what the previous administration did was unlawful, so now they need legislation to authorize this off-reservation casino.

The bill was opposed by 10 of the 13 voting Republicans in the committee markup. Ranking Member Rob Bishop was one of those. These Members are joined by Ameri-

cans for Limited Government, the American Principles Project, the Coalition for American Values, Eagle Forum, the Governor of Rhode Island, Wampanoag Tribe of Gay Head, Congressman David Cicilline, Congressman James Langevin, and President Donald Trump in opposing this bill.

President Trump tweeted that he opposed the bill and urged Members of Congress to do the same last week. House Minority Whip Steve Scalise also sent an email recommending Members vote “no” on H.R. 312.

The bill is also strenuously opposed by the only other Federally-recognized Tribe in Massachusetts.

All of this opposition was enough to have the bill pulled from consideration by the House of Representatives under the suspension of the rules procedures one week after it was considered in committee with no bill report or score—actually, there was a bill report but no score from the Congressional Budgetary Office.

Now, the Democrat leadership is using a closed rule and not allowing any amendments to get this controversial bill out of the House of Representatives. Given that H.R. 312 authorizes an off-reservation casino, bails out a foreign corporation from major financial problems of its own making, and reverses the judgment of a Federal court and contradicts Interior and Supreme Court decisions, it is no wonder that the majority had to resort to these drastic measures.

I urge everyone to vote “no” and to oppose this bill that sets a dangerous precedent that will open the floodgates to off-reservation Tribal casinos all over the United States if enacted into law.

Once again, I want to reiterate, if you have a problem with the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act, let’s do the wholesale changes on a massive scale, not do it one piece at a time, one Tribe at a time, not allowing lawful actions to occur.

So, I ask all my colleagues to vote “no” against this bill. Send a clear message that we have got to follow the law or change it wholesale for everybody.

Mr. Speaker, I ask a “no” vote from my colleagues, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Upholding the establishment of Tribal homelands should be, and is, one of the most important actions that this Congress can take. It is not just about tax-exempt status or economic development, both of which are vitally important to Tribal communities.

It is also about the construction of schools, housing, clinics, elder care facilities, things that are extremely vital to the quality of life and well-being of Tribal members.

It is also about recognizing a Tribe’s historical, cultural, and spiritual connection.

It is not about protecting a market share. It is not about the tweets from the President. It is not about the scare tactics and hysteria of off-reservation gaming that is constantly used in trying to fight the self-determination and the ability of Tribes to take care of themselves.

And it is about identity.

I want to just follow up on the gentlewoman from Kansas’ comment. To

ensure Tribal sovereignty and self-governance, land is critical to the connection of people to their land. And the real-world decisions that we are making have real consequences.

To strip people of their land is to strip them of their identity, to strip them of their self-governance and their self-determination. It is a sad state that, nearly 400 years later, the Mashpee still have to fight for land that is rightfully theirs.

But we can remedy that today.

I want to thank our colleagues Mr. KEATING and Mr. KENNEDY, as well as the entire Massachusetts delegation, for spearheading this effort to save the Mashpee’s land, preserve their way of life, and reestablish and not allow a precedent to stand where trust land that was given is taken away.

This is an important piece of legislation with implications across Indian Country.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the swift adoption of H.R. 312, and I yield back the remainder of my time.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the following letter from the Wampanoag Tribe of Gay Head Aquinnah expressing their concerns about this legislation. I want to reiterate that I support this legislation. However, I believe it is important that the concerns of this sister tribe be included in this debate.

WAMPANOAG TRIBE OF
GAY HEAD AQUINNAH,
Aquinnah, MA.

To: The United States House of Representatives, Honorable Representatives

From: Chairwoman Cheryl Andrews-Maltais, The Wampanoag Tribe of Gay Head Aquinnah (The Aquinnah Wampanoag)

Date: May 15, 2019

Re: H.R. 312

THE WAMPANOAG TRIBE OF GAY HEAD AQUINNAH (AQUINNAH WAMPANOAG TRIBE) STRENUOUSLY OPPOSES H.R. 312, MASHPEE WAMPANOAG TRIBE RESERVATION REAFFIRMATION ACT

The Wampanoag Tribe of Gay Head Aquinnah (Aquinnah Wampanoag) strenuously opposes the above referenced Bill due to the fact that it creates two classes of Tribes within the same Wampanoag Tribal Nation.

H.R. 312 unfairly provides a pathway for economic development for one Tribe (the Mashpee Wampanoag) while simultaneously creating an obstruction to the other Wampanoag Tribe (the Aquinnah Wampanoag) whose Tribal community also lives within the same shared Ancestral territory of the Wampanoag Nation.

The Bill sets forth a pathway for one Tribe (the Mashpee) to acquire lands in trust outside of its original homeland “village site” of the Town of Mashpee and does not provide the same opportunity for the other Tribe (the Aquinnah).

H.R. 312 also removes all clouds of the applicability of the Indian Reorganization Act (as Amended), and all other laws enacted for the benefit of Federally Recognized Tribes for one Tribe (the Mashpee) and not for the Aquinnah who is of the same Wampanoag Nation and who was federally recognized 25 years earlier.

The Bill provides a remedy to the Department of the Interior’s (DOI’s) egregious determination that the Wampanoag are not eligible to have lands taken into trust for one Tribe (the Mashpee Wampanoag), while

omitting the other Wampanoag Tribe (the Aquinnah Wampanoag) from this remedy from which the Aquinnah Wampanoag are also suffering.

The Aquinnah Wampanoag would support this Bill, H.R. 312 if included as part of "and for other purposes". The simple request is for a simple amendment to create fairness, equity and parity for both Wampanoag Tribes within Massachusetts.

SEC. (d) REAFFIRMATION OF INDIAN TRUST LAND TO ALSO INCLUDE THE WAMPANOAG TRIBE OF GAY HEAD AQUINNAH (THE AQUINNAH WAMPANOAG)

(a) IN GENERAL.—The taking of any land into trust by the United States for the benefit of the Wampanoag Tribe of Gay Head Aquinnah of Massachusetts is reaffirmed as trust land and the actions of the Secretary of the Interior in taking that land into trust are ratified and confirmed.

(b) APPLICABILITY OF LAWS.—All laws (including regulations) of the United States of general applicability to Indians or nations, Indian Tribes, or bands of Indians (including the Act of June 18, 1934 (25 U.S.C. 5101 et seq.)), shall be applicable to the Wampanoag Tribe of Gay Head Aquinnah and its Tribal members.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 377, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on passage of the bill will be followed by 5-minute votes on:

The motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 375; and

The motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 1892.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 275, nays 146, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 207]

YEAS—275

Adams	Calvert	Crist
Aguilar	Carbajal	Crow
Allred	Cárdenas	Cuellar
Amodei	Carson (IN)	Cunningham
Armstrong	Cartwright	Davids (KS)
Axne	Case	Davis (CA)
Babin	Casten (IL)	Davis, Danny K.
Bacon	Castor (FL)	Davis, Rodney
Barragán	Castro (TX)	Dean
Bass	Chu, Judy	DeFazio
Beatty	Cisneros	DeGette
Bera	Clark (MA)	DeLauro
Bergman	Clarke (NY)	DelBene
Beyer	Clay	Delgado
Bishop (GA)	Clyburn	Demings
Blumenauer	Cohen	DeSaulnier
Blunt Rochester	Cole	Deutch
Bonamici	Connolly	Diaz-Balart
Boyle, Brendan	Cook	Dingell
F.	Cooper	Doggett
Brindisi	Correa	Doyle, Michael
Brown (MD)	Costa	F.
Brownley (CA)	Courtney	Duffy
Bustos	Cox (CA)	Engel
Butterfield	Craig	Escobar

Eshoo	Lieu, Ted	Roybal-Allard
Espallat	Lipinski	Ruiz
Evans	Loeb	Ruppersberger
Ferguson	Loftgren	Rush
Finkenauer	Lowenthal	Sánchez
Fitzpatrick	Lowey	Sarbanes
Fletcher	Lucas	Scanlon
Foster	Luján	Schakowsky
Frankel	Luria	Schiff
Fudge	Lynch	Schneider
Gabbard	Malinowski	Schrader
Gallego	Maloney,	Schrier
Garamendi	Carolyn B.	Scott (VA)
García (IL)	Maloney, Sean	Scott, Austin
García (TX)	Massie	Scott, David
Golden	Mast	Serrano
Gomez	Matsui	Sewell (AL)
Gonzalez (OH)	McAdams	Shalala
Gonzalez (TX)	McBath	Sherman
Gottheimer	McClintock	Sherill
Green (TX)	McCollum	Simpson
Grijalva	McEachin	Sires
Haaland	McGovern	Slotkin
Hagedorn	McHenry	Smith (NJ)
Harder (CA)	McNerney	Smith (WA)
Hastings	Meeks	Soto
Hayes	Meng	Spanberger
Heck	Moolenaar	Speier
Higgins (NY)	Moore	Stanton
Hill (CA)	Morelle	Staubert
Himes	Moulton	Stefanik
Hollingsworth	Mucarsel-Powell	Stevens
Horn, Kendra S.	Mullin	Suozzi
Horsford	Murphy	Takano
Houlihan	Nadler	Thompson (CA)
Hoyer	Napolitano	Thompson (MS)
Huffman	Neal	Thompson (PA)
Hurd (TX)	Neguse	Thornberry
Jackson Lee	Newhouse	Titus
Jayapal	Norcross	Tlaib
Jeffries	Nunes	Tonko
Johnson (GA)	O'Halleran	Torres (CA)
Johnson (TX)	Ocasio-Cortez	Torres Small
Joyce (OH)	Omar	(NM)
Kaptur	Pallone	Trahan
Katko	Panetta	Trone
Keating	Pappas	Underwood
Kelly (IL)	Pascrell	Upton
Kennedy	Payne	Van Drew
Khanna	Perlmutter	Peters
Kildeer	Peters	Vargas
Kilmer	Peterson	Veasey
Kim	Phillips	Vela
Kind	Pingree	Velázquez
King (NY)	Pocan	Visclosky
Kirkpatrick	Porter	Walden
Krishnamoorthi	Pressley	Walorski
Kuster (NH)	Kuster (NC)	Wasserman
LaMalfa	Quigley	Schultz
Lamb	Raskin	Waters
Larsen (WA)	Reed	Watkins
Larson (CT)	Reschenthaler	Watson Coleman
Lawrence	Rice (NY)	Welch
Lawson (FL)	Richmond	Wexton
Lee (CA)	Rogers (KY)	Wild
Lee (NV)	Rooney (FL)	Wilson (FL)
Levin (CA)	Rose (NY)	Yarmuth
Levin (MD)	Rouda	Young
Lewis	Rouzer	

NAYS—146

Aderholt	Collins (GA)	Graves (MO)
Allen	Collins (NY)	Green (TN)
Amash	Comer	Griffith
Arrington	Conaway	Grothman
Baird	Crawford	Guest
Balderson	Crenshaw	Guthrie
Banks	Curtis	Harris
Barr	Davidson (OH)	Hartzler
Biggs	DesJarlais	Hern, Kevin
Bilirakis	Duncan	Herrera Beutler
Bishop (UT)	Dunn	Hice (GA)
Bost	Emmer	Hill (AR)
Brady	Estes	Holding
Brooks (AL)	Fleischmann	Hudson
Buchanan	Flores	Huizenga
Buck	Fortenberry	Hunter
Bucshon	Fox (NC)	Johnson (OH)
Budd	Fulcher	Johnson (SD)
Burchett	Gaetz	Jordan
Burgess	Gallagher	Joyce (PA)
Byrne	Gianforte	Kelly (MS)
Carter (GA)	Gibbs	Kelly (PA)
Carter (TX)	Gohmert	King (IA)
Chabot	Gooden	Kinzinger
Cheney	Gosar	Kustoff (TN)
Cicilline	Granger	LaHood
Cline	Graves (GA)	Lamborn
Cloud	Graves (LA)	Langevin

Latta	Ratcliffe	Taylor
Lesko	Rice (SC)	Timmons
Long	Riggleman	Tipton
Loudermilk	Rodgers (WA)	Turner
Luetkemeyer	Roe, David P.	Wagner
Marchant	Rogers (AL)	Walberg
Marshall	Rose, John W.	Walker
McCarthy	Roy	Waltz
McCaul	Rutherford	Weber (TX)
McKinley	Scalise	Weber (FL)
Meadows	Schweikert	Wenstrup
Meuser	Sensenbrenner	Westerman
Miller	Shimkus	Williams
Mitchell	Smith (MO)	Wilson (SC)
Mooney (WV)	Smith (NE)	Wittman
Norman	Smucker	Womack
Olson	Spano	Woodall
Palazzo	Steil	Wright
Shalala	Steupe	Yoho
Perry	Stewart	Zeldin
Posey	Stivers	

NOT VOTING—10

Abraham	Higgins (LA)	Ryan
Brooks (IN)	Johnson (LA)	Swalwell (CA)
Cleaver	Pence	
Cummings	Roby	

□ 1555

Mr. MARSHALL changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. BERGMAN, AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, SMITH of Washington, HORSFORD, BABIN, and MASSIE changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REAFFIRMING AUTHORITY OF SECRETARY OF INTERIOR TO TAKE LAND INTO TRUST FOR INDIAN TRIBES

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. 375) to amend the Act of June 18, 1934, to reaffirm the authority of the Secretary of the Interior to take land into trust for Indian Tribes, and for other purposes, 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 Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) 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 323, nays 96, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 208]

YEAS—323

Adams	Bilirakis	Byrne
Aguilar	Bishop (GA)	Calvert
Allred	Bishop (UT)	Carbajal
Amash	Blumenauer	Cárdenas
Armstrong	Blunt Rochester	Carson (IN)
Axne	Bonamici	Carter (TX)
Babin	Bost	Cartwright
Bacon	Boyle, Brendan	Case
Baird	F.	Casten (IL)
Balderson	Brindisi	Castor (FL)
Barr	Brooks (AL)	Castro (TX)
Barragán	Brown (MD)	Chu, Judy
Bass	Brownley (CA)	Cisneros
Beatty	Buchanan	Clark (MA)
Bera	Bucshon	Clarke (NY)
Bergman	Bustos	Clay
Beyer	Butterfield	Clyburn

Cohen Kelly (IL) Reschenthaler
 Cole Kennedy Rice (NY)
 Conaway Khanna Rice (SC)
 Connolly Kildee Richmond
 Cook Kilmer Rodgers (WA)
 Cooper Kim Roe, David P.
 Correa Kind Rogers (AL)
 Costa King (IA) Rogers (KY)
 Cox (CA) King (NY) Rooney (FL)
 Craig Kinzinger Rose (NY)
 Crawford Kirkpatrick Rouda
 Crist Krishnamoorthi Rouzer
 Crow Kuster (NH) Roybal-Allard
 Cuellar LaMalfa Ruiz
 Cunningham Lamb Ruppertsberger
 Davids (KS) Lamborn Rush
 Davis (CA) Larsen (WA) Sánchez
 Davis, Danny K. Larson (CT) Sarbanes
 Davis, Rodney Lawrence Scanlon
 Dean Lawson (FL) Schakowsky
 DeFazio Lee (CA) Schiff
 DeGette Levin (CA) Schneider
 DelBene Levin (MI) Schrader
 Delgado Lewis Schriener
 Demings Lieu, Ted Scott (VA)
 DeSaulnier Lipinski Scott, Austin
 Deutch Loeb sack Scott, David
 Dingell Lofgren Scott, David
 Doggett Lowenthal Serrano
 Doyle, Michael Lowey Sewell (AL)
 F, Lucas Shalala
 Duffy Luetkemeyer Sherman
 Dunn Luján Sherrill
 Emmer Luria Simpson
 Engel Lynch Sires
 Escobar Malinowski Slotkin
 Eshoo Maloney, Carolyn Smith (MO)
 Espallat Carolyn B. Smith (NJ)
 Evans Maloney, Sean Smith (WA)
 Ferguson Marshall Smucker
 Finkenauer Finkenaue Soto
 Fitzpatrick Mast Spanberger
 Fleischmann Matsui Spano
 Fletcher McAdams Speier
 Fortenberry Mc Bath Stanton
 Foster McCarthy Stauber
 Frankel McCaul Stefanik
 Fudge McClintock Steil
 Gabbard McCollum Stevens
 Gallagher McEachin Stivers
 Gallego McGovern Suozzi
 Garamendi McHenry Takano
 Garcia (IL) McNerney Thompson (CA)
 Garcia (TX) Meadows Thompson (MS)
 Golden Meeks Thompson (PA)
 Gomez Meng Thornberry
 Gonzalez (OH) Mitchell Tipton
 Gonzalez (TX) Moolenaar Tlaib
 Gottheimer Mooney (WV) Tonko
 Granger Moore Torres (CA)
 Green (TX) Morelle Torres Small
 Griffith Moulton (NM)
 Grijalva Mucarsel-Powell Trahan
 Guest Mullin Trone
 Haaland Murphy Trone
 Hagedorn Nadler Turner
 Harder (CA) Napolitano Underwood
 Harris Neal Upton
 Hastings Neguse Van Drew
 Heck Newhouse Vargas
 Hern, Kevin Norcross Veasey
 Herrera Beutler Nunes Vela
 Higgins (NY) O'Halleran Velázquez
 Hill (AR) Ocasio-Cortez Vislosky
 Hill (CA) Omar Wagner
 Holding Pallone Walberg
 Hollingsworth Walden Walden
 Horn, Kendra S. Pappas Walorski
 Horsford Pascrell Waltz
 Houlahan Payne Wasserman
 Hoyer Perlmutter Schultz
 Huffman Peters Waters
 Hurd (TX) Peterson Watkins
 Jackson Lee Phillips Watson Coleman
 Jayapal Pingree Welch
 Jeffries Pocan Wexton
 Johnson (GA) Porter Wild
 Johnson (SD) Pressley Wilson (FL)
 Johnson (TX) Price (NC) Wilson (SC)
 Joyce (OH) Quigley Wittman
 Kaptur Raskin Womack
 Katko Ratcliffe Yarmuth
 Keating Reed Young

Cheyne Grothman Palazzo
 Cicilline Guthrie Palmer
 Cline Hartzler Perry
 Cloud Hayes Posey
 Collins (GA) Hice (GA) Riggleman
 Collins (NY) Himes Rose, John W.
 Comer Hudson Roy
 Courtney Huizenga Rutherford
 Crenshaw Hunter Scalise
 Curtis Johnson (OH) Schweikert
 Davidson (OH) Jordan Sensenbrenner
 DeLauro Joyce (PA) Shimkus
 DesJarlais Kelly (MS) Smith (NE)
 Duncan Kelly (PA) Steube
 Estes Kustoff (TN) Stewart
 Flores Ruppertsberger
 Foxx (NC) LaHood Taylor
 Fulcher Langevin Timmons
 Gaetz Latta Titus
 Gianforte Lee (NV) Walker
 Gibbs Lesko Weber (TX)
 Gohmert Long Webster (FL)
 Gooden Loudermilk Wenstrup
 Gosar Marchant Westerman
 Graves (GA) McKinley Williams
 Graves (LA) Meuser Woodall
 Graves (MO) Miller Wright
 Green (TN) Norman Yoho
 Olson Zeldin

NOT VOTING—12

Abraham Cummings Pence
 Brady Diaz-Balart Roby
 Brooks (IN) Higgins (LA) Ryan
 Cleaver Johnson (LA) Swalwell (CA)

□ 1603

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

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

QUADRENNIAL HOMELAND SECURITY REVIEW TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS 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. 1892) to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to make technical corrections to the requirement that the Secretary of Homeland Security submit quadrennial homeland security reviews, 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 gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. TORRES SMALL) 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 415, nays 0, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 209]

YEAS—415

Adams Banks Bonamici
 Aderholt Barr Bost
 Aguiar Barragán Boyle, Brendan
 Allen Bass F.
 Allred Beatty Brady
 Amash Bera Brindisi
 Amodei Bergman Brooks (AL)
 Armstrong Beyer Brown (MD)
 Arrington Biggs Brownley (CA)
 Axne Bilirakis Buchanan
 Babin Bishop (GA) Buck
 Bacon Bishop (UT) Burchess
 Baird Blumenauer Budd
 Balderson Blunt Rochester Burchett

Burgess Gooden
 Bustos Gosar
 Butterfield Gottheimer
 Byrne Granger
 Calvert Graves (GA)
 Carbajal Graves (LA)
 Cárdenas Graves (MO)
 Carson (IN) Green (TN)
 Carter (GA) Green (TX)
 Carter (TX) Griffith
 Cartwright Grijalva
 Case Grothman
 Casten (IL) Guest
 Castor (FL) Guthrie
 Castro (TX) Haaland
 Chabot Hagedorn
 Cheney Harder (CA)
 Chu, Judy Harris
 Cicilline Hartzler
 Cisneros Hastings
 Clark (MA) Hayes
 Clarke (NY) Heck
 Clay Hern, Kevin
 Cloud Herrera Beutler
 Clyburn Hice (GA)
 Cohen Higgins (NY)
 Cole Hill (AR)
 Collins (GA) Hill (CA)
 Collins (NY) Himes
 Comer Holding
 Conaway Hollingsworth
 Connolly Horn, Kendra S.
 Cook Horsford
 Cooper Houlahan
 Correa Hoyer
 Costa Hudson
 Courtney Huffman
 Cox (CA) Huizenga
 Craig Hunter
 Crawford Hurd (TX)
 Crenshaw Jackson Lee
 Crist Jayapal
 Crow Jeffries
 Cuellar Johnson (GA)
 Cunningham Johnson (OH)
 Curtis Johnson (SD)
 Davids (KS) Johnson (TX)
 Davidson (OH) Jordan
 Davis (CA) Joyce (OH)
 Davis, Danny K. Joyce (PA)
 Davis, Rodney Kaptur
 Dean Katko
 DeFazio Keating
 DeGette Kelly (IL)
 DeLauro Kelly (MS)
 DelBene Kelly (PA)
 Delgado Kennedy
 Demings Khanna
 DeSaulnier Kildee
 DesJarlais Kilmer
 Deutch Kim
 Diaz-Balart Kind
 Dingell King (IA)
 Doyle, Michael King (NY)
 F, Kinzinger
 Duffy Kirkpatrick
 Duncan Krishnamoorthi
 Dunn Kuster (NH)
 Emmer Kustoff (TN)
 Engel LaHood
 Escobar LaMalfa
 Eshoo Lamb
 Espallat Lamborn
 Estes Langevin
 Evans Larsen (WA)
 Finkenauer Larson (CT)
 Fitzpatrick Latta
 Fleischmann Lawrence
 Fletcher Lawson (FL)
 Flores Lee (CA)
 Fortenberry Lee (NV)
 Foster Lesko
 Foxx (NC) Levin (CA)
 Frankel Levin (MI)
 Fudge Lewis
 Fulcher Lieu, Ted
 Gabbard Gabbard
 Gaetz Gaetz
 Gallagher Gallagher
 Gallego Gallego
 Garamendi Garamendi
 Garcia (IL) Garcia (IL)
 Garcia (TX) Garcia (TX)
 Gianforte Gianforte
 Gibbs Gibbs
 Golden Golden
 Gomez Gomez
 Gonzalez (OH) Gonzalez (OH)
 Gonzalez (TX) Gonzalez (TX)
 Maloney, Carolyn B.
 Maloney, Sean
 Marchant
 Marshall
 Massie
 Massie
 Mast
 Matsui
 McAdams
 Mc Bath
 McCarthy
 McCaul
 McClintock
 McCollum
 McEachin
 McGovern
 McHenry
 McNerney
 Meadows
 Meeks
 Meng
 Mitchell
 Moolenaar
 Mooney (WV)
 Moore
 Morelle
 Moulton
 Mucarsel-Powell
 Mullin
 Murphy
 Nadler
 Napolitano
 Neal
 Neguse
 Newhouse
 Norcross
 Nunes
 O'Halleran
 Ocasio-Cortez
 Omar
 Pallone
 Panetta
 Panetta
 Pappas
 Pascrell
 Payne
 Perlmutter
 Peters
 Peterson
 Phillips
 Pingree
 Pocan
 Porter
 Pressley
 Price (NC)
 Quigley
 Raskin
 Ratcliffe
 Reed
 Reschenthaler
 Rice (NY)
 Rice (SC)
 Richmond
 Rodgers (WA)
 Rogers (AL)
 Rogers (KY)
 Rooney (FL)
 Rose (NY)
 Rose, John W.
 Rouda
 Rouzer
 Roy
 Roybal-Allard
 Ruiz
 Ruppertsberger
 Rush
 Sánchez
 Sarbanes
 Scalise
 Scanlon
 Schakowsky
 Schiff
 Schneider
 Schrader
 Schriener
 Schweikert
 Scott (VA)
 Scott, Austin
 Scott, David
 Sensenbrenner

NAYS—96

Aderholt Banks Burchett
 Allen Biggs Burgess
 Amodei Buck Carter (GA)
 Arrington Budd Chabot

Serrano	Takano	Walden
Sewell (AL)	Taylor	Walker
Shalala	Thompson (CA)	Walorski
Sherman	Thompson (MS)	Waltz
Sherrill	Thompson (PA)	Wasserman
Shimkus	Thornberry	Schultz
Simpson	Timmons	Waters
Sires	Tipton	Watkins
Slotkin	Titus	Watson Coleman
Smith (MO)	Tlaib	Weber (TX)
Smith (NE)	Tonko	Webster (FL)
Smith (NJ)	Torres (CA)	Welch
Smith (WA)	Torres Small	Wenstrup
Smucker	(NM)	Westerman
Soto	Trahan	Wexton
Spanberger	Trone	Wild
Spano	Turner	Williams
Speier	Underwood	Wilson (FL)
Stanton	Upton	Wilson (SC)
Stauber	Van Drew	Wittman
Stefanik	Vargas	Womack
Steil	Veasey	Woodall
Steube	Vela	Wright
Stevens	Velázquez	Yarmuth
Stewart	Visclosky	Yoho
Stivers	Wagner	Young
Suozzi	Walberg	Zeldin

NOT VOTING—16

Abraham	Ferguson	Roby
Brooks (IN)	Gohmert	Rutherford
Cleaver	Higgins (LA)	Ryan
Cline	Johnson (LA)	Swalwell (CA)
Cummings	McCaul	
Doggett	Pence	

□ 1613

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.

□ 1615

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

Mr. CLOUD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 962, the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under guidelines consistently issued by successive Speakers, as recorded in section 956 of the House Rules and Manual, the Chair is constrained not to entertain the request unless it has been cleared by the bipartisan floor and committee leaderships.

Mr. CLOUD. Mr. Speaker, if this unanimous consent cannot be entertained, I urge the Speaker and the majority leader to immediately schedule the Born-Alive bill.

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

REPORT ON H.R. 2745, MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND VETERANS AFFAIRS AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2020

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 116-63) on the bill (H.R. 2745) making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Af-

fairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Union Calendar and ordered to be printed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1, rule XXI, all points of order are reserved on the bill.

EXPAND HEALTHCARE ACCESS

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

Mr. PAYNE. Madam Speaker, the contrast between Republicans and Democrats on the issue of healthcare could not be any clearer.

Why do Republicans in the Trump administration want to make Americans sick again?

They want to eliminate protections for people with preexisting conditions. They want to take us backward.

Democrats, on the other hand, want to make America healthy.

We want to expand healthcare access. We want to strengthen the Affordable Care Act, and we want to make sure that people with preexisting conditions are not denied insurance coverage.

Madam Speaker, more than 200,000 people in New Jersey who purchased their insurance through the Affordable Care Act marketplace have preexisting conditions. That is why H.R. 986, the Protecting Americans with Preexisting Conditions Act, is so important.

It would block the Trump administration's efforts to weaken the Affordable Care Act's protections for preexisting conditions, because there is no going back to healthcare discrimination.

NATIONAL POLICE WEEK 2019

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

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize this week, May 12 through 18, as National Police Week 2019.

It is a privilege to take time this week to remember and honor our Federal, State, and local law enforcement officers who courageously defend American citizens and protect our communities.

They selflessly put their lives on the line to ensure that this Nation is one of safety and order.

Just this past week, in the First Congressional District of Georgia, this reality hit home when Sergeant Kelvin Ansari passed away in the line of duty while investigating a robbery.

Overall last year, 158 police officers died in the line of duty across the country.

As tens of thousands of police officers gather this week in Washington, D.C., and other cities throughout America, I hope that everyone will take some time to thank these individuals who work to keep us all safe.

To all of our police officers, thank you for your service to our communities. God bless you.

TRUMP ADMINISTRATION AND UKRAINE

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Speaker, how does one define a traitor?

According to Merriam Webster, a traitor is one who betrays another's trust or is false to an obligation or duty.

How does one define a traitor to a Nation?

By this definition, the Trump administration and some of its minions have some explaining to do. While snubbing—and even offending—key U.S. allies, the President and several of his crew have cozied up with Russia time after time.

This certainly doesn't strike me as dutiful.

Well, look at Paul Manafort, his campaign manager, or Michael Flynn, who have chosen to serve their Nation now in Federal prison because of violating the trust of the American people.

This blatant disregard of duty has reached new lows. President Trump's personal lawyer, Rudy Giuliani, recently announced a visit to Ukraine to chase conspiracy theories.

This is a dangerous time for Ukraine. Following a historic election, the Nation is now undergoing a transition of power in the face of Russian invasion.

The House of Representatives is watching. The American people are watching. Pay attention to traitors.

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

REBUILDING OUR NATION'S CRUMBLING INFRASTRUCTURE

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

Mr. SPANO. Madam Speaker, I rise today in honor of Infrastructure Week, a week to highlight the importance and necessity of rebuilding our country's crumbling infrastructure, thus investing in our own future.

The American Society of Civil Engineers gives U.S. infrastructure a "D plus" with over 56,000 bridges considered structurally deficient, major airports unable to keep up with the demand and outdated water pipelines experiencing an estimated 240,000 water main breaks annually.

In fact, my own district in Central Florida, one of the fastest growing in America, is crisscrossed by Interstate 4, which has been deemed one of the most dangerous highways in the entire Nation.

The need to invest in highway improvements, auxiliary roads, public

transportation, and airports is palatable.

As a member of the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, upgrading infrastructure with 21st century technology would benefit all Americans, and can be done in a bipartisan manner.

If we seek to sustain the economic growth witnessed these last 2 years or simply keep our citizenry safe, further expansion of infrastructure hubs is necessary, and we should no longer delay in investing in our future. It is time to build and time for Congress to get to work.

HONORING THE KNIGHTS OF COLUMBUS

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

Mr. VAN DREW. Madam Speaker, from the moment of their founding in 1882, the Knights of Columbus have made charity their first principle.

Their Liberty Council 1910, based at the parish of the Holy Cross in Bridgeton, New Jersey, is made up of a diverse group of men of the Catholic faith who are guided by the principles of charity, unity, fraternity, but particularly, by charity.

A short list of the good works they do includes: blood drives, planning and implementing youth activities, painting the parking lines in their churches, helping the homeless, advocating for the most vulnerable in our society, leading a diaper drive for new mothers in need of assistance, and helping with various fundraisers in the parish.

The Knights are committed to serving their parish, their community, and their country, and they do it without fanfare and without expecting thanks.

I want to thank the men of Liberty Council 1910 and all the local councils for their service to South Jersey, and the National Organization for its service to our great country, the United States of America.

IN RECOGNITION OF BILL DUNLAP

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

Mr. STIVERS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor an outstanding constituent of the 15th Congressional District, Mr. Bill Dunlap, as he retires from his role as deputy director of the Athens-Hocking-Vinton 317 Board.

Madam Speaker, it is not news that we are facing a drug epidemic in this country. Families from Ohio to Oregon are torn apart by addiction, and we can't hope to overcome this crisis without outstanding individuals on the ground in each of those communities, without people who are compassionate and dedicated to their neighbors, without people like Bill Dunlap.

I have had a chance to see Mr. Dunlap's work firsthand over the

years. We have collaborated on drug task forces, and other community initiatives, and I can't say enough about his dedication and commitment to combating the drug crisis.

I can say without a doubt, Athens, Hocking and Vinton Counties—and truly, all of southeastern Ohio—are better and healthier places as a result of his efforts.

Madam Speaker, I am incredibly grateful for Bill's service and his leadership. I wish him the best in his next chapter.

ENSURING RELIGIOUS LIBERTY

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

Mr. LIPINSKI. Madam Speaker, all Americans deserve equal treatment under the law and should have these rights protected, including individuals in the LGBT community.

They should be able to compete equally for jobs, be assured equal opportunity in education, housing, financial, and judicial settings.

At the same time, the free exercise of religious beliefs is a core ideal of our country, protected in the Constitution and through Federal law.

The Equality Act explicitly prevents application of the Religious Freedom Restoration Act, RFRA. This law was passed nearly unanimously in 1993 by a Democratic House, Senate, and White House.

Congress has never passed a law that shrinks or exempts itself from RFRA. It is critical to ensuring that religious freedom stands a chance of being fully lived out and fairly treated in court.

This week, I will vote for the Equality Act for the broader goals. But before it becomes law, we must do more to ensure religious liberty.

THE EQUALITY ACT ENDGAME

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

Mr. FULCHER. Madam Speaker, usually it is easy to identify the endgame for bad policy.

Those who want open borders are looking for more votes. Those who support things like the Green New Deal want to eliminate fossil fuels and American energy strength along with it.

But here is the endgame for the Equality Act, or H.R. 5. It would flip our moral, social, legal, and religious fabric of this Nation upside down.

By erasing the recognition of gender from Federal law, the traditional family, laws, religious beliefs, morality and/or identity gets erased with it.

Madam Speaker, every man and woman in this body are special, and they should vote "no" on H.R. 5.

□ 1630

THE MUELLER REPORT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Speaker, I rise today to lead a reading of parts of the Mueller report, otherwise called the "Report On The Investigation Into Russian Interference In The 2016 Presidential Election." As I said, it is more commonly known as the Mueller report. It documents widespread and effective foreign intervention to target voters and influence the outcome of the 2016 election.

This operation, led by Russian agents, was a direct attack on our democracy. The report has not been taken seriously by the administration. Even worse, it has been ignored for fear it would somehow minimize President Trump's electoral college victory and bruise his ego.

It is critical that we set the record straight and work to address an ongoing threat that Russia poses to our future elections.

My fellow Members and I will be reading excerpts taken directly from the report, documenting the Russian campaign to secure a Trump Presidency.

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

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HECK), to read his quote.

Mr. HECK. Madam Speaker, from volume I, page 14, section 2, entitled: "Russian 'Active Measures' Social Media Campaign," it read as follows:

"The IRA"—which was a Russian troll farm. "The IRA and its employees began operations targeting the United States as early as 2014. Using fictitious U.S. personas, IRA employees operated social media accounts and group pages designed to attract U.S. audiences. These groups and accounts, which addressed divisive U.S. political and social issues, falsely claimed to be controlled by U.S. activists. Over time, the social media accounts became a means to reach large U.S. audiences. IRA employees traveled to the United States in mid-2014 on an intelligence-gathering mission to obtain information and photographs for use in their social media posts."

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for coming.

I yield to the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE) to read a quote from the Mueller report.

Ms. MOORE. Madam Speaker, of course I am reading from volume I, pages 22 through 24, inclusive.

"Dozens of IRA employees were responsible for operating accounts and personas on different U.S. social media platforms. The IRA referred to employees assigned to operate the social

media accounts as ‘specialists.’ Starting as early as 2014, the IRA’s U.S. operations included social media specialists focusing on Facebook, YouTube, and Twitter. The IRA later added specialists who operated on Tumblr and Instagram accounts.

“Initially, the IRA created social media accounts that pretended to be the personal accounts of U.S. persons. By early 2015, the IRA began to create larger social media groups, or public social media pages that claimed (falsely) to be affiliated with the U.S. political and grassroots organizations. In certain cases, the IRA created accounts that mimicked real U.S. organizations. For example, one IRA-controlled Twitter account, @TEN—GOP, purported to be connected to the Tennessee Republican Party. More commonly, the IRA created accounts in the name of fictitious U.S. organizations and grassroots groups and used these accounts to pose as anti-immigration groups, Tea Party activists, Black Lives Matter protesters, and other U.S. social and political activists.

“The IRA closely monitored the activity of the social media accounts—redacted. By February 2016, internal IRA documents referred to support for the Trump campaign and opposition to candidate Clinton. For example,—redacted—directions to IRA operators—redacted. ‘Main idea: Use any opportunity to criticize Hillary Clinton and the rest, (except Sanders and Trump—we support them)’—redacted.

“The focus on the U.S. Presidential campaign continued throughout 2016. In—redacted—2016 internal—redacted—reviewing the IRA-controlled Facebook book ‘Secured Borders’ the author criticized the ‘lower number of posts dedicated to criticizing Hillary Clinton’ and reminded the Facebook specialist, ‘it is imperative to intensify criticizing Hillary Clinton.’ IRA employees also acknowledged that their work focused on influencing the U.S. Presidential election—redacted.”

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for reading.

Madam Speaker, I am going to read a quote from the Mueller reporter dealing with Russian interference.

“The first form of Russian election influence came principally from the Internet Research Agency”—and you will hear this evening, over and over again, the name IRA, and that is what it is—“the Internet Research Agency, LLC (IRA), a Russian organization, funded by Yevgeniy Viktorovich Prigozhin and companies he controlled, including Concord Management and Consulting LLC and Concord Catering, (collectively ‘Concord’). The IRA conducted social media operations targeted at large U.S. audiences with the goal of sowing discord in the U.S. political system. These operations constituted ‘active measures’”—and it is translated into Russian—“a term that typically refers to operations conducted by Russian security services aimed at influencing the course of international affairs.”

That is volume I, page 14.

I am going to read one more, and this is from volume I, pages 14 and 15.

“By the end of the 2016 U.S. election, the IRA”—that is that Russian organization that has influenced the media in the United States of America in our elections—“the IRA had the ability to reach millions of U.S. persons through their social media accounts. Multiple IRA-controlled Facebook groups and Instagram accounts had hundreds of thousands of U.S. participants. IRA-controlled Twitter accounts separately had tens of thousands of followers, including multiple U.S. political figures who retweeted IRA-created content. In November 2017, a Facebook representative testified that Facebook had identified 470 IRA-controlled Facebook accounts that collectively made 80,000 posts between January 2015 and August 2017. Facebook estimated the IRA reached as many as 126 million persons through its Facebook accounts. In January 2018, Twitter announced that it had identified 3,814 IRA-controlled Twitter accounts and notified approximately 1.4 million people Twitter believed may have been in contact with an IRA-controlled account.”

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE).

Ms. MOORE. “The IRA organized and promoted political rallies inside the United States while posing as U.S. grassroots activists. First, the IRA used one of its preexisting social media personas (Facebook groups and Twitter accounts, for example) to announce and promote the event. The IRA then sent a large number of direct messages to followers of its social media account asking them to attend the event. From those who responded with interest in attending, the IRA then sought a U.S. person to serve as the event’s coordinator. In most cases, the IRA account operator would tell the U.S. person that they personally could not attend the event due to some preexisting conflict or because they were somewhere else in the United States. The IRA then further promoted the event by contacting U.S. media about the event and directing them to speak with the coordinator. After the event, the IRA posted videos and photographs of the event to the IRA’s social media accounts.

“The office identified dozens of U.S. rallies organized by the IRA. The earliest evidence of a rally was a ‘confederate rally’ in November 2015. The IRA continued to organize rallies, even after the 2016 U.S. Presidential election. The attendance at rallies varied. Some rallies appear to have drawn few (if any) participants, while others drew hundreds. The reach and success of these rallies was closely monitored—redacted.”

“Redacted.”

“From June 2016 until the end of Presidential campaign, almost all the U.S. rallies organized by the IRA focused on the U.S. election, often promoting the Trump campaign and opposing the Clinton campaign. Pro-

Trump rallies included three in New York, a series of pro-Trump rallies in Florida in August 2016, and a series of pro-Trump rallies in October 2016 in Pennsylvania. The Florida rallies drew the attention of the Trump campaign, which posted about the Miami rally on candidate Trump’s Facebook account (as discussed below).

“Many of the same IRA employees who oversaw the IRA’s social media accounts also conducted the day-to-day recruiting for political rallies inside the United States.”

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Speaker, let me just remind everyone that the IRA stands for the organization that coordinated all of the online activities dealing with interference in the U.S. election.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER) to read a quote.

Ms. SPEIER. Madam Speaker, this is from volume I, page 6.

“Summer 2016. Russian outreach to the Trump campaign continued into the summer of 2016, as candidate Trump was becoming the presumptive Republican nominee for President. On June 9, 2016, for example, a Russian lawyer met with senior Trump campaign officials Donald Trump, Jr., Jared Kushner, and campaign chairman Paul Manafort to deliver what the email proposing the meeting had described as ‘official documents and information that would incriminate Hillary.’”

□ 1645

“The materials were offered to Trump Jr. as ‘part of Russia and its government’s support for Mr. Trump.’ The written communications setting up the meeting showed that the campaign anticipated receiving information from Russia that could assist candidate Trump’s electoral prospects, but the Russian lawyer’s presentation did not provide such information.”

Testimony of Colin Stretch, the general counsel of Facebook. This is in volume I, page 15.

“We estimate that roughly 29 million people were served content in their news feeds directly from the IRA’s,” and that stands for the Internet Research Agency’s, “80,000 posts over the 2 years.”

The IRA is the Russian organization in which some 30 persons have been indicted.

“Posts from these pages were also shared, liked, and followed by people on Facebook, and, as a result, three times more people may have been exposed to a story that originated from the Russian operation. Our best estimate is that approximately 126 million people may have been served content from a page associated with the IRA at some point during the 2-year period.”

“The Facebook representative also testified that Facebook had identified 170 Instagram accounts that posted approximately 120,000 pieces of content during that time. Facebook did not

offer an estimate of the audience reached via Instagram.”

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Reading from volume I, page 33.

“The investigation identified two different forms of connections between the IRA and members of the Trump campaign. (The investigation identified no similar connections between the IRA and the Clinton campaign.) First, on multiple occasions, members and surrogates of the Trump campaign promoted—typically by linking, retweeting, or similar methods of reposting—pro-Trump or anti-Clinton content published by the IRA through IRA-controlled social media accounts. Additionally, in a few instances, IRA employees represented themselves as U.S. persons to communicate with members of the Trump campaign in an effort to seek assistance and coordination on IRA-organized political rallies inside the United States.”

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from the great State of Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE).

Ms. MOORE. Madam Speaker, I will be reading now from volume I, page 36.

“Beginning in March 2016, units of the Russian Federation’s Main Intelligence Directorate of the General Staff (GRU) hacked the computers and email accounts of organizations, employees, and volunteers supporting the Clinton campaign, including the email account of campaign chairman John Podesta. Starting in April 2016, the GRU hacked into the computer networks of the Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee (DCCC) and the Democratic National Committee (DNC).

“The GRU targeted hundreds of email accounts used by Clinton campaign employees, advisers, and volunteers. In total, the GRU stole hundreds of thousands of documents from the compromised email accounts and networks. The GRU later released stolen Clinton campaign and DNC documents through online personas, ‘DCLeaks’ and ‘Guccifer 2.0,’ and later through the organization WikiLeaks. The release of the documents was designed and timed to interfere with the 2016 U.S. Presidential election and undermine the Clinton campaign.

“The Trump campaign showed interest in the WikiLeaks releases and, in the summer and fall of 2016—redacted. After—redacted—WikiLeaks’ first Clinton-related release—redacted—the Trump campaign stayed in contact—redacted—about WikiLeaks’ activities. The investigation was unable to resolve—redacted—WikiLeaks’ release of the stolen Podesta emails on October 7, 2016, the same day a video from years earlier was published of Trump using graphic language about women.”

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Volume I, page 35.

“Starting in June 2016, the IRA contacted different U.S. persons affiliated with the Trump campaign in an effort to coordinate pro-Trump IRA-organized rallies inside the United States.

In all cases, the IRA contacted the campaign while claiming to be U.S. political activists working on behalf of a conservative grassroots organization. The IRA’s contacts included requests for signs and other materials to use at rallies, as well as requests to promote the rallies and help coordinate logistics.

“While certain campaign volunteers agreed to provide the requested support (for example, agreeing to set aside a number of signs), the investigation has not identified evidence that any Trump campaign official understood the requests were coming from foreign nationals.”

Volume I, page 35.

“In sum, the investigation established that Russia interfered in the 2016 Presidential election through the ‘active measures’ social media campaign carried out by the IRA, an organization funded by Prigozhin and companies that he controlled. As explained further . . . the office concluded (and a grand jury has alleged) that Prigozhin, his companies, and IRA employees violated U.S. law through these operations, principally by undermining through deceptive acts the work of Federal agencies charged with regulating foreign influence in the U.S. elections.”

That is also volume I, page 35.

Volume I, pages 42 and 43.

“On June 14, 2016, the DNC and its cyber-response team announced the breach of the DNC network and suspected theft of DNC documents. In the statements, the cyber-response team alleged that Russian state-sponsored actors (which they referred to as ‘Fancy Bear’) were responsible for the breach.

“Apparently in response to that announcement, on June 15, 2016, GRU officers,” that is, the Russian spy agency officers, “using the persona Guccifer 2.0 created a WordPress blog. In the hours leading up to the launch of that WordPress blog, GRU officers logged into a Moscow-based server used and managed by Unit 74455 and searched for a number of specific words and phrases in English, including ‘some hundred sheets,’ ‘illuminati,’ and ‘worldwide known.’ Approximately 2 hours after the last of those searches, Guccifer 2.0 published its first post, attributing the DNC server hack to a lone Romanian hacker and using several of the unique English words and phrases that the GRU officers had searched for that day.

“That same day, June 15, 2016, the GRU also used the Guccifer 2.0 WordPress blog to begin releasing to the public documents stolen from the DNC and DCCC computer networks. The Guccifer 2.0 persona ultimately released thousands of documents stolen from the DNC and DCCC in a series of blog posts between June 15, 2016, and October 18, 2016.

“Released documents included opposition research performed by the DNC (including a memorandum analyzing potential criticisms of candidate

Trump), internal policy documents (such as recommendations on how to address politically sensitive issues), analyses of specific congressional races, and fundraising documents. Releases were organized around thematic issues, such as specific States (e.g., Florida and Pennsylvania) that were perceived as competitive in the 2016 U.S. Presidential election.”

That is volume I, pages 42 and 43.

This is now volume I, pages 49 and 50.

“Unit 26165 officers also hacked into a DNC account hosted on a cloud-computing service—redacted. On September 20, 2016, the GRU began to generate copies of the DNC data using—redacted—function designed to allow users to produce backups of databases (referred to—redacted—as ‘snapshots’). The GRU then stole those snapshots by moving them to—redacted—account that they controlled; from there, the copies were moved to GRU-controlled computers. The GRU stole approximately 300 gigabytes of data from the DNC cloud-based account.”

That was volume I, pages 49 and 50.

This is volume I, page 50.

“In addition to targeting individuals involved in the Clinton campaign, GRU officers also targeted individuals and entities involved in the administration of the elections. Victims included U.S. State and local entities, such as State boards of elections (SBOEs), secretaries of state, and county governments, as well as individuals who worked for those entities. The GRU also targeted private technology firms responsible for manufacturing and administering election-related software and hardware, such as voter registration software and electronic polling stations.”

□ 1700

“The GRU continued to target these victims through the elections in November 2016. While the investigation identified evidence that the GRU targeted these individuals and entities, the office did not investigate further. The office did not, for instance, obtain or examine servers or other relevant items belonging to these victims. The office understands that the FBI, the U.S. Department of Homeland Security, and the States have separately investigated that activity.”

This is volume I, pages 51 and 52.

“The Trump campaign showed interest in WikiLeaks’ releases of hacked materials throughout the summer and fall of 2016—redacted.

“On June 12, 2016, Assange claimed in a televised interview to ‘have emails relating to Hillary Clinton which are pending publication,’ but provided no additional context.

“In debriefings with the office, former Deputy Campaign Chairman Rick Gates said that,—redacted. Gates recalled candidate Trump being generally frustrated that the Clinton emails had not been found.”

“Gates recalled candidate Trump being generally frustrated”—again it

says—“that the Clinton emails had not been found.”

Again, that is volume I, pages 51 and 52.

I am hoping that some more Members come down, but if not, I am going to read just a couple more things.

“Many IRA operations used Facebook accounts created and operated by its specialists—redacted.

“IRA Facebook groups active during the 2016 campaign covered a range of political issues and included purported conservative groups (with names such as ‘Being Patriotic,’ ‘Stop All Immigrants,’ ‘Secured Borders,’ and ‘Tea Party News,’), purported Black social justice groups (‘Black Matters,’ ‘Blacktivist,’ and ‘Don’t Shoot Us’), LGBTQ groups (‘LGBT United’), and religious groups (‘United Muslims of America.’)

“Throughout 2016, IRA accounts published an increasing number of materials supporting the Trump campaign and opposing the Clinton campaign. For example, on May 31, 2016, the operational account ‘Matt Skiber’ began to privately message dozens of pro-Trump Facebook groups asking them to help plan a ‘pro-Trump rally near Trump Tower.’

“To reach larger U.S. audiences, the IRA purchased advertisements from Facebook that promoted the IRA groups on the news feeds of U.S. audience members. According to Facebook, the IRA purchased over 3,500 advertisements and the expenditures totaled approximately \$100,000.

“During the U.S. Presidential campaign, many IRA-purchased advertisements explicitly supported or opposed a Presidential candidate or promoted U.S. rallies organized by the IRA (discussed below). As early as March 2016, the IRA purchased advertisements that overtly opposed the Clinton campaign. For example, on March 18, 2016, the IRA purchased an advertisement depicting candidate Clinton and a caption that read in part, ‘If one day God lets this liar enter the White House as a President—that day would be a real national tragedy.’”

That was a quote from the ad that they paid for.

“Similarly, on April 6, 2016, the IRA purchased advertisements for its account ‘Black Matters’ calling for a ‘flash mob’ of U.S. persons to ‘take a photo with #HillaryClintonForPrison2016 or #noHillary2016.’ IRA-purchased advertisements featuring Clinton were, with very few exceptions, negative.”

Again, this is a Russian agency, Russian corporation.

“IRA-purchased advertisements referencing candidate Trump largely supported his campaign. The first known IRA advertisement explicitly endorsing the Trump campaign was purchased on April 19, 2016. The IRA bought an advertisement for its Instagram account ‘Tea Party News’ asking U.S. persons to help them ‘make a patriotic team of young Trump supporters’”—I will say

that again: “make a patriotic team of young Trump supporters”—“by uploading photos with the hashtag #KIDS4TRUMP. In subsequent months, the IRA purchased dozens of advertisements supporting the Trump campaign, predominantly through the Facebook groups ‘Being Patriotic,’ ‘Stop All Invaders’ and ‘Secured Borders.’

“Collectively, the IRA’s social media accounts reached tens of millions of U.S. persons. Individual IRA social media accounts attracted hundreds of thousands of followers. For example, at the time they were deactivated by Facebook in mid-2017, the IRA’s ‘United Muslims of America’ Facebook group had over 300,000 followers, the ‘Don’t Shoot Us’ Facebook group had over 250,000 followers, the ‘Being Patriotic’ Facebook group had over 200,000 followers, and the ‘Secured Borders’ Facebook group had over 130,000 followers. According to Facebook, in total the IRA-controlled accounts made over 80,000 posts before their deactivation in August 2017, and these posts reached at least 29 million U.S. persons and ‘may have reached an estimated 126 million people.’”

That is Volume I, pages 24 to 26.

Madam Speaker, I am going to yield back my time.

I think it is worth people taking a look at the Mueller report. You can get it in book form. You can also download it for free. It can be downloaded for free from—I think it is the Justice Department, isn’t it? The Justice Department website.

I think, seeing the extent and reading the words that talk about the extent of Russian interference in our elections is really important, especially as we head into a new election cycle where Americans want to have confidence that their vote really matters, that the messages that they are getting are legitimate ones from inside the United States of America, and that Russian or any other foreign influence is not using the internet, using names that are supposed to sound like they are American organizations and American websites and American Facebook pages.

I think it is very important for people to learn about that. It is worth the read.

Actually, if you consider all the redactions, it is not as long a read as you might think. And then all of us would be informed.

About 3 percent of Americans have read the Mueller report, and I would certainly encourage more.

One of our colleagues, MARY GAY SCANLON, I know, is going to begin at noon tomorrow with a full reading. It is going to be done in one of the House rooms here, upstairs in the Rules Committee, a reading of the Mueller report.

Otherwise, I think people have misguided information about what is in it and the idea that there is really nothing at all that is important.

Those Americans who are interested in the sanctity of our elections, I would

very much encourage. You could even watch the reading that is going on starting at noon tomorrow of the full Mueller report. And consider the threat to our elections and that we have to do everything we can to make sure that there is no outside interference.

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

REPUBLICAN STUDY COMMITTEE BUDGET

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BANKS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BANKS. Madam Speaker, the former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Mike Mullen, called our national debt “the single biggest threat to national security.”

Since then, we have added more than \$7 trillion more in red ink. Our national debt today stands at \$22 trillion, and it is only getting worse.

The Congressional Budget Office is projecting trillion-dollar deficits in perpetuity. These deficits will leave future generations like my daughter’s generation saddled with higher taxes, stagnant growth, and a lower standard of living. This is simply unacceptable.

Thankfully, pro-growth policies implemented by President Trump and congressional Republicans have led to a booming economy with 3.2 percent GDP growth and unemployment below 4 percent.

Our strong economy provides Congress a unique opportunity to tackle this problem, but bold leadership is required to do so.

Unfortunately, it is clear that there will be no such leadership from the Democrats. The Democrats have failed to perform the most basic function of government, which is passing a budget. In fact, they have not even bothered to bring a budget to the floor for a vote. Why, you might ask? Because the radical left is now in control of the Democratic agenda and demanding trillions of dollars in additional spending for programs like the Green New Deal, which aims to eliminate everything from air travel to requiring every single building in the United States to be rebuilt or upgraded, banning farting cows, and will cost upwards of \$92 trillion to implement; or, another budget-busting initiative like Medicare-for-all, which would increase government spending by \$32 trillion over the next decade.

□ 1715

Think about that for a moment. The Democrats look at \$22 trillion in debt,

trillion-dollar deficits, and think that we aren't spending enough already of our taxpayer dollars.

Thankfully, the Republican Study Committee is here to do something about it, and we have taken the challenge head-on.

As chairman of the Republican Study Committee's Budget and Spending Task Force, I am very proud to have worked with a task force of eight of my colleagues, as well as the rest of our 141-member strong Republican Study Committee, to produce the "Preserving American Freedom" budget resolution.

This budget reduces government debt by cutting \$12.6 trillion in wasteful spending over the next 10 years.

It ensures permanent solvency for Medicare and Social Security so that these programs will exist for the seniors who rely on them today, as well as for future generations.

It repeals ObamaCare and gives unprecedented control to the States to design healthcare programs that fit the unique needs of their citizens.

It reforms welfare to move more people into employment with a sense of purpose and self-reliance.

Finally, it matches President Trump's commitment to national security by fully funding the border wall and making the necessary investments in our military to ensure the safety of the American people from foreign threats.

The "Preserving American Freedom" budget is the only serious proposal from Congress to address Washington's addiction to spending and a bloated and growing national debt. I am very proud to have led the RSC's effort to tackle this generational challenge and ensure a brighter future for all Americans.

Madam Speaker, tonight, we are going to hear from some of my colleagues about this very important budget proposal and what we can do to address fiscal responsibility so desperately needed in Washington, D.C.

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

Mr. CLOUD. Madam Speaker, I am rising also to join my coworkers in advocating for fiscal responsibility as Congress seeks to craft a budget.

The RSC budget is bold, and I am pleased to see it include such proposals as requiring the Congressional Budget Office to account for debt servicing in the cost estimates they prepare for Congress. My bill, H.R. 638, the Cost Estimates Improvement Act, would do that very thing.

Before legislation passes either the House or the Senate, lawmakers should know how much it will actually cost. This would seem to go without saying, but lawmakers consistently overlook one key cost, the new interest payments their spending will create. Folks back home understand how important this is, that we should be honest about the true cost of spending.

If you were budgeting for monthly car payments and only considered the

list price of the car itself and didn't factor in the extra cost of interest payments, you would later discover that the total cost is more than you could afford. Unfortunately, this is exactly what Congress does when considering new spending.

Congress relies on the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office and the Joint Committee on Taxation to estimate the cost of legislation. But Congress does not require either of them to include the cost of servicing the additional debt that is created by authorizing or reauthorizing spending. This results in an incomplete picture of the total actual cost.

Servicing national debt is becoming a substantial part of Federal spending. Within just a few years, our Nation will be spending more on interest payments than on the entire Department of Defense. This should alarm all of us, as this will increasingly crowd out other spending priorities.

I introduced H.R. 638, the Cost Estimates Improvement Act, to address these problems by requiring the Congressional Budget Office and the Joint Committee on Taxation to add the cost of servicing the debt to the cost estimates of any future legislation.

In essence, Congress is not considering the comprehensive budgetary impact of spending and tax proposals. This distorts congressional decision-making in favor of more spending and debt accumulation.

Congress routinely ignores the true costs and overstates the benefits of new spending. The American people have to account for the cost of debt in their family budgets, and providing Congress with accurate cost estimates that include the cost of debt servicing is a commonsense reform that would hold Congress to the same standard, forcing lawmakers to reckon with the actual cost of raising our national debt.

Mr. BANKS. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MITCHELL), my good friend and fellow classmate of the last congressional class, a great conservative leader in the Congress.

Mr. MITCHELL. Madam Speaker, I thank the budget action team chair for this fine work and for yielding time.

We should be debating right now in Congress a budget. We should be debating ideas from the Democrats, ideas from the Republicans, the RSC budget. We should be doing that to develop a road map for the current year and for future years for appropriations, what our priorities are.

You will note that we are talking about it, but it is pretty quiet down here today. Why? Because, unfortunately, the leadership of the Democratic Party has been unable to produce a budget. They can't agree, even among themselves, what a budget should be.

I spent 35 years in private business. Budgets are pretty basic. Without them, I don't know how you operate.

Apparently, we are going to try, and that is unfortunate.

My focus tonight is on the Federal budgeting and appropriations process and what we need to do to fix it. We can fix individual items in our budget, but long term, we need to fix the process, or we are, in fact, as noted earlier by Mr. CLOUD, doomed for some pretty dire outcomes.

The Federal budget and appropriations restraints under current law are totally ineffective. They simply do not work. And you know what? We can fix this.

Virtually all Federal spending right now is mandatory. Two-thirds of what we spend every year is called mandatory spending. It is on autopilot.

Let me give you some examples of what that means. \$2,523 billion is mandatory. Our interest payments in 2018 will be \$325 billion. I want you to stop and think about what a massive number that is.

The Federal debt crossed \$22 trillion last year. It now exceeds the entire annual production of the United States and equates to more than \$67,000 for every American in this country. Over the next 10 years, interest alone on the Federal debt will be the third largest Federal expenditure.

Now, at home, if that was what you were dealing with, you would be calling a debt counselor. If your interest payment alone was the third highest expenditure you had—never mind principal, just the interest—you are in serious trouble. Here, we call it government.

This process robs the American people of their voice, their representation. Long term, it will rob them of the basic opportunity for services if we don't get this under control.

The RSC "Preserving American Freedom" budget proposal and what I propose address that issue.

First and foremost, we must address what is called mandatory spending. Mandatory spending has taken on this huge component. As I said, it is two-thirds of Federal expenditures.

We need to move everything except Social Security, Medicare, and TRICARE to discretionary spending and require everybody in this room and this building to vote, to put their priorities forward, rather than have it be on autopilot.

The second thing we need to do is not have it simply be whatever we spent last year. How much more are we going to spend? We need to require zero-based budgeting of all agencies every few years—maybe 3 years because they are so big, frankly—where they have to justify down to the penny what they are spending money on. Because you know what a budget cut is in Washington? A budget cut in Washington is you get less money than the increase you asked for and they tell you they took a budget cut.

I spent 35 years in private business. A budget cut means you actually spend less than what you spent last year. You

spend less money, less real cash, not that you didn't get as much as you asked for.

Frankly, that is like my teenagers and allowance. Well, you cut my budget. No, I didn't give you as much as you asked for.

Second, the next thing we need to do is we need to use a 51-vote requirement for budgets, 51 votes to pass a budget, a simple majority. We need to say 51 votes to make any change in discretionary outlays. That way, in fact, we can manage our budget appropriations and not have the system manage us, not have the Senate decide no, we need 60 votes, and we just go along our merry way, putting out money hand over fist.

Additionally, we need to change a few rules about how we manage ourselves. We need to require there be no recess until budget appropriations are completed. Everyone stays here. Frankly, I think we just lock the doors and stay here till we get it done because, far too often, we will just do a continuing resolution.

You would be disgusted at the number of continuing resolutions that happen for a week, 3 days. All these continuing resolutions, all we do is spend the same money. So, sorry, no recess until we get it done.

Additionally, we need to withhold the pay for all Members of Congress until we get the job done, until there are budget and appropriations resolutions done for the year.

When we hit the time that we should be funded already for the year, if it is not done, everyone on the payroll here that is a Member of Congress doesn't get paid, because I know how to get folks' attention after 35 years in private business.

There is one way to put it: Follow the money. Other ways are not appropriate on the floor of the House, but you have the idea.

We have to address this issue. The only way to address this is to get our appropriations under control.

One of the things I proposed, in conjunction with another Member, is the Protecting Our Children's Future Act, which talks about these changes that must be made in how we do budgeting and appropriations in a process. Otherwise, we just do the same thing over and over again here in Congress, and that, Madam Speaker, is the perfect definition of insanity.

I appreciate the time to talk about something I think is so urgent because, without this fundamental change, we are tilting at windmills. We need to make this change sooner than later.

Mr. BANKS. Madam Speaker, what I hear from Hoosiers all over my district is that they sent their Representatives here to bring back fiscal sanity, to balance our budget. That is what hard-working Hoosier families do every day.

It is what they have come to find in their State legislature in my great home State of Indiana as well. Indiana has a balanced budget amendment. We

have legislators who go to the State house and pass fiscally responsible budgets every 2 years.

It was a pleasure of mine for 6 years to serve with the next speaker, somebody who is a true American hero and one of the great conservative leaders of this freshman class in the new Congress.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BAIRD).

Mr. BAIRD. Madam Speaker, I rise today to offer my support for the RSC 2020 budget.

I have a copy of that here, so I encourage everyone to take the opportunity to study it and look for those positive aspects that are important that Congressman BANKS and his team put together to have a balanced budget.

It reduces Federal spending by over \$12 trillion in the next decade and balances our Federal budget in the next 6 years.

As the gentleman mentioned, the State of Indiana passed an amendment to the constitution in 2018 to require our budgets to balance, and Hoosiers have enjoyed a balanced State budget since 2012.

We are among a minority of States that have a Triple-A credit rating, and Indiana has cut 15 different taxes while still balancing our budget and funding key State priorities.

This proposed budget addresses out-of-control spending and rightfully aims to significantly decrease our national debt. We are \$22 trillion in debt as a Nation. That is not my money. That is money that belongs to the taxpayers. Because we have been paying interest on this debt for decades, it is really the money of our next generation of American taxpayers, our kids and our grandchildren.

Madam Speaker, I am proud of what Hoosiers have been able to do in our State, and I will continue to fight for that same Hoosier common sense here in D.C.

□ 1730

Mr. BANKS. Madam Speaker, the State of Indiana has so much to be proud of. Indiana provides a road map for the rest of the Nation when it comes to fiscal responsibility.

There are few leaders in the House of Representatives who do as much for the conservative cause and promote fiscal responsibility as Representative HICE from the great State of Georgia.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. HICE).

Mr. HICE of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I thank my good friend for yielding, and I appreciate those kind words.

Madam Speaker, I rise with my colleagues this evening in support of the Republican Study Committee budget for 2020.

Here in Congress, there are immense problems and vast issues that we deal with, and sometimes they can feel overwhelming. For that reason, it is important that we have a purpose, that

we have a vision, that we have a pathway to get us out of some of the issues that we face and to give us a sense of purpose for getting through those things, a playbook, if you will.

Madam Speaker, I just want to publicly commend my colleagues who have labored so diligently to put together this draft. I especially want to recognize the RSC chairman, MIKE JOHNSON, and the Spending Task Force chairman, JIM BANKS, my good friend. Their leadership has been invaluable, and we are deeply appreciative to all of them.

I am particularly pleased that in this budget they have included a proposal to eliminate official time. This is something I have been working on for a long time.

For those who may not be familiar with it, official time allows a Federal employee who is part of a union to conduct union activities in the course of their workday even if that means not doing the job that they were hired to do.

In many cases, people are hired to do a job and yet 100 percent of their time is spent doing Federal union activities, and so the taxpayer is paying these people to do a job which they are not doing. It ends up these agencies have to hire someone else to do a job while the first individual is doing union activities rather than that for which they were hired.

Over the years since I have been here, I have personally tried to cut some of the official time usage. That didn't work. We have tried diligently to reform official time, to no avail. We have even tried to just provide some degree of transparency, and yet in every attempt, everything that we have tried to do, we have faced tremendous opposition both from Federal employee unions and many of their allies here in Congress.

Make no mistake, the opposition is real; it is strong; it is entrenched in this place. And yet we have got to continue to move forward. We have got to try to address these issues.

The Federal bureaucracy has tremendous power and influence over our lives, and yet in this case of official time, there is little to no transparency or accountability.

To add to the problem, it is virtually impossible to remove a Federal employee. According to the GAO, the Government Accountability Office, it can take between 170 and 370 days to remove a bad actor, a bad worker in a Federal position, and this is because of the appeals process, grievances that can be filed, complaints that just drag on and on and on.

There are thousands, by the way, of Federal employees who agree with me. Recently, a survey found that 31 percent of Federal employees feel that there are few to little steps taken to remove or deal with poor-performing employees in the Federal Government.

So, Madam Speaker, we need to restore fiscal sanity around here. We

need to enforce accountability and instill transparency in our Federal Government, and I believe this RSC budget is a step in that direction. It rises in stark contrast to the nonexistent budget of the Democratic majority.

So with that, again, I thank my friend for yielding to me.

Mr. BANKS. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments tonight.

Madam Speaker, as I said before, there are 140 members of the Republican Study Committee. Many of those 140 members are new freshman Members who were elected just beginning of this Congress, who are conservative Members who stepped up to the plate to preach fiscal responsibility, to keep the commitments that they made on the campaign trail. One of those new Members is my colleague and friend, Representative HERN from Oklahoma.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. KEVIN HERN).

Mr. KEVIN HERN of Oklahoma. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I stand with my colleagues today to stress the importance of fiscal health in our country.

There is a very real problem here. If we don't address it, we are condemning our children to doom.

My colleagues across the aisle like to use the 12 years left hyperbole to talk about the necessity to act on climate change, but they ignore the fiscal cliff we are standing on, a much more imminent threat to the well-being of our country and our people.

Instead of addressing the debt crisis, the Democrat majority chose not to draft a budget at all this year. That tells us all we need to know about their priorities.

Speaker PELOSI herself said: Show me your budget, and I will show you your values.

So, without a budget, what are the majority's values?

The RSC budget addresses our deficits and aims to balance by 2025. This budget refocuses spending on our core constitutional responsibilities and limits the growth of government.

Forty-nine out of the 50 United States are required to have a balanced budget, but the Federal Government does not have that requirement. A budget that balances is the first and most important step towards financial well-being for our country.

I spent more than 30 years as a business owner before coming to Congress. In the business world, a company will fail if they continually spend more money than they bring in. You just can't do it.

That is a foreign concept to many of my colleagues here. In fact, several people in this building believe that the best way to address our debt is to ignore its existence entirely. That is just simply ridiculous. Problems don't just disappear. They don't disappear for you or me. You have to take corrective action, and this budget does just that.

The former Secretary of Defense, General James Mattis, testified that our national debt is the greatest threat to our democracy. It is rather chilling that we borrow money from other nations to fund things like our military, who then must protect us from the very nations that we borrow money from.

We can only defend ourselves on borrowed money for so long. What happens when we run out of other people's money?

I find it interesting that Democrats only seem to care about our debt after we start putting taxpayer dollars back in people's pockets. No one is talking about the fact that Democrat proposals coming from Congress will, alone, cost over \$100 trillion in new spending. Why aren't we holding hearings about that?

This budget is the only budget put forward in the House so far. It deserves our attention and our consideration because we are the only ones trying to right the ship.

Mr. BANKS. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments.

As the gentleman from Oklahoma said, the Republican Study Committee budget is the only budget proposal on the table. It is the only proposal that balances the budget, that begins to rein in wasteful government spending and begins to pay down a disastrous \$22 trillion national debt.

There are few Members in this Congress whom I have served with who have preached fiscal responsibility as much as my friend and my colleague from Georgia (Mr. ALLEN).

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ALLEN).

Mr. ALLEN. Madam Speaker, I thank Congressman BANKS for yielding, for the Special Order here this evening, for his leadership in crafting this very important budget, and for this discussion we are having on it tonight.

Madam Speaker, obviously, we have been waiting on a budget to vote on in the United States Congress and have yet to see a budget. Then I think we learned that there may not be a budget in the United States Congress this year.

That is very hard to understand because we are spending \$4 trillion to \$4.2 trillion. Two-thirds of that \$4.2 trillion is mandatory spending, which is basically on automatic pilot, and it is skyrocketing. The biggest increases in our deficit are created by this mandatory spending.

On the discretionary side, it is about a third of what we spend totally. As far as discretionary spending goes, we have had some modest increases.

For the first part of the time that I was in Congress, we basically had budget caps, and, actually, discretionary spending was held to the same level the entire time.

I think it is sad that we are financing our standard of living in my generation on the backs of my children and their children and their children and their children.

So what do we do about it?

I am very proud to talk about what JIM BANKS and his leadership and what the Republican Study Committee have done in presenting here this evening. This budget exemplifies fiscal sanity and preserves American freedom.

As most of you know, I spent my career in the running of small businesses, starting out in the construction industry, then participating in the banking industry and electronic medical records and real estate development. I did this in conjunction with my wife, Robin, as my partner.

Many times, we would sit down at the kitchen table, just like every other American family, and we would map out a budget. I knew that spending more than my means was simply out of the question.

Well, folks, why can't we do that here in Washington? We need more fiscal common sense here in Washington, and the RSC fiscal year 2020 budget does just that.

Picture this: \$12.6 trillion in total deficit reduction over 10 years, balancing the budget in just 6 years by 2025. On that fact alone, I would hope that every Member of this body would offer their support.

This budget also fosters a rewarding environment for economic growth and job creation.

We have heard it over and over again from those who deal in investments and deal with the economy and the growth of the economy that the biggest wind at our face is this budget deficit. It is a headwind. It is going to be a headwind against the growth of this economy if we don't get serious about a budget.

This budget will give us that opportunity for economic growth and job creation.

Right now, we have the best economy in the world: 263,000 jobs were created last month, and over 7 million jobs are available throughout this Nation, far exceeding the number of jobseekers.

I was so glad to work with my colleagues here in Congress the last 2 years and with the President in making this happen. But the American people made it happen. All we did was provide an opportunity. We reformed regulations and we passed a tax reform bill that gave the economy a boost.

Frankly, in dealing with the budget deficit and going forward, our only hope in this is to grow our economy. We must have GDP growth.

In a telephone townhall with constituents from Georgia's 12th District last night, 73 percent of participants reported that our economy is headed in the right direction. When I ran for Congress in 2014, 70 percent of the people in my district said that the economy was going in the wrong direction, and we have flipped it.

However, a soaring economy also creates challenges. As we face increasing workforce needs, this budget prioritizes moving Americans off the sidelines and back into the workforce, rewarding work and promoting innovation.

Madam Speaker, I am the grandfather of 13 beautiful grandchildren, and the last thing I want to do is leave an insurmountable debt behind for our future generations. I strongly encourage all of my colleagues to get onboard with the RSC budget to restore a sense of fiscal responsibility to Washington. Our future depends on it.

Mr. BANKS. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia, a great friend and a great conservative in the House of Representatives, for being here tonight.

Madam Speaker, when the chairman of the Republican Study Committee, MIKE JOHNSON from Louisiana, asked me to take on this task as chairman of the Budget and Spending Task Force, I was very proud to do so, not just because I have enormous respect for Chairman JOHNSON as a conservative leader in this Congress, but because of the stature and reputation of the Republican Study Committee.

□ 1745

At one point, our Vice President, from my home State, MIKE PENCE, one of the greatest conservative leaders in this Nation, was chairman of the Republican Study Committee. And so, too, was another man whom I respect just as much, one of the greatest leaders in our Nation, the Republican whip, Mr. STEVE SCALISE, from Louisiana, chair of the Republican Study Committee, too. The reputation of RSC is important because it is the conservative vehicle in the Congress to advance conservative principles. No one does that more on a daily basis than my friend from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE).

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE).

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Indiana for yielding and for his kind words, too, especially. He has been a great friend and a great leader on this front. I want to commend him for taking on the task of putting together a budget, Madam Speaker, that confronts some of the challenges that our country is facing in a way that not only protects those promises that were made, for example, to seniors.

Seniors were promised the safety net of Medicare, and yet, if we do nothing—and there are some suggesting that we leave Medicare where it is today—it actually goes bankrupt, Madam Speaker, in the next 8 years. It would be irresponsible for us, as Members of Congress, to sit back and say we are afraid to confront these important issues, because failing to confront them literally would lead to a bankrupt program for seniors today and a broken promise by the Federal Government to those seniors.

So we save Medicare from bankruptcy and, in fact, we do it in a way that nothing changes for current seniors. In fact, the only thing that would change is if we didn't do this, it would go bankrupt. So the program is actu-

ally solvent again, not only for current seniors, but for younger people, too, who don't think it will be there. In fact, it won't be there for them the way it is for current seniors if we don't make these bold reforms.

Madam Speaker, we also save the Social Security program, another important promise made to people who work through their years and then want to retire and have a safety net. And, today, maybe they have got a lot of other means of savings, too. They might have 401(k)s, or they might have a pension plan from their company. But they also paid into that Social Security trust fund. And, again, if we do nothing, that program goes bankrupt, as well. So we save that program, again, not only for current seniors, but then for younger people. It will also be there for them, too, generationally saving it.

Just like when Ronald Reagan worked with Tip O'Neill to save Social Security from bankruptcy, they did it in a way that actually strengthened the program. So for those people who want to hold their head in the sand and say, don't do anything, not doing anything means those two vital programs—Medicare and Social Security—would go bust for seniors today. We can't let that happen.

Madam Speaker, I thank our leader, Mr. BANKS, for doing that.

And then, again, we strengthen defense. We continue to build on the reforms we have made to our economy so that we are able to create more jobs, so that we repeal the death tax. We continue lowering taxes, which has gotten such a great revolution in job creation and higher wages for workers. The things that we are doing that are working, we build upon those things and make this country even stronger and greater for generations.

So while putting a budget together is tough—and I know the other side hasn't even passed a budget out of committee, Madam Speaker—we, with this RSC budget, have shown what bold conservative reforms can do to strengthen programs like Medicare, like Social Security, encourage innovation in failing programs, block granting Medicaid to States so States can innovate, strengthening defense, and, again, building on the great successes we are seeing in our economy so that wages can be higher, and we protect people with preexisting conditions.

These are the kinds of things that people call on us to do. We come here to Congress to do the big things, to tackle the tough problems in a way where we protect people who count on us and actually strengthen this country for future generations, so we can build on this great American Dream.

Mr. BANKS. Madam Speaker, this Republican Study Committee budget proposal was a gigantic effort: over 300 member proposals from the 141 members of the Republican Study Committee who offered ideas and proposals to include in this budget proposal.

Over the past several weeks, we met on a weekly basis, almost a dozen times, to put together this budget proposal, assembling a task force of eight conservative members, who gathered on a weekly basis to comb through the Federal budget to talk about ways that we could put forth something that conservatives, not just in Congress but throughout the country, could be very proud of.

I am really proud that, on our task force, we had Members who came from different States, different perspectives, who had different ideas. That made the effort stronger and, in the end, it allowed us to produce a stronger budget proposal. One of those members, I am very proud to say, is my friend, the representative from Florida, my colleague, Representative YOHO.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOHO).

Mr. YOHO. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the chairman of the RSC Budget Committee for yielding to me, along with Chairman MIKE JOHNSON, for leading the way on this task. I thank all of my colleagues who participated in this, and the RSC staff who did the hard work. They were there every night and every day to bring this budget together—Richard Stern, Jay, and Mark. Many times, they don't get recognized for the work that they did, but yet they put in a lot of effort.

So why do a budget? Everybody asks, why do you guys worry about a budget? Well, this House is tasked with the power of the purse. We are the ones who are supposed to be in charge of a budget and spending the people's money, because the American people care how we spend their money. They want us to spend it smartly, prudently, and responsibly. If you don't have a budget, can you do that?

We have got a budget. Right here, we have got a budget. This is a budget. This is a good budget. We are at \$22 trillion in debt. This Nation is at \$22 trillion in debt.

In the previous administration, we saw the debt double. This administration, it will probably double again. And if a Democrat gets in, or a Republican, it will probably double again. If this body does not come together, not as Republicans or Democrats, but as Americans, this problem will never be addressed. What happens is a political divide happens because we can blame the other side for not doing what they are supposed to.

We didn't have a budget last year and the Democrats don't have a budget this year. So how serious is this body about correcting this? The Republican Study Committee has a budget. This budget needs to be looked at.

I was born in the fifties—1955—and I grew up during the sixties. Our mandatory spending in this country was roughly 30 percent: 70 percent was discretionary spending. Do you know what that allows you to do? That allows you to do an interstate system, and it allows you to have a space program and have aspirations of going to

the Moon and coming back by a Democratic President who put country above politics. We came together, and we did that because we could.

Do you know what? We can't do that today, because, today, 71 percent of our spending is mandatory, and 29 percent is discretionary. But let me tell you who can do that.

China can go to the Moon. China can do infrastructure. In fact, they are doing it all over the world. Do you know why? Because they are cash rich. We are cash poor. In fact, they hold a large portion of our debt.

Let me tell you what \$22 trillion in debt is. If you take \$22 trillion and divide it by 330 million Americans, roughly, that comes down to \$67,000, not per family, but per individual. So for 300 million Americans, they are \$67,000 in debt.

Is it my fault? Yeah, I guess so, because I am here. It is your fault, it is their fault. If we are here, this is our generation's fault, and this is something that we have to come together as Americans to fix.

If we don't have a budget, can we fix a budget problem? If we don't have a budget, can we acknowledge a problem?

As I pointed out, the other side doesn't have a budget. There is a budget and if we come together as Americans and put down the crazy politics of fighting one side over the other, we can fix the problems of this country. We can fix education, we can fix healthcare, we can fix infrastructure, and we can plan for a future brighter than today. We can create a vision for this country 50 to 100 years down the road, but we can't do it if we are fighting over budgetary problems in this Nation.

Madam Speaker, I appreciate the honor to be able to be on this committee. I hope it sinks into the other side that we come together, and we come together as Americans.

Mr. BANKS. Madam Speaker, we need to confront this fiscal challenge now, as it is no longer a far-off concern.

Currently, we are set to run trillion-dollar deficits in perpetuity. The Social Security trust fund will be bankrupt by 2035. The Medicare trust fund will be bankrupt by 2026. Without bold and immediate action, this growing debt will condemn America to a future that is less prosperous and less free.

My colleagues and I from the Republican Study Committee are determined to make sure that this never materializes. The Republican Study Committee preserving the American freedom budget would not only prevent that bleak future, it would ensure even greater prosperity for all Americans for years and generations to come.

I could not be prouder to lead this effort on behalf of the Republican Study Committee and its 141 conservative members.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Ms. Mariel Ridgway, one of his secretaries.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE OF THE SENATE AND THE SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable CHUCK GRASSLEY, President pro tempore of the Senate, and the Honorable NANCY PELOSI, Speaker of the House of Representatives:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, DC, May 15, 2019.

Pursuant to the provisions of Section 201(a)(2) of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974, Public Law 93-344, the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives hereby appoint Dr. Phillip Swagel as the Director of the Congressional Budget Office, effective June 3, 2019, for the term expiring January 3, 2023.

CHUCK GRASSLEY,
President pro tempore
of the Senate.

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House
of Representatives.

DECLARING A NATIONAL EMERGENCY TO SECURE THE INFORMATION AND COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGY AND SERVICES SUPPLY CHAIN—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 116-35)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 *et seq.*) (IEEPA), the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1601 *et seq.*), and section 301 of title 3, United States Code, I hereby report that I have issued an Executive Order declaring a national emergency to deal with the threat posed by the unrestricted acquisition or use in the United States of information and communications technology or services designed, developed, manufactured, or supplied by persons owned by, controlled by, or subject to the jurisdiction or direction of foreign adversaries.

Foreign adversaries are increasingly creating and exploiting vulnerabilities in information and communications technology and services, which store and communicate vast amounts of sensitive information, facilitate the digital economy, and support critical infrastructure and vital emergency services, in order to commit malicious

cyber-enabled actions, including economic and industrial espionage against the United States and its people. Although maintaining an open investment climate in information and communications technology, and in the United States economy more generally, is important for the overall growth and prosperity of the United States, such openness must be balanced by the need to protect our country against critical national security threats. To deal with this threat, additional steps are required to protect the security, integrity, and reliability of information and communications technology and services provided and used in the United States.

The Executive Order prohibits certain transactions involving information and communications technology or services where the Secretary of Commerce (Secretary), in consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, the Attorney General, the Secretary of Homeland Security, the United States Trade Representative, the Director of National Intelligence, the Administrator of General Services, the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, and, as appropriate, the heads of other executive departments and agencies (agencies), has determined that:

(i) the transaction involves information and communications technology or services designed, developed, manufactured, or supplied, by persons owned by, controlled by, or subject to the jurisdiction or direction of a foreign adversary; and

(ii) the transaction:

(A) poses an undue risk of sabotage to or subversion of the design, integrity, manufacturing, production, distribution, installation, operation, or maintenance of information and communications technology or services in the United States;

(B) poses an undue risk of catastrophic effects on the security or resiliency of United States critical infrastructure or the digital economy of the United States; or

(C) otherwise poses an unacceptable risk to the national security of the United States or the security and safety of United States persons.

I have delegated to the Secretary the authority to, in consultation with, or upon referral of a particular transaction from, the heads of other agencies as appropriate, take such actions, including directing the timing and manner of the cessation of transactions prohibited pursuant to the Executive Order, adopting appropriate rules and regulations, and employing all other powers granted to the President by IEEPA, as may be necessary to implement the Executive Order. All agencies of the United States Government are directed to take all appropriate measures within their authority to carry out the provisions of the Executive Order.

I am enclosing a copy of the Executive Order I have issued.

DONALD J. TRUMP,
THE WHITE HOUSE, May 15, 2019.

□ 1800

WOMEN IN THE ARMED FORCES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. HOULAHAN) for 30 minutes.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. HOULAHAN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of my Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. HOULAHAN. Madam Speaker, there are over a dozen caucuses in Congress today that address issues facing servicemembers and/or veterans, but none of these are geared towards addressing the issues faced by the fastest growing cohort in our Nation's military: women.

Today, that changes.

My name is CHRISSY HOULAHAN, and I represent Pennsylvania's Sixth Congressional District. Today I am announcing the launch of the first ever Servicewomen and Women Veterans Congressional Caucus.

When the draft ended in 1973, women represented just 2 percent of the enlisted force and 8 percent of the officer corps. Today, those numbers have grown to 16 percent and 18 percent, respectively. Currently, there are 2 million living women veterans in the United States, and in the next 25 years, women veterans are projected to nearly double their population and will account for one in five living veterans.

We cannot afford to wait, and the time to act is now.

Twenty-seven years ago, I gave birth to my first child, my daughter Molly. I was Active Duty at the time, and I was given 6 weeks of maternity leave. When I returned, I intended to enroll my daughter in the on-base childcare but discovered that there was a 6-month-long waiting list. I looked for private care in Boston where I was serving, but the cost was too high. In fact, my entire paycheck would have gone to childcare.

I was a lieutenant in the Air Force, stationed at Hanscom Air Force Base at the time, and my assignment, my job, was to determine what kind of information people needed and in what order and in what visual display when ballistic missiles were raining down on them and the end of the world was coming.

I am a very well-educated engineer. I became an engineer in the Air Force, and yet I couldn't, with my skills and my education, figure out how I was

supposed to make ends meet and make childcare work to fulfill my military responsibilities and serve our country.

I was going against the system in many ways, a new mother serving in the military with a working civilian husband. That is not what most people picture when they picture a traditional military family. It wasn't even what I saw as a young girl when I was growing up.

I was the daughter and granddaughter of career Naval officers and career Navy wives, and I watched as my mother and my grandmother moved us all around the country and cared for us while my father and my grandfather served. My mother's job was to create a sense of home in every new place that we moved. Her job was my brother and I.

So there I was with a new baby of my own and a mission to deal with ballistic missile defense, no viable options for childcare, and working within a system that had not yet caught up with me and my career. So I decided to make a very difficult choice, and I separated from the Air Force.

You see, at that time, I didn't really have any role models, anyone that I knew or could look up to who had walked in my boots, so to speak, and had navigated being a new mother while simultaneously serving our country. So few women were really high up in the Air Force's ranks at the time, so there were very few I knew who could show me what Active Duty looked like as a mother.

But that is changing. In 2019, women represent the fastest growing cohort in America's military. More and more women are hearing that same call that I and my friends here heard—the call to serve.

What is upsetting, though, is 27 years later, despite women's increased presence across all branches of the military, we all still struggle with many of the same issues, including access to quality and affordable childcare, and I find this unacceptable.

In this 116th Congress, we set a record. For the first time in history, there are more than two women veterans serving in the House of Representatives. There are now four. It was the realization that I was surrounded by three other women who served our country that inspired me to start this caucus.

Now is the time to address these issues that have been plaguing our servicewomen and women veterans for years, and that is what today is about. That is what the Servicewomen and Women Veterans Congressional Caucus is about.

We four women are here to enact change to better support the brave women who have also answered the call to serve. We four are here as four women veterans who will lead this caucus with our lived experiences in the Armed Forces and who will evaluate the unique issues that our women face and who will work towards enacting

legislation that better serves them and better serves their families.

This is not a Democratic issue nor is it a Republican issue. It is neither a man's issue nor a woman's issue. It is an intrinsically American and human issue, and that is why this caucus has members from both sides of the aisle, and that is why we have veterans and nonveterans as participants, men and women.

This caucus is comprised of people who are held together by a shared understanding that, when Congress neglects its duty to support the men and women who serve, it hasn't done its job. It undermines our country's national security and our military's readiness.

I remember thinking to myself when I got here that I was just one person. Then when I got here, I met Representative TULSI GABBARD, Representative ELAINE LURIA, Representative MIKIE SHERRILL, and the one became four. And now, today, I am launching that Servicewomen and Women Veterans Congressional Caucus, the very first caucus in our country's history to specifically address the issues facing servicewomen and women veterans.

We are more than 50 strong in number now; 1 became 4, and 4 became more than 50. We have a mission. We have our marching orders. And speaking as an Air Force veteran, I can promise I won't stop fighting until our mission has been accomplished.

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

MAKING THE MATH WORK

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

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Madam Speaker, this is actually something we try to do about once a week, come in here and actually sort of talk about our unified theory in our office: What do we do to, basically, keep our promises?

Here is a thought experiment.

Social Security and Medicare are two of the greatest fragilities we have in our society because we are getting older very fast. Remember, we have talked about this over and over and over. In about 8½ years, 50 percent of the spending in this body, less interest, will be to those 65 and up.

How do you make the math work? And in an intellectual, lazier time, you would get some that would say: Well, we could raise taxes here or we can do entitlement reform here.

Well, it turns out that math really actually doesn't work anymore. Now, we actually have to do everything to make the math work. So we have been trying to actually sell this concept that it is economic growth, and within economic growth it is how we design our tax system, how we design trade, how we design our regulatory environment, how we actually do population

stability—and this one actually gets complicated.

You saw the article in *The Wall Street Journal* today about what has happened to U.S. birth rates. How do you encourage family formation, but also how do you deal with the immigration system that maximizes a talent-based immigration system to maximize that economic velocity?

Remember, this is about us having a vibrant enough economy so we can keep our promises, but within that, we also have some other issues. How do you do what we call labor force participation?

Countries like Japan and some in Western Europe are dealing with how they get those who are older, and if they are healthy and want to, how they create incentives to actually say: Are you willing to stay in or come back into the labor force?

We actually have this quirky math here in our country of millennial males. In December, we started to see this breakthrough of millennial females entering the workforce. We still actually have a whole bunch of millennial males who are missing in the workforce who should be there. How do we build a society that encourages participation in that labor force?

It turns out, if you actually look at a lot of our economic data, from the Joint Economic Committee to the Joint Committee on Taxation, when they talk about what are the barriers for us to be able to keep growing and continue this actually incredibly robust cycle we are having right now, it is capital stock.

Well, actually, the numbers since tax reform have been dramatically healthier than we modeled for, with folks having savings, and that savings actually becoming lendable capital. You actually can see that in just nationwide interest rates.

The second fragility that was being written about was labor force participation, and we now live in a society where we have hundreds and hundreds and hundreds of thousands of jobs and no workers. So who would have ever thought a couple years ago you would live in a society with more job openings than available workers?

This is a wonderful problem, but it actually does genuinely become a barrier to economic growth, and it is something we have to find a way to deal with.

Part of this is actually really optimistic, though, as we started to see in the data over the last several months the number of business organizations and others who are taking a chance on people, hiring right out of correctional facilities, making accommodations for our brothers and sisters who may have a personal impairment, a personal handicap; and we actually see that in some of the Social Security disability numbers of individuals actually moving into the labor force.

So, look, this is just our unified theory.

Today, we are actually going to start to talk about technology, which is one of our five pillars, and how aggressive I believe the adoption of technology has to be to keep the economic growth going.

We have done lots of floor time over the last couple months on the healthcare technology, the revolution that I believe, our office believes, some of the people we work with believe, that is about to happen and the ability for you to take care of yourself, the wearables—the kazoo you blow into that instantly tells you if you have the flu, to the other side of the spectrum, the single shot cure for hemophilia—and how do we finance those types of disruptions.

Wouldn't it be amazing if this body were no longer having the, actually, in some ways, insane debate we have had for decades about who gets subsidized, who gets to pay in healthcare, and started actually talking about what we pay and how we are going to cure our brothers and sisters who have chronic conditions? We all know, the 5 percent of Americans with those chronic conditions are well over half of our healthcare spending.

So what happens when we actually bring cures to market? And then our obligation: How do we finance them so we roll them out as fast as possible?

But today, we are going to talk about another fixation of mine, and that is environment issues.

I wish I had a more delicate way to talk about this. Often, the discussion around here is almost Malthusian, saying the pie is only so big. If you care about global warming, if you care about greenhouse gases, we must shrink the economy; we must get individuals to drive less; we must generate less power; we must do these types of things.

And a decade or so ago, maybe that was a legitimate view, but they have missed an entire technology revolution that is going on around us, and there should be optimism in this body that, if you are someone who cares about greenhouse gases in our national and world environment, the revolution is here, and it is a technology one.

□ 1815

How does this body start to remove the barriers that have slowed down the adoption of this clean generation, these alternative generations that are in our marketplace? A simple thought: solar generation.

I hope I get this story, which is coming out of New Mexico, correct. They wanted to run a power line to Arizona. They have been working on the power transmission lines for a dozen years.

We have seen the discussion in the upper Midwest. I believe it is Iowa, with wind generation, finally figuring it out and saying maybe we can run the power lines in the railroad right-of-way because we want this power to make it to Illinois. That is where the demand is, and over here is where the clean generation is.

These are things we often don't think about. It is not enough to have the technology. How do you get the power to where it needs to be consumed? We have never fixed the bureaucratic barriers to moving that power.

It is like some of the discussions we have had in our office. A couple of years ago, we did a math experiment. A pipeline in west Texas, a pipeline loop that would capture methane so you didn't have to flare it off, had a really impressive calculation in U.S. greenhouse gas emissions, but it requires permitting a pipeline.

I need us to remove some of our ideological blinders and think of pro-growth, pro-environment, pro-effectiveness. We have to be willing to change the permitting system and so much of the litigation and bureaucracy that slows these things down.

We are going to walk through a couple of these boards, just because I think there is incredible optimism out there.

This one I am sort of thrilled with. This is a chart that talks about battery efficiency. For those of you that geek out on this stuff with me, you probably all saw the article—I think it was April 1—on some new solid-state battery technology. It looks like they finally have a major breakthrough on what we call power density.

This chart here, do you see that coming down? That is the cost of battery storage. It is a remarkable reduction.

In Arizona, we have our largest and best utility, Arizona Public Service. When you read some of the articles that are going on right now with them, the amount of solar that is now in their portfolio, they have baseline nuclear and now the holy grail. What happens when you live in the desert Southwest as I do? I am blessed to live in the Phoenix-Scottsdale area. We produce lots of solar.

Into the peak of the afternoon, California now produces so much alternative solar generation that they can't use it all. On some days, they paid Arizona to buy it off them.

What happens when a company like APS gets really creative and says: How do we have solar power at night when, if you live in the Phoenix area, you are still running your air-conditioner into the evening? It turns out the battery investment is about to bring solar generation into the hours it is dark because they will store it. If you design that type of battery storage that holds for about 4 hours, you get us through the peak.

It is referred to as the duck curve. If you see the back of a duck, we have all this production, and then it collapses. Yet, we still have all this demand. How do you cover that gap?

In the past, we used peaking power plants, fire them up to cover those few hours. Now, with what is happening with battery storage, it is here.

Our privately owned utility in Arizona, APS, recently did an RFP or RFQ. The numbers that came back

were remarkably competitive. It is happening.

When on this floor we discuss global warming, greenhouse gases, and what we are going to do in alternative generation, it is here. We just need to understand what is happening right around us.

How do you keep curves like this line continuing? When we are reading that there is a breakthrough in battery technology, how do we remove barriers so that technology rolls out and becomes part of what we do here in the United States and around the world?

Here is something else. I am blessed to be on the Ways and Means Committee. Last year, we updated a tax credit mechanism for carbon sequestration. It turns out that we have multiple facilities now that were an experiment, but they are growing. They are about to go to large-scale commercial where they capture all the carbon.

This first one, I believe this is the NET Power facility outside Houston. It is a natural gas-fired facility, so they are using a hydrocarbon and they have no smokestack. They capture not only the manmade CO₂, but they even capture any other gas throw-off.

The remarkable design is that they throw a little oxygen. They heat it up, and heat it really, really hot. They use that to spin the turbines. Then they cool it down and pull out the CO₂ and then use that to sell for other purposes. They don't have a smokestack.

This technology is up and running today. The proof of concept is done. Now we are heading toward, I believe, a fairly substantial expansion in the scale of the facility.

This was research that has been going on for years. Those of us here in this body, a year ago, we updated the carbon sequestration tax credits. It is paying off.

The next one is another facility that is also in Texas. This one was really an interesting experiment because, in many ways, it broke through a bit of folklore.

It sits right next to an existing coal-fired generation facility. It is a coal-fired carbon capture plant. They are spinning the turbines, burning coal, and they capture the carbon.

It was only 2 or 3 years ago when we had witnesses around here saying this sort of technology would not work. It is up and running today.

There should be joy and optimism around this place because the ability to basically say, for the hydrocarbons we have, what happens if we can use them to help us through this transition of time and we are capturing the CO₂? This is wonderful.

Let's go even further. If we are going to continue the thought experiment, you have already seen the United States do some pretty remarkable reductions. Most of it has come from natural gas, but there have been some pretty remarkable reductions in our CO₂ production.

A lot of the rest of the world hasn't even come close. For the number of

new coal-fired plants moving in Southeast Asia, part of the Chinese Belt and Road Initiative, they are not going to have the types of capture technology we have here in the United States.

We have to have a worldwide strategy. I am one of those who has been really excited because I have been following a facility that is going up in Canada. It looks like they have succeeded in the breakthrough of mining the air to pull CO₂ out of it. Mathematically, we had lots of smart people saying this is absurd, that you are not going to be able to do it.

We had a very smart professor in Arizona at Arizona State University who had been working on sort of a carbon capture artificial tree. This technology is rolling out. It is under production right now, and they are moving up to industrial scale. The amazing thing is, they think they can do it for about \$100 a ton, which is remarkable if you have actually played the math game. This is for the new facility.

What happens if they start to break that curve? If you understand that carbon that has been captured, to have the ability to refine it and do other things, even make another fuel source out of it?

The other thing is, think about the article we hopefully all saw last week about what the Dutch are doing. The Dutch are basically about to take a depleted oil field and take carbon that they have captured and shove it back in the ground and sequester it.

All of a sudden, it is a negative calculation. In this place, in a lot of the debate, for a lot of the witnesses we have had in previous years, the concept of mining and having negative emissions was considered absurd. It is here. The technology is here.

This is a facility that has, apparently, really smart, really wealthy people investing in it because they are so excited about the technology. We need to understand that there is optimism out here.

How do we get ourselves up to date on the cutting-edge technology? How do we move it forward and promote it?

We also need to understand that the theater that we engage in here often is not good math. I wish I had a more recent date, but the latest we could find is 2015 on this.

Do you see the yellow bar on the side? That is all the photovoltaic solar that rolled out in 2015. It was an impressive year. There were fairly aggressive subsidies, State, local, and Federal.

Do you see the other bar chart next to it? That was all the nuclear that went offline that year.

The reality of it is, in 2015, if you were thinking about power generation in the United States that did not produce CO₂ and you were joyful that this much solar hit the grid, understand that almost the equal amount of nuclear came off the grid. We were peddling in place.

We need to be honest about the math, and we need to be honest about that

baseload nuclear being really, really important if you care about this issue.

There are a couple of quirky things I wanted to throw out here. This one is just fun. It is sort of an odd thought experiment.

In the desert Southwest and mountain Southwest, uranium mining has always been a dodgy issue. We need it. We know we need it. We need it for everything from our X-rays to refining and refining for a nuclear power plant.

In previous decades, we have been able to take very high grades and step it down, but that was some of the excess that was out there after the Cold War. That stock has been substantially used up. So what are we going to do?

There is a technology breakthrough of mining seawater for uranium. We should be joyful and pushing these technologies. They solve some of the moving problem of wanting nuclear generation but where are we going to get the uranium? How are we going to step it up? It turns out, even on that, the technology has moved forward.

Look at other little thought experiments. How many of us in high school with Popular Science magazine used to get excited about how you generate power from ocean waves? It turns out that a new design is rolling out. It is sort of a bobbing power generation. It exists now, and it works. It is much more robust than anything that has ever been designed.

We should be joyful and trying to promote more of this type of technology, but we have to deal with how you bring the power in from the shore. All of a sudden, you have a whole other layer of regs, rules, and permitting.

You want clean power. We all want it, but we have to deal with the bureaucratic malaise, mess, and blocks that stop us from being able to pull this type of new power generation into our communities and our country.

What is exciting about that is that is a type of power generation that, if we make it work, it can be all over the world. Being someone who, as a younger man, trekked Indonesia, Vietnam, lots of India, and Sri Lanka, think about most of the world's population living near coastal communities. Wouldn't that be exciting?

Why aren't we promoting these types of technologies? We need to get rid of this Malthusian mindset that the pie is only so big, that we can cut it only so many ways, that once you cut it those ways, there is never an opportunity for it to grow.

There are still people who believe that the 1968 book "The Population Bomb" was real. The only thing they got accurate was the author's name.

□ 1830

We need to understand there is a technology breakthrough happening around us, in particularly power generation. But if you want to have a revolution—and I am sort of banking on being one of the first people to talk

about this because this one is really disruptive, but it is worth the thought experiment.

For anyone who might be watching or having an interest in this Google, “photosynthesis 40 percent”. Read the complete articles that have been written.

Madam Speaker, you remember your high school biology class talking about plants and plant cells having a certain inherent inefficiency, where there is a flaw that has been there for millions and millions of years where it reaches out and grabs the oxygen molecule when it should have grabbed the carbon molecule.

Through some synthetic biology they fixed the inefficiency. It now will reach over and grab the carbon molecule every time. All of a sudden it means a 40 percent efficiency in growth.

So, what happens tomorrow when crops require 40 percent less water, 40 percent less land, and 40 percent less fuel?

What does it mean to the world?

Thought experiment: I need you to take it a step further. World agriculture represents 2.2 times the total greenhouse gases of every automobile on Earth. Just adopting this plant technology in our agriculture equals removing every car off the face of the Earth.

As this rolls out, how fast would it take to change the seed stock around the world?

There are solutions, and they are not always a linear thought. They sometimes require some creativity. Let’s face it. We work in a math-free zone that also lacks creativity. This exists. This is rolling out. It is a revolution.

Yes, it is going to be incredibly disruptive to agriculture around the world. It is going to be incredibly disruptive.

At the same time, what happens when you want to plant trees and you can grow them 40 percent more efficiently, and they are just little carbon capture machines?

This is here. We should be excited about it.

The last one is just more of the thought experiment of trying to say, if we really care, we need to stop the theater that seems to be what happens behind these microphones and actually understand the problem, understand the math, and then focus on that solution. Because often around here I believe a solution is a problem for us because the very thing that we got elected on, that we love coming and complaining about, oh, dear heaven, what happens if we solve it?

So let’s actually talk about something that is part of our pop culture right now, but it is a real issue. For someone like myself, I grew up scuba diving. I love scuba diving, and I have been blessed to do it in a lot of really neat places. Ninety percent of the plastic in the world’s oceans come from 10 rivers. Eight of these rivers are in Asia, and two of those rivers are in Africa.

Ninety percent of the plastic in the ocean comes from 10 rivers. If you give a darn about plastic in the ocean, banning straws in your community is theater. It is absurd math. It may make you feel better and get you in the local newspaper, but you didn’t do anything.

This body here immediately should figure out what aid programs we have, what research, what we can do to go to those 10 rivers that are 90 percent of the plastic in the ocean and help, instead of complaining about it and instead of doing a nice video of going out and saying, I am going to pick up plastic off a beach.

No. If you care, it is 10 rivers, we know where the problem is. If you really want to have an impact, go where it is coming from. This is a simple example of we talk, talk, talk, talk, and talk around this place, but if we solve it, then we don’t get to actually talk about it. But solving is the most ethical thing we can do as a body.

Policy that is made with math and policy that is made with facts can do amazing things for our country, my 3-year-old little girl, and for this world. Policy around here that is done by folklore, by an anecdote, and by feelings, time and time again, when we look back, it may have been well-intended, but ultimately it hurts people.

If we get our math right, if we actually understand the underlying basis of a problem, figure out an honest solution that continues to grow our economy and continues to provide opportunities instead of this sort of constant Malthusian echo around here that says that we can’t grow anymore, we can’t do this—they are wrong, and the folks who embrace that philosophy have been wrong for centuries now.

There are technology breakthroughs happening all around us. You actually saw the latest one on this. Finally, we have broken the code on a plastic that truly breaks down. Let’s incentivize that. There are solutions. This body is an honorable body, but it needs to become one about solutions instead of theatrics.

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

PUBLICATION OF BUDGETARY MATERIAL

REVISION TO THE AGGREGATES, ALLOCATIONS, AND OTHER BUDGETARY LEVELS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2020

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET,
Washington, DC, May 15, 2019.

MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (CBA), the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (BBEDCA), and H. Res. 293 (116th Congress), I hereby submit for printing in the Congressional Record a revision to the aggregates and allocations set forth in the Statement of Aggregates, Allocations, and Other Budgetary Levels for Fiscal Year 2020 published in the Congressional Record on May 3, 2019.

This revision is for allowable adjustments for amounts for program integrity initiatives and Overseas Contingency Operations

pursuant to section 251(b) of BBEDCA. These amounts are contained respectively in the text of H.R. 2740, the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2020, and of H.R. 2745, the Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2020, as reported by the Committee on Appropriations.

Accordingly, I am revising aggregate spending levels for fiscal year 2020 and the allocation for the House Committee on Appropriations for fiscal year 2020. For purposes of enforcing titles III and IV of the CBA and other budgetary enforcement provisions, the revised aggregates and allocation are to be considered as aggregates and allocations included in the budget resolution, pursuant to the Statement published in the Congressional Record on May 3, 2019.

Questions may be directed to Jennifer Wheelock or Raquel Spencer of the Budget Committee staff.

JOHN YARMUTH.

TABLE 1.—REVISION TO ON-BUDGET AGGREGATES
(On-budget amounts, in millions of dollars)

	2020	2020–2029
Current Aggregates:		
Budget Authority	3,709,585	n.a.
Outlays	3,676,452	n.a.
Revenues	2,740,533	34,847,515
Revision for Program Integrity (H.R. 2740):		
Budget Authority	1,842	n.a.
Outlays	1,481	n.a.
Revenues	---	---
Revision for Overseas Contingency Operations (H.R. 2745):		
Budget Authority	921	n.a.
Outlays	7	n.a.
Revenues	---	---
Revised Aggregates:		
Budget Authority	3,712,348	n.a.
Outlays	3,677,940	n.a.
Revenues	2,740,533	34,847,515

n.a. = Not applicable because annual appropriations for fiscal years 2021 through 2029 will not be considered until future sessions of Congress.

TABLE 2.—REVISED ALLOCATION OF SPENDING AUTHORITY TO THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS
(In millions of dollars)

	2020
Base Discretionary Action:	
BA	1,295,018
OT	1,360,935
Revision for Program Integrity (H.R. 2740):	
BA	1,842
OT	1,481
Revision for Overseas Contingency Operations (H.R. 2745):	
BA	921
OT	7
Revised Allocation:	
BA	1,297,781
OT	1,362,423
Current Law Mandatory:	
BA	1,075,820
OT	1,067,358

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o’clock and 35 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, May 16, 2019, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker’s table and referred as follows:

1026. A letter from the Deputy Under Secretary, Comptroller, Department of Defense, transmitting a semi-annual report titled,

“Acceptance of contributions for defense programs, projects, and activities; Defense Cooperation Account”, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2608(i); Public Law 101-403, title II, Sec. 202(a)(1) (as amended by Public Law 103-160, Sec. 1105(b)); (107 Stat. 1750); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1027. A letter from the Under Secretary, Army, Department of Defense, transmitting annual audit of the American Red Cross's consolidated financial statements for the year ending June 30, 2018, pursuant to 36 U.S.C. 300110(b); Public Law 105-225, Sec. 300110(b); (112 Stat. 1493); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1028. A letter from the Director, Office of White House Liaison, Department of Education, transmitting a notification of a designation of acting officer, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

1029. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Civil Rights, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's FY 2018 No FEAR Act report, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 2301 note; Public Law 107-174, 203(a) (as amended by Public Law 109-435, Sec. 604(f)); (120 Stat. 3242); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

1030. A letter from the Director, Federal Housing Finance Agency, transmitting the Agency's inventories of commercial and inherently governmental activities performed by federal employees for Fiscal Year 2017, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 501 note; Public Law 105-270, Sec. 2(c)(1)(A); (112 Stat. 2382); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

1031. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Labor Relations Authority, transmitting a notification of a nomination, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

1032. A letter from the Chairman, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's inventories of commercial and inherently governmental activities performed by employees for fiscal year 2017, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 501 note; Public Law 105-270, Sec. 2(c)(1)(A); (112 Stat. 2382); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

1033. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Energy, transmitting a letter submitted to amend Sec. 661 of the Department of Energy Organization Act of 1977; jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and the Judiciary.

1034. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, Legislative Affairs, Department of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation, titled the “National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2020”; jointly to the Committees on Armed Services, Natural Resources, Veterans' Affairs, Small Business, the Judiciary, Transportation and Infrastructure, Oversight and Reform, Foreign Affairs, Appropriations, and Science, Space, and Technology.

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:

Ms. DeLAURO: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 2740. A bill making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes (Rept. 116-62). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 2745. A bill making

appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes (Rept. 116-63). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. ROUDA (for himself, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. PERRY, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. RYAN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. WEBER of Texas, and Mr. GARAMENDI):

H.R. 2739. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to limit certain rolling stock procurements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. PALLONE (for himself, 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):

H.R. 2741. A bill to rebuild and modernize the Nation's infrastructure to expand access to broadband and Next Generation 9-1-1, rehabilitate drinking water infrastructure, modernize the electric grid and energy supply infrastructure, redevelop brownfields, strengthen health care infrastructure, create jobs, and protect public health and the environment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Natural Resources, Science, Space, and Technology, Ways and Means, Transportation and Infrastructure, and Education and Labor, 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. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. BUDD, Mr. STEUBE, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. BUCK, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. LATTA, Mr. GREEN of Tennessee, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania, Mr. NORMAN, and Mr. ABRAHAM):

H.R. 2742. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that amounts paid for an abortion are not taken into account for purposes of the deduction for medical expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BUDD (for himself, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, and Mr. DAVIDSON of Ohio):

H.R. 2743. A bill to repeal the Office of Financial Research, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. MCCAUL (for himself and Mr. ENGEL):

H.R. 2744. A bill to authorize the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development to prescribe the manner in which programs of the agency are identified overseas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KIND (for himself, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. SCHRADER, and Mr. YOH0):

H.R. 2746. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for an exclusion for assistance provided to participants in certain veterinary student loan repayment or forgiveness programs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POCAN (for himself, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. CRIST, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. NORTON, Mr. KILMER, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. PETERS, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. RYAN, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Ms. TITUS, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. PAPPAS, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. ENGEL, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. PAL-LONE, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. MENG, Ms. MOORE, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. GRIMALVA, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. SCANLON, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Ms. ESHOO, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. SOTO, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. COHEN, Mrs. CRAIG, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. HAYES, Mr. MORELLE, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD):

H.R. 2747. A bill to prevent harassment at institutions of higher education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. POCAN, Mr. COHEN, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. MENG, and Mr. MCGOVERN):

H.R. 2748. A bill to establish an integrated national approach to respond to ongoing and expected effects of extreme weather and climate change by protecting, managing, and conserving the fish, wildlife, and plants of the United States, and to maximize Government efficiency and reduce costs, in cooperation with State, local, and Tribal Governments and other entities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. NADLER (for himself, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. BONAMICI, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. CISNEROS, Mr. COHEN, Mr. COOPER, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. EVANS, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. GOLDEN, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mrs. MCBATH, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCEACHIN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL, Ms. NORTON, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Ms. PORTER, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. RUSH, Mr. RYAN, Ms. SCANLON, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. TONKO, Mr. VELA, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and Ms. CASTOR of Florida):

H.R. 2749. A bill to prohibit forced arbitration in work disputes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Education and Labor, 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. CICILLINE (for himself, Mr. RESCENHALER, and Mr. TAKANO):

H.R. 2750. A bill to amend title 9 of the United States Code to prohibit predispute arbitration agreements that force arbitration of certain disputes arising from claims of servicemembers and veterans; to the Committee on the Judiciary, 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 Ms. MOORE (for herself, Ms. HAALAND, and Mrs. DINGELL):

H.R. 2751. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to provide coverage under the Medicaid program for services provided by doulas and midwives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ALLRED:

H.R. 2752. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to furnish medically necessary transportation for newborn children of certain women veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. BEATTY:

H.R. 2753. A bill to amend the Fair Credit Reporting Act to require certain consumer reporting agencies to include a credit score when providing consumers with a free annual consumer report; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER (for himself, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Miss RICE of New York, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. HECK, and Mr. COOPER):

H.R. 2754. A bill to amend the Help America Vote Act of 2002 to require paper ballots and risk limiting audits in all Federal elections, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. POCAN, Mr. GALLEGRO, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CISNEROS, Mr. SHERMAN, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. LAMB, Mr. SOTO, Ms. FEINKENAUER, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, and Mr. VEASEY):

H.R. 2755. A bill to standardize and extend certain Buy America provisions; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BROWN of Maryland (for himself and Mr. BANKS):

H.R. 2756. A bill to direct the Secretary of Defense to develop workforce development investment incentives and to consider a qualified training program of an offeror as part of the past performance rating of such offeror, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM (for himself, Mr. BILIRAKIS, and Mr. EVANS):

H.R. 2757. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for adjustments to the Medicare part D cost-sharing reductions for low-income individuals; 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 Ms. DELAURO (for herself and Mrs. HAYES):

H.R. 2758. A bill to provide disaster relief assistance to individuals for the purpose of clearing fallen debris, and for other purposes;

to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. ESCOBAR (for herself, Ms. HILL of California, Ms. HAALAND, Mr. GALLEGRO, and Mr. CISNEROS):

H.R. 2759. A bill to require the Secretary of Defense to enhance the readiness of the Department of Defense to challenges relating to climate change and to improve the energy and resource efficiency of the Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. ESHOO (for herself and Mr. SHIMKUS):

H.R. 2760. A bill to further deployment of Next Generation 9-1-1 to enhance and upgrade the 9-1-1 systems of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. FLETCHER (for herself, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. BABIN, Mr. BRADY, Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. FLORES, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico, Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. YOHO, Mr. OLSON, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, and Mr. BUTTERFIELD):

H.R. 2761. A bill to require the Director of the Office of Management and Budget to immediately release certain grant funds awarded for mitigation activities under the Community Development Block Grant program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. GALLEGRO (for himself, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. CISNEROS, Ms. ESCOBAR, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. VELA, Mrs. TRAHAN, and Ms. TORRES SMALL of New Mexico):

H.R. 2762. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for the modification and clarification of construction authority in the event of a declaration of war or national emergency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. GARCIA of Texas (for herself, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Ms. ESCOBAR, and Mr. CORREA):

H.R. 2763. A bill to prohibit the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development from implementing certain rules; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. LEVIN of California (for himself and Mr. NEGUSE):

H.R. 2764. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to create a national zero-emission vehicle standard, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MOOLENAAR (for himself and Mr. CUELLAR):

H.R. 2765. A bill to allow qualified current or former law enforcement officers to purchase their service weapons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOOLENAAR:

H.R. 2766. A bill to nullify certain memorandum of the Office of Chief Counsel of the Internal Revenue Service regarding the application of the excise tax on heavy trucks and trailers to certain chassis renovations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOULTON (for himself and Mr. MAST):

H.R. 2767. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for eating disorders treatment for members and certain former members of the uniformed services, and dependents of such members, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. NEGUSE (for himself, Ms. STEFANIK, and Ms. FUDGE):

H.R. 2768. A bill to amend the General Education Provisions Act to allow the release of

education records to facilitate the award of a recognized postsecondary credential; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 2769. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Home Rule Act to permit the Council of the District of Columbia to enact laws with respect to the organization and jurisdiction of the District of Columbia courts; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. PASCRELL (for himself, Mr.

KINZINGER, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. NORTON, Mr. COHEN, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. PETERS, Mr. TONKO, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. MOULTON, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CICILLINE, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. KING of Iowa, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. KILMER, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. CLAY, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. GOLDEN, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. GRUJALVA, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. COOPER, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. ZELDIN, Mrs. RADEWAGEN, Mr. HILL of Arkansas, Mr. POCAN, Mr. BEYER, and Mr. COOK):

H.R. 2770. A bill to waive the 24-month waiting period for Medicare eligibility for individuals disabled by Huntington's disease; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. RODGERS of Washington (for herself and Mr. LOEBSACK):

H.R. 2771. A bill to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to revise regulations with respect to payment rates for durable medical equipment under the Medicare program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. RUPPERSBERGER (for himself, Mr. STIVERS, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. ZELDIN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. KILMER, Mr. CUELLAR, and Mr. BARR):

H.R. 2772. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reinstate advance refunding bonds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SABLAN (for himself, Mr. SAN NICOLAS, and Mrs. RADEWAGEN):

H.R. 2773. A bill to amend title 13, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Commerce to conduct a mid-decade census of population for the Northern Mariana Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the U.S. Virgin Islands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. SCHNEIDER (for himself and Ms. STEFANIK):

H.R. 2774. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require coverage without a deductible of certain primary care services by high deductible health plans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. SHALALA (for herself, Ms. HILL of California, Mr. POCAN, Mr. PANNETTA, Mr. PAPPAS, Mr. MORELLE, Mrs. CRAIG, Ms. SCANLON, Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Ms. HAALAND, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. CISNEROS, Ms.

CLARKE of New York, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York):

H.R. 2775. A bill to amend the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act to ensure protections for lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender youth and their families; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. TRAHAN (for herself, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. ROUDA, Ms. TLAIB, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. TRONE, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. PAPPAS, Mr. RYAN, Mr. BEYER, and Mr. SERRANO):

H.R. 2776. A bill to make certain municipalities eligible for grants under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ (for herself and Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana):

H.R. 2777. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to protect coverage for screening mammography, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and 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 Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN (for herself, Ms. ADAMS, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. DELBENE, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. FRANKEL, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. GRIMALVA, Ms. HAALAND, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. KHANNA, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LEWIS, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. MENG, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. MOORE, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. NADLER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RYAN, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. TONKO, Mr. TRONE, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Ms. BASS, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Mr. RICHMOND):

H.R. 2778. A bill to amend title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act to provide for a special enrollment period for pregnant women, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Oversight and Reform, and Education and Labor, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MOULTON:

H.J. Res. 58. A joint resolution requiring congressional approval prior to engaging in hostilities within the sovereign country of Iran; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SHERMAN (for himself, Mr. BANKS, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. LUJÁN, and Mr. FLEISCHMANN):

H. Con. Res. 39. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) continues to make an invaluable contribution to United States and international security, and noting former Senator Richard G. Lugar's indispensable contributions to international security and reducing nuclear weapons-related risks; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GUEST (for himself and Mr. KING of New York):

H. Res. 383. A resolution expressing support for recognizing the week of May 13 through May 19, 2019 as "National Police Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONNOLLY (for himself, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, and Mr. BEYER):

H. Res. 384. A resolution recognizing the September 11th National Memorial Trail as an important trail and greenway to be enjoyed by all in honor of the heroes of September 11th; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

50. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, relative to House Joint Memorial 3, urging the Congress of the United States to enact the IDEA Full Funding Act, which would fully fund the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act; which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

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. ROUDA:

H.R. 2739.

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

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. PALLONE:

H.R. 2741.

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

Article 1, Section 8, clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution. That provision gives Congress the power "to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes."

By Mr. BIGGS:

H.R. 2742.

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

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. BUDD:

H.R. 2743.

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

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. McCAUL:

H.R. 2744.

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. KIND:

H.R. 2746.

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

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. POCAN:

H.R. 2747.

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

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 2748.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3. To regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes.

By Mr. NADLER:

H.R. 2749.

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

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. CICILLINE:

H.R. 2750.

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

Article 1, Section 8

By Ms. MOORE:

H.R. 2751.

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

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. ALLRED:

H.R. 2752.

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

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the Necessary and Proper Clause.

By Mrs. BEATTY:

H.R. 2753.

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

To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes

By Mr. BLUMENAUER:

H.R. 2754.

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

Article I, Section IV, Clause I

By Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 2755.

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.

By Mr. BROWN of Maryland:

H.R. 2756.

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

Necessary and Proper Clause (Art. 1, Sec. 8, Cl. 18)

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H.R. 2767.

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

This bill is enacted pursuant to Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. DELAURO:

H.R. 2758.

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

Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Ms. ESCOBAR:

H.R. 2759.

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

Constitutional Authority—Necessary and Proper Clause (Art. I, Sec. 8, Clause 18)

THE U.S. CONSTITUTION

ARTICLE I, SECTION 8: POWERS OF CONGRESS

CLAUSE 18

The Congress shall have power . . . To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.

By Ms. ESHOO:

H.R. 2760.

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

H.R. 1830: Mr. BOST, Mrs. LESKO, Mr. WESTERMAN, Ms. UNDERWOOD, Ms. SCHRIER, and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.

H.R. 1832: Mr. PHILLIPS.

H.R. 1846: Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. HIMES, Miss RICE of New York, and Mr. CUMMINGS.

H.R. 1851: Mr. DUNN.

H.R. 1873: Mr. KING of New York, Mr. ROUDA, Mr. MARSHALL, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, and Mr. COX of California.

H.R. 1903: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1910: Mr. GREEN of Tennessee.

H.R. 1948: Mr. FERGUSON, Ms. SCANLON, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. STEUBE, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. PETERSON, and Mr. COLLINS of New York.

H.R. 1959: Mr. NEWHOUSE.

H.R. 1965: Mr. VARGAS.

H.R. 1978: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 1979: Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 1982: Ms. JACKSON LEE and Mr. SWALWELL of California.

H.R. 1992: Mr. RASKIN.

H.R. 1994: Ms. SCHRIER, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. McCAUL, and Mr. MARSHALL.

H.R. 2009: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.

H.R. 2010: Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. OLSON, Mr. HICE of Georgia, and Mr. DESJARLAIS.

H.R. 2015: Ms. CHENEY and Mr. HURD of Texas.

H.R. 2042: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 2053: Mr. SWALWELL of California.

H.R. 2088: Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. SLOTKIN, and Ms. MATSUI.

H.R. 2091: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK and Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 2093: Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. HECK, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. CÁRDENAS.

H.R. 2096: Ms. SPANBERGER, Mr. PAPPAS, Mr. TONKO, and Ms. PINGREE.

H.R. 2113: Ms. SLOTKIN.

H.R. 2123: Mr. OLSON.

H.R. 2148: Mr. HIMES.

H.R. 2149: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.

H.R. 2150: Mr. GALLEGRO, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, and Ms. STEFANIK.

H.R. 2151: Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 2164: Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 2167: Mr. MALINOWSKI.

H.R. 2178: Mr. DELGADO, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. PETERSON.

H.R. 2180: Mr. PAPPAS.

H.R. 2213: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.

H.R. 2214: Ms. PORTER, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 2219: Mrs. WALORSKI.

H.R. 2231: Ms. OMAR.

H.R. 2247: Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. DELBENE, Ms. JAYAPAL, and Ms. SCHRIER.

H.R. 2249: Mr. WESTERMAN.

H.R. 2255: Mr. CISNEROS.

H.R. 2262: Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. PRESSLEY, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. MOORE, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. BASS, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. EVANS, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. MEEKS, and Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.

H.R. 2266: Mr. ROONEY of Florida.

H.R. 2319: Mr. KIND.

H.R. 2329: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 2334: Ms. ESCOBAR.

H.R. 2335: Mr. CLOUD.

H.R. 2340: Mr. PAPPAS.

H.R. 2348: Mr. EVANS and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 2349: Ms. PINGREE.

H.R. 2352: Mr. CRIST.

H.R. 2354: Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. CARBAJAL, Ms. MOORE, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 2377: Mr. KIM, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. LUJÁN.

H.R. 2382: Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. BRINDISI, Miss RICE of New York, Mrs. AXNE, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.R. 2388: Mr. CRIST and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 2402: Mr. CRIST, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. LAMB, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Ms. OMAR.

H.R. 2410: Mr. CÁRDENAS and Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 2415: Mr. MEEKS, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. RASKIN, and Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 2428: Mr. GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 2430: Mr. DEFazio.

H.R. 2439: Mr. KING of New York and Mr. KATKO.

H.R. 2441: Ms. WILD.

H.R. 2457: Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 2474: Ms. MENG, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. GALLEGRO, Ms. SCHRIER, Ms. BASS, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. SLOTKIN, and Mr. HECK.

H.R. 2480: Mrs. MCBATH and Mr. CASTRO of Texas.

H.R. 2481: Mr. KINZINGER, Mr. TIMMONS, Mrs. AXNE, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. GALLAGHER.

H.R. 2482: Mr. WATKINS, Ms. HILL of California, Ms. NORTON, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. TAYLOR, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. HILL of Arkansas, and Ms. DELAURO.

H.R. 2483: Ms. SPANBERGER, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. SUOZZI, and Ms. HILL of California.

H.R. 2508: Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. PINGREE, and Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.

H.R. 2516: Mr. NORMAN.

H.R. 2525: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 2534: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York and Mr. HECK.

H.R. 2561: Mr. CICILLINE.

H.R. 2570: Mr. KHANNA, Mr. LUJÁN, and Mrs. DINGELL.

H.R. 2585: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. CISNEROS, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 2591: Ms. SLOTKIN.

H.R. 2602: Ms. LEE of California, Ms. ESCOBAR, and Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.

H.R. 2615: Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. HURD of Texas, and Mr. CISNEROS.

H.R. 2619: Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 2634: Mr. RASKIN.

H.R. 2635: Ms. OMAR.

H.R. 2649: Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ.

H.R. 2655: Mr. TURNER.

H.R. 2656: Mr. TURNER.

H.R. 2662: Mr. SOTO.

H.R. 2692: Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. POCAN, Mr. SWALWELL of California, and Mr. STIVERS.

H.R. 2733: Mr. MCNERNEY.

H.J. Res. 2: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.

H. Con. Res. 36: Mr. LANGEVIN, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. RUSH, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. LUJÁN, and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H. Res. 23: Ms. WILD and Mr. PASCRELL.

H. Res. 45: Mrs. CRAIG.

H. Res. 60: Ms. WILD.

H. Res. 138: Ms. JOHNSON of Texas.

H. Res. 152: Ms. LOFGREN and Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.

H. Res. 220: Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. PHILLIPS, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma, and Mr. MALINOWSKI.

H. Res. 221: Mr. PHILLIPS, Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma, and Mr. MALINOWSKI.

H. Res. 222: Mr. PHILLIPS, Mr. SOTO, Mr. GIANFORTE, and Mr. MALINOWSKI.

H. Res. 246: Mr. CLINE, Mr. STEWART, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. ROONEY of Florida.

H. Res. 259: Mrs. ROBY, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. LOFGREN, and Mr. WELCH.

H. Res. 276: Mr. STANTON.

H. Res. 277: Mr. CASE and Ms. LOFGREN.

H. Res. 326: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. AGUILAR, and Mr. PAYNE.

H. Res. 354: Ms. SLOTKIN, Mrs. MCBATH, Ms. WATERS, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. DELBENE, Ms. UNDERWOOD, Ms. HOULAHAN, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Miss RICE of New York, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Ms. SCANLON, Mrs. AXNE, Ms. SCHRIER, Mrs. FLETCHER, Mrs. TORRES of California, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mrs. WALORSKI, Ms. GRANGER, Mrs. MILLER, Mrs. RODGERS of Washington, Ms. FOX of North Carolina, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mrs. ROBY, Mr. MCCARTHY, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. PLASKETT, Ms. HILL of California, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mrs. CRAIG, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. PINGREE, and Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas.

H. Res. 369: Mr. BEYER and Mr. RASKIN.

H. Res. 372: Mr. CUMMINGS.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

The amendment to be offered by Representative PALLONE or a designee to H.R. 987 the Strengthening Health Care and Lowering Prescription Drug Cost Act, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 165

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, MAY 15, 2019

No. 81

Senate

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to resume consideration of the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Kenneth Kiyul Lee, of California, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

PENTAGON OVERSIGHT

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to shed light on yet another really dark cloud that is hanging over our Department of Defense. In fact, for decades, a dark cloud of fiscal mismanagement has loomed large over the Pentagon. During my very first term here in the Senate, I began my quest to bring fiscal accountability to the Pentagon. Four decades later, I am still keeping tabs on the money trail. That money trail is sometimes difficult to follow. Back then, it was a bit like David taking on Goliath.

We all know that the United States of America has the strongest and mightiest military in the world. I am thankful for that because a strong military is not meant to fight a war; it is meant to maintain the peace. We haven't had a world war III since we have had a strong military.

Our brave men and women who serve in the U.S. Armed Forces protect our shores at home and abroad to keep us safe and to protect the blessings of liberty for our children and grandchildren. That is exactly why it is so very important to keep check on the Pentagon's ledgers, to help make sure that every tax dollar assigned to the Nation's defense is actually spent effectively and not squandered on waste, fraud, and abuse.

With the help of brave whistleblowers who stuck their necks out to "commit

truth," I stuck my neck out during the Reagan administration. That is when I learned about the Pentagon's little shop of price horrors.

Of course, ripping off the taxpayers started during the Revolutionary War, when contractors sold rotten meat to the Continental Army, and it continued during the Civil War, when profiteers sold ammunition filled with sawdust and shoddy shoes and horses to the Union Army. It looks like it continues to this day.

Back in 1985, Americans will recall, the Defense Department was shelling out vast amounts of taxpayer dollars for spare parts. Remember back then the \$450 hammers and the \$640 toilet seats? That sounds like a real bargain compared to the more recent wasteful spending at the Pentagon, such as the \$1,280 coffee mug and the \$14,000 toilet seat lid. Obviously, the cost of waste is getting a whole lot more expensive for our taxpayers.

Back in the 1980s, I fought to win a spending freeze on unchecked spending sprees. Misspending and overspending were riddling the defense budget at the expense of the American taxpayer.

Military readiness drives the spending decisions that Members of Congress make when we cast our votes on the defense budget. Our constituents expect their elected representatives to make sure that the moms and dads, sons and daughters, brothers and sisters who are serving our country in uniform are well equipped with the best resources money can buy. But they also expect their elected representatives to make sure their hard-earned dollars that are withheld from every paycheck—their tax dollars—are not being ripped off by greedy corporations, like TransDigm Group, Inc., which I will speak about in a moment.

That is why I conduct robust oversight of defense spending. As a taxpayer watchdog—and all of us are supposed to be watchdogs, and all of us would claim to be watchdogs—it is our

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

PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

Eternal Spirit, our shelter in the time of storm, when our hearts grow faint and weary, renew our strength and enable us to soar above our challenges.

Today, fill our lawmakers with the spirit of wisdom. May their different approaches to problem-solving for our Nation and world contribute to more effective solutions for freedom in the years to come. Lord, deliver our Senators from the spirit of pessimism, and bless them as they seek to honor You. In their thoughts, words, and deeds, may they passionately strive to glorify You, ever seeking Your divine approval.

We pray in Your Holy Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

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

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRAMER). Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

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



Printed on recycled paper.

S2845

responsibility and my responsibility to make sure every defense dollar is spent as effectively and as efficiently as possible. Every dollar lost to waste, fraud, and abuse harms military readiness, and it also lines the pockets of somebody else at taxpayers' expense.

Trimming the fat in a bloated bureaucracy won't happen in the shadows. There is no magic wand to wave either. If there is one thing I have learned in my years of oversight, transparency matters. Transparency brings accountability.

Every time I come to the floor to talk about the fiscal mess at the Pentagon, I get a bit of *deja vu*. Earlier, I said my fraud-fighting efforts in the 1980s could be compared to David v. Goliath. Now let's fast-forward to this year, 2019. I am still here working as hard as ever to do away with wrongdoing and extract fiscal accountability at the Pentagon. Today, some might say that job is like the one performed by the famous character in Greek mythology who was destined to roll that heavy stone up the hill and to do it from then until eternity.

Congressional oversight can be extremely tedious, and it can be time-consuming, but, as I like to remind each of the other 534 Members of Congress, it is essential to our country that we exercise this system of checks and balances. Without it, the dark fiscal cloud looming over the Pentagon would swell bigger and bigger and bigger.

Oversight work may feel like an uphill climb, but oversight is not futile in the end. That is why I keep my shoulder to the wheel—to hold people at the Pentagon accountable, to protect taxpayers, and most importantly, when it comes to a defense dollar, to make sure we have our military readiness.

Right now, I am here today to share some new details about the broken record of fiscal mismanagement at the Department of Defense.

No matter how high I turn up the volume, the overdogs at the Pentagon remain tone deaf to fiscal integrity. Consider the recent report by the Department of Defense Office of Inspector General. It is called "Review of Parts Purchased From TransDigm Group Inc."

First, I want to compliment Senator WARREN and two Representatives, RO KHANNA and TIM RYAN, for getting the ball rolling with their request asking the inspector general to look into the contract—this contractor's pricing structure. We need all hands on deck in Congress to conduct oversight, so I thank these other Members of Congress just named.

After digging into the details, I can only conclude that the Pentagon is still, after all these years, stuck on autopilot. No one on board in the Pentagon's mother ship seems to bother to steer its "fiscal ship" into shape. Fiscal integrity somehow got lost in the spare parts horror story I am about to tell. In fact, I was more than dismayed

with the response from the internal watchdogs at the DOD IG office. Their team wrote the report, and yet the inspector general leadership team seemed to show no urgency whatsoever to fix the problem they described.

This tells me I also need to keep a tight leash on the internal watchdogs leading the Department of Defense inspector general's office. Their February report exposes a galactic price gouging, colossal ripple, and out-of-this-world waste. It reads like a sequel to the same financial shenanigans that have turned the Pentagon into a taxpayer money pit. Change out the name of the contractor, inflate the charges, submit the invoice and *voilà*—the American taxpayer is on the hook for another fixed-price, sole source contract.

For this report, the inspector general examined one contractor, TransDigm Group. In total, the inspector general analyzed 113 contracts between January 2015 and January 2017. They reviewed 47 spare parts the Department of Defense purchased from this contractor. In just those 2 years, the inspector general found TransDigm overcharged the Pentagon by \$16-1/10th million out of a total of \$29-7/10th million in contracts.

The reasonable profit threshold is considered by the Department of Defense to be 15 percent or below. The IG found that TransDigm earned excess profits on 46 of the 47 parts sold to the Defense Department.

On 17 of those parts, TransDigm earned more than a 1,000-percent profit. Remarkably, the highest profit percentage was 4,436 percent.

It is obvious to our taxpayers that that is a fleecing of the American taxpayer. Pulling the wool over the eyes of Congress and the taxpayers will only stop with transparency—which transparency will bring accountability.

So that is why I am here today. Just think for a minute about the big picture. This report is just one snapshot of a much larger problem. It is kind of a spit in the ocean when you consider the enormous \$716 billion defense budget. Just imagine the boatloads of bloat elsewhere in the bureaucracy. The Department of Defense is obligated under Federal law and under regulations to uphold basic measures of fiscal integrity.

So where do we go from here? The inspector general made just a few paltry recommendations. For starters, it directed contracting officers to request voluntary refunds for excess profits. Guess the chances of getting voluntary refunds. Let me suggest that I would not advise taxpayers to hold their breath on a voluntary refund. The inspector's general recommendations, then, have no teeth. Their recommendations are insufficient. What is worse, the inspector general leadership team claims no single Department of Defense official is responsible for this price gouging that goes on.

So let me repeat: The inspector general leadership team, the internal

watchdog for fiscal integrity and compliance at the Department of Defense, is effectively saying something like this: No one person at the Department of Defense can be held accountable for waste, fraud, and abuse of taxpayers' money. Obviously, to the taxpayers listening or anybody else, this illustrates a cavalier attitude toward taxpayer money that former Secretary of Defense James Mattis sought to extinguish. By the way, I wrote him a note, complimenting him on some statements he made about taking care of some of these problems.

The decades-long odyssey of misspending at the Pentagon keeps going around and around and around. That is why—the way I see it—the Department of Defense has a fundamental responsibility to uphold fiscal integrity. After reviewing the IG report and meeting with its auditing team and the Department of Defense pricing czar, I have reached three conclusions. No. 1, fiscal control at the Department of Defense is AWOL. The Pentagon will never clean up its books if it cannot properly track the money trail and connect the dots.

Consider why the Department of Defense contracting officers were unable to even certify if a profit was "fair and reasonable." Do you know why? It was because they could not obtain critical cost data at the company TransDigm. In the most egregious case—that case I mentioned where there was a 4,436-percent profit margin for just one spare part—the contracting officer—you will not believe this—certified that the price was fair and reasonable. There is something very, very wrong about that procedure. A whopping 4,000-percent profit margin for a spare part doesn't square with our midwestern common-sense standard.

No. 2, the leadership team at the IG office has exhibited an alarming hands-off approach toward stopping waste, fraud, and abuse. The lack of urgency and the failure to hold anyone accountable is very revealing. It sends a signal throughout the chain of command: Just keep on signing contracts; keep ordering spare parts; keep up business as usual. Lastly, it shows that no one will be held accountable for price gouging.

No. 3, the pattern of price gouging at TransDigm and its subsidiaries has gone unimpeded for decades. It has amassed exclusive rights to sell these spare parts to the Pentagon. In fact, the Defense Department accounted for 34 percent of its sales in 2017. TransDigm exploited its business model and took advantage of its sole source position to leverage higher prices.

Now, as a former chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee—and still a member of that committee—I have examined anticompetitive business practices over a long period of time, including those in agriculture and the pharmaceutical sectors of our economy. It is very concerning to me when

contracting arrangements, like those between TransDigm and its 100 subsidiaries, are effectively a monopoly. It is like an octopus with 100 arms putting the squeeze on the Pentagon. Effectively, the Pentagon is at the mercy of TransDigm—which owns the intellectual property—to buy the spare parts it needs to build the Nation's critical weapon systems. That leaves the American taxpayer on the hook for exorbitant price gouging.

The inspector general report found that TransDigm's choke hold has added up to tens of millions of dollars overcharging to the taxpayer. This is a good time to refresh people's memories about my legislative and oversight work with anticompetitive business practices. It is pretty simple. Monopolies invite government regulation. If that is the road TransDigm wants to continue following, I am here to deliver a message. The jig is up on this cozy relationship. The buck stops here.

I have written a letter to Acting Secretary Shanahan about these flawed contracts and failures to identify price gouging. I have asked him to make measurable recommendations on how to restore accountability and end this price gouging. One thing is crystal clear. Transparency and competition are MIA—missing in action—when the Pentagon buys spare parts from TransDigm and its subsidiaries. Now, thank God the other body, the House of Representatives, its Committee on Oversight and Reform, called an oversight hearing this week to examine TransDigm and its price-gouging shenanigans.

Congress has a constitutional duty of oversight to keep check on taxpayers' money and hold government accountable. As I said earlier, we need all hands on deck to root out wasteful spending.

Once again, we are back to square one. The Pentagon has flunked a fundamental benchmark of fiscal responsibility and stewardship. It is one of Washington's worst kept secrets. Year after year, Congress shovels more money into the Pentagon coffers to ensure we maintain the best military in the world, and I express my support for the military. I express my support that a strong department of national defense is also a strong keeper of the peace because we might not be challenged, and we are going to be able to help keep peace around the world, but year after year, the Pentagon squanders hundreds of millions of taxpayer dollars. Some people at the Pentagon seem to think that paying \$16 million in excess profits somehow seems to be small potatoes.

In my letter to the Acting Defense Secretary, I made it clear that I am not one of those people. I have asked him to answer a direct question. That question is this: What specific steps is he going to take to stop the profiteers from pilfering taxpayer money?

Contracts like I have described today between TransDigm and the Pentagon

are shortchanging the troops, fleecing the taxpayers, and tarnishing its reputation.

As Justice Brandeis said, "sunshine is said to be the best of disinfectants." So I am here today to pull back the curtains on the TransDigm audit. The American people need the sun to shine in on price gouging at the Pentagon so we can root out the wasteful spending here and elsewhere.

Transparency is the best ammunition that we have to chase away the dark fiscal crowd looming along the shores of the Potomac.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

NATIONAL POLICE WEEK

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Iowa for always staying on top of things like this.

Mr. President, first, I would like to talk about Police Week. Today we observe Peace Officers Memorial Day, the heart of National Police Week. We all remember the men and women in law enforcement who have made the ultimate sacrifice, and we pause to say thank you to all of our police officers who work day and night to keep our communities safe.

I want to share a special thanks to all of our law enforcement members visiting from New York, who, in my view, are the gold standard in police work.

I grew up in a neighborhood where police officers lived. I played with their children at their houses. You would always know sort of instinctively, even as a kid, when that phone rang and the spouse—almost always, in those days, the wife of a police officer—heard the phone ring, what went through her head a little bit is this: I hope that is not the call I dreaded. This is the job of police officers and their families—that is, to risk their safety for our safety—and they do a great job.

As we recognize their contributions, we should acknowledge what we could do in Congress to make their jobs safer and easier. We can make our streets safer by passing comprehensive background check legislation. We can help law enforcement combat foreign opioid trafficking by passing the bipartisan Fentanyl Sanctions Act and the POWER Act, which provides handheld scanning devices. When a police officer is on a drug bust, they can tell if fentanyl is part of a crime scene there, and they can take precautions to protect themselves, because we know how deadly fentanyl is, even if it gets on your skin or in your nostrils. We can also do more to care for the families of fallen officers.

That is why I have been so proud to fight alongside my colleague Senator GILLIBRAND and so many others to make sure that the September 11th Victim Compensation Fund has the necessary funding.

Last Friday, the New York Police Department, or the NYPD, added the names of nearly 50 police officers to

the 9/11 memorial wall, all of whom died in 9/11-related illnesses. It is our duty to take care of these families, and the first step is making sure that the Victims Compensation Fund has enough funds to compensate them.

I say to our law enforcement officers two words: Thank you. Thank you for your service. It is an honor to represent you in the Senate, and we are all grateful for the sacrifices you make every day.

NOMINATIONS

Mr. President, now on judges, during the same week that we mark the 65th anniversary of the historic "Brown v. Board of Education" decision, Leader MCCONNELL has scheduled votes on nominees whose views directly contradict the spirit of equality and justice that Brown represents.

It is appalling. These new people we are putting on the bench turn the clock so backward after we have made so much progress, many of it through the courts.

Consider the nomination of Michael Truncale of Texas. He has peddled conspiracies of "widespread voter fraud" and once called President Obama an "un-American imposter" who "bows to Arab Sheikhs and other world leaders." This is a man who we are putting on the bench, a man who is supposed to be judicious, thoughtful, and sees both sides. What we are putting on the bench is hard-right ideologues who will do damage to this country for a generation. Mr. Truncale was approved by the Republican Senate yesterday for a seat on the district court in Texas, and he is going to sit on that bench for life—a man who says things like this and who thinks like this.

I have always tried to put on the bench people who are moderate. So many of us have. Bill Clinton did. Barack Obama did. Here we have a parade of narrow ideologues, and that is not who should be on the bench because they will make law rather than interpret the law.

Here is another one, Kenneth Lee of California. His past writings reveal shocking positions on race and diversity, affirmative action, educational opportunity, and women's reproductive freedom. He once wrote that multiculturalism is a "malodorous sickness" and that sexism—sexism, which we have all seen and heard about and a little more than half of our population experiences—is "irrelevant pouting." That is a man who should be on the bench? If confirmed today, Mr. LEE may preside over cases dealing with gender discrimination.

Consider Wendy Vitter, nominated to the Eastern District of Louisiana. She once promoted the idea that contraceptives caused cancer and claimed that Planned Parenthood kills 150,000 women annually. She also refused to acknowledge that Brown v. Broad was correctly decided. On this very anniversary, that is who is on the floor to be voted on in lockstep by all the folks here on the Republican side. She refused to acknowledge that Brown v.

Board was correctly decided, saying instead that the decision was correct with the benefit of hindsight—whatever that means. In the same district, where 6-year-old Ruby Bridges became the first African-American child to attend an all-White elementary school in the South, the Senate will consider confirming someone who claims that hindsight was needed to understand why the decision that allowed Ruby to go to the same school as a White child wasn't correct. That is who we are putting on the bench.

These are not just conservatives. We understand that the President and Republicans will put in conservatives, but hard-right, narrow ideologues who show no understanding or sympathy for people who don't look like them or pray like them or marry like them—what is wrong here?

It is not hard. If you need the benefit of hindsight to understand that *Brown v. Board of Education*, which brought an end to school segregation and led to the end of American apartheid, was correctly decided, you shouldn't be a Federal judge. I urge my colleagues, in the spirit of the Brown anniversary and what it means, to oppose Ms. Vitter's nomination this afternoon.

PUERTO RICO

Mr. President, now on Puerto Rico, briefly, as negotiations on a final package of disaster aid continue, I want to stress to everyone that we must remain focused on reaching an agreement as swiftly as possible. Disaster-stricken Americans in the West, the South, the Midwest, and 3 million citizens of Puerto Rico are waiting on Congress to deliver relief, in some cases for disasters that occurred over a year ago.

Why is this held up?

We know why. Republicans are not willing to give aid to Puerto Rico. There was a bill that would never pass the House and something they didn't think originally, when President Trump said: Don't do it. And they just bowed down. They thought they could roll over the House and the Democratic minority in the Senate, who wouldn't stand up for certain Americans.

Well, we did. Now, thankfully, we are making progress. Republicans are realizing that Puerto Ricans cannot be left out of the package, but now we must avoid poison pills at all costs. President Trump, if he sticks his thumb into this again and asks for something unreasonable, will delay disaster aid once again, just as he did before.

To my Republican colleagues, let's do this together. Let's do it in the right way. Let's do it in the way that can pass the House.

President Trump will sign the bill. We have to make sure this legislation gets across the finish line. Every time the President intervenes and Republican colleagues go along, it gets held up even further.

ABORTION

Mr. President, on the Alabama abortion bill, last night the Republican Alabama Senate passed, perhaps, the

most draconian abortion law in the country. It bans abortion in every stage of pregnancy, imposes criminal penalties—criminal penalties—on any doctor who performs one, and includes no exception in the case of rape or incest, even if the victim is a child. If a child is raped, they have to have the baby.

The Alabama bill is as extreme as it gets. It is a clear attack on women's freedom. It contravenes a woman's constitutional right to make private medical decisions. It would deeply harm women, turn doctors into criminals, and deny the right of rape victims, even if they are children, to make personal medical decisions.

The Alabama abortion bill is plainly inhumane. It should never have passed. The Governor should not sign it. If she does, it ought to be swiftly struck down by the courts.

IRAN

Mr. President, on Iran, over of the past few days, it has come to light in public reporting that the Trump administration's national security team has reviewed a plan to deploy as many as 120,000—yes, you heard that right, 120,000—U.S. troops in the Mideast should tensions with Iran escalate. I was stunned to read this report in the *New York Times* yesterday.

The administration just started a maximum pressure campaign of sanctions against Iran, but is it simultaneously reviewing plans for war? That would make no sense.

Meanwhile, the President oddly denied the report while also saying he would “absolutely” send ground troops to the Middle East. But if he did, it would be a “heck”—and I am paraphrasing—“of a lot more troops [than 120,000].”

Did we learn the lessons of the last decade? Do we know that we have to spend our time focusing on building up this country here, not build roads and bridges in the Middle East but do them here?

There is an alarming lack of clarity here. There is a lack of strategy, and there is a lack of consultation. The President ought to come up with a strategy and make it clear to Congress. An adventure like this—120,000 troops or a large number of troops—should have to be approved by Congress. It certainly should be discussed with Congress ahead of time. There need to be open hearings and closed briefings with the committees of jurisdiction immediately.

Any potential increase in our military presence in the Middle East should require consultation with Congress, and anything beyond that would require this body to act.

President Trump, what is your strategy? Where are you headed? Why aren't you talking to Congress about it?

PUBLIC HOUSING

Mr. President, finally, on public housing, it was reported last week that the Department of HUD has proposed a rule that would bar families with

mixed immigration status from receiving public housing assistance, even if everyone but one member of the family is a legal resident. So if it is a family of six—a mother who is an American citizen, four children who are American citizens, but a husband who is not and who is not here legally—they kick them all out. It risks displacing tens of thousands of legal residents and of American citizens, including 55,000 children. The administration has created crisis after crisis with the immigration community. Are they going to create another one and take 55,000 young American children, almost all of whom are citizens, and just kick them out on the streets when we know there is very little affordable housing? What a cruel and callous policy. It is another example of the Trump administration's desire to separate families and disrupt communities.

There is nothing to say about this proposed rule but that it is cruel, wrong-headed, and would lead to even more chaos than the administration has created already.

In an effort to appear even more punitive toward immigrants, the administration has conjured up a rule that could potentially force tens of thousands of children into homelessness or away from their families.

My message to President Trump and Secretary Carson is simple: Scrap this idea now.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri is recognized.

MAIDEN SPEECH

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. President, it is an honor to rise today to speak in this Chamber on behalf of the people of Missouri. When I think of those who have served my State here before me, I am humbled. When I think of the true and strong Missourians who have sent me here, I am sobered, because to represent them will be a great responsibility indeed. I pledge to my fellow Missourians that I will work at this task with all the strength that God can give me, and I will serve without fear and without favor to any man.

We Missourians are known for our frankness, and today I will be frank because this is a moment of great need for my State and for our Nation. This Nation was born in a revolution by “We the People” and premised on a revolutionary faith that it is the people—the common man and woman who make democracy work—and it is the calling of every generation to renew that revolution for their day. In our time, our revolutionary faith is faltering, and in the heartland of this country, the great challenge of our age is unfolding.

I come from a town called Lexington, MO. It is a small place, but a proud one. It is a place where people wake early and work late to make a life for themselves and their children. It is a place where people value honesty and gumption and life's simple pleasures: a fine morning in a deer stand, reading

to the kids before bed, and Sunday dinner at Mom's. Although it is humble, it is a place that reflects the dignity and quiet greatness of the working men and women.

These are the people who explored a continent, who built the railroads, and who opened the West. These are the workers whose labor launched the Industrial Revolution and whose ingenuity made the American economy the marvel of the world. These are the families who have rallied to this country's flag at every hour of danger and who bear the burden of defending our Nation even now. These are the patriots who man the fire department and coach the Little League. These are the generous who give \$25 a month out of their gas money to assist people halfway around the globe whom they will never meet just because they believe in helping others. They don't ask for much, and they live by a simple creed: Give the best of yourself to your family, your community, and your fellow man. America is a place of promise, because in these hearts, honor lives.

These working men and women are confronting crises today, and, as they do, so does our democracy. After years of sacrifice, the great American middle is being pushed aside by a new arrogant aristocracy. The new aristocrats seek to remake society in their own image, to engineer an economy that works for the elite but few else, and to fashion a culture that is dominated by their own preferences. When they think of helping their fellow citizens, they think of making everyone else more like themselves.

And Washington has just gone along. This town has embraced the politics of elite values and elite ambition rather than building opportunities to thrive in the great and broad American middle. This has left middle America—the great American middle class—under siege, battling the loss of respect and work, the decline of home and family, and an epidemic of loneliness and despair. This is the crisis of our time.

I am afraid you wouldn't know it to listen to the talk of this town much of the time. As the crisis deepens, the political establishment looks the other way, rehearsing and rehashing the political debates of 30 or 40 years ago. There is no time for that any longer. The 21st century is upon us, and the great struggle of this century can no longer wait. The crisis that we face goes to the heart of our revolution.

The United States is unique in history as a republic governed not by a select elite but by the working man and woman, because we believe it is through the working man and woman that God chooses to change the world. That change comes not through spectacular feats of daring or glory but through everyday work and everyday sacrifice and everyday acts of courage and love. It has been the proud working people, our farmers and mechanics, and teachers and tradesmen who have defined the character of this country.

For too long now, neither our economy nor our culture has lent them much support. Instead, our policymakers have entrenched the new elites and undermined the way of life that once bound this country together. It is time to face the facts.

Over the last 40 years, our economy has worked best for those at the top—the wealthy and the well-educated. If you have a job in Silicon Valley or an expensive and prestigious degree, this economy has worked for you, and Washington has focused on how to get more people to join this elite. But if you want a life built around the place where you grew up, if your ambition is not to start a tech business but to join the family business, to serve in the PTA or in your local church, well, you are told that you are not a success, and you are told that you are on your own.

This is no accident. The people who make the rules now, who run our large corporations, and who set the tone for our popular culture all belong to the same class. This economy has been their economy. They made it for themselves.

But in places like the one where I grew up in middle Missouri, good-paying jobs that you can raise a family on are going away. The jobs go overseas or south of the border or to cities on the coasts. Once vibrant towns decline, taking with them the network of schools and neighborhoods and churches that make up middle-class life.

Rural America has been particularly hard hit. Rural Americans' life expectancy has not just leveled off. It has actually dropped, and for women without a high school degree, that drop has been staggering. In some rural places, residents struggle with outright deprivation. My home State contains some of the poorest counties in America, all in rural places that once boasted thriving small towns. As those communities struggle, want sets in.

The crisis reaches well beyond economics. The message that Washington has sent our whole society is loud and clear: Our elites are the people who matter and those who aspire to join them. Everyone else is unimportant or backward.

Millions of Americans are left with a sense that the people who run this country view them with nothing but contempt and value them as nothing but consumers. These trends tear at our country's social fabric, and they undermine our common ethic of citizenship because being a free person and being an American isn't just about what you can buy. It is about the pride that comes in supporting a family. It is about contributing something of worth to your community. It is about being able to look a neighbor in the eye and know that you are his equal. It is about respect, and too many Americans haven't been getting it.

They are certainly not getting it from our cultural elite. The media, Hollywood, and academia relentlessly press their values and their priorities

on the rest of us. They advocate liberation from the duties of family and tradition. They look down on the plain virtues of patriotism, self-giving, and faith. They idealize fame and preach self-realization through consuming more stuff, and as they do, they assault the foundations of the great American middle.

Perhaps we shouldn't be surprised, then, at the epidemic of loneliness and despair that is spreading across working communities. Fewer young people are getting married and starting families. Drug addiction is surging. The opioid menace has ravaged every sector, every age group, and every geography of working people.

It is not only pills. It is heroin, cocaine, fentanyl, meth, and, of course, marijuana that have flooded our streets and our homes. Everywhere, deaths of despair are mounting among farmers and among the young. Most shockingly, the young are the hope of our society, but in America today, they are taking their lives in numbers we have never seen in our history.

The well-off frequently note that our Nation has never been richer, but the tragedy of youth suicide betrays a profound poverty of hope. And is that really so surprising? Today's youth must make their way in a society increasingly defined not by the genuine and personal love of family and church but by the cold and judgmental world of social media.

A typical young person is bombarded by video games and violence and the relentless status-seeking imposed and modeled by our cultural elite. There is no more shocking illustration of our cultural poverty and no more damning indictment of our cultural leaders than these lost lives.

The sum of it all is that too many Americans are losing their standing as citizens. They are losing their voice in the life of this Nation, and with that, they are losing their liberty. To be free is to have a voice. It is to have a say, and it is to have the power of self-government.

The chattering class often tells us that all of this—the jobs, the despair, and the loss of standing—is a result of forces beyond anyone's control, as if that is an excuse to do nothing, but in fact, it is not true. Today's society benefits those who shaped it, and it has been shaped not by working men and women but by the new aristocratic elite. Big banks, big tech, and big multinational corporations, along with their allies in the academy and the media—these are the aristocrats of our age. They live in the United States, but they consider themselves citizens of the world. They operate businesses or run universities here, but their primary loyalty is to their own agenda for a more unified, progressive, and profitable global order.

These modern aristocrats often claim to be a meritocracy, and many of them truly believe they are. What they don't see or will not acknowledge is that the

society they have built works mainly for themselves. They have effectively run this country for decades, and their legacy is national division and national decline.

It is time to reclaim our revolutionary heritage and reassert the democracy of "We the People." To those who despair at the task ahead, I say the hour is not too late and the crisis is not too deep for the determined effort of a great people, and to those who feel forgotten and unheard, I say this is your time. Now we must stand together to renew the promise of our enduring revolution. We must put aside the tired orthodoxies of years past and forge a new politics of national renewal.

We must begin by acknowledging that GDP growth alone cannot be the measure of this Nation's greatness, and so it cannot be the only aim of this Nation's policy because our purpose is not to make a few people wealthy but to sustain a great democracy. We need not just a bigger economy but a better society. We need a society that offers rewarding work for every worker who wants it, wherever she is from, whatever degree he might have, whether their ambition is to start a business or to start a family. We need a society that will allow towns and neighborhoods to flourish across the great heartland of this country and not just in the megacities of the coasts. We need a society that puts American workers first, that prioritizes them over cheap goods from abroad and offers them the chance to better their station. All this we must fight for and more.

We need to repair the torn fabric of our common life. We need a politics that prioritizes strong marriages and encourages strong families, where children can know their parents and be nurtured by their love. We need strong schools and churches and co-ops because these are the things that make liberty possible, for liberty is more than selling or buying or the right to be left alone. Liberty is the ability to master our own fate and, as a free people, to set our own course. That is the promise of the American Revolution, and we will renew it for our day.

Washington has ignored the need for this renewal for too long. It has rested easy with the priorities of an earlier age. Now it must wake up and face the facts of this day. Now we must ask new questions, force new debates, articulate new priorities, and find new solutions to make the great American middle thrive again.

This is not the work of a day or a season. It is the work of a generation. We will make it the work of this generation and so do our part to see the success of liberty in our time.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SASSE). The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

WELCOMING SENATOR HAWLEY OF MISSOURI

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I am glad to be joined by my good colleague Senator HAWLEY. He brings incredible depth to the issues we talked about. He grew up in Lexington, MO, I understand, in smalltown America. He was educated in some of the best schools in our country and had the great good fortune to be assigned as a John Roberts law clerk in the office of another John Roberts law clerk and the good judgment to convince her to marry him. He and Erin are a valuable asset to our State. They have two wonderful little boys. I have enjoyed the time we have had together and look forward to more time with JOSH and his family. He clearly thinks deeply about the issues that affect the country. He is focused on not only the present but the future. Those are all good things.

We have jointly had the opportunity to represent a State that is as diverse as any State in the country. I think a week, a month, a year in Missouri is probably the closest thing to that same period of time if you could somehow condense the entire United States into one place, where sometimes St. Louis is seen as the westernmost eastern city and Kansas City may be more like Denver than St. Louis. Northern Missouri is more like Iowa.

I would state to Senator GRASSLEY that when crossing the border there, you certainly can't tell when you cross from Missouri farmland into Iowa farmland and the small cities and small towns. The Bootheel, Delta South in character where JOSH and I live in Springfield has that northwest Arkansas-Oklahoma vitality that is different from anywhere else in our State. As we travel actively around our State, as we both do, I think we have a great sense of so much of what happens in the country. It is still the population center of America, if not the exact geographic center. Missouri is where the country comes together.

JOSH had an opportunity last year to talk to tens of thousands of Missourians about that and to communicate in other ways with millions of Missourians about that. I am glad he is here and glad to welcome him to the work we will be doing together. We won't agree every single day because if we did, I guess we could have just one Senator and give him two votes. But it gives us a chance to talk about the issues we face and what that means for our State but also what it means to the country.

I am delighted he has committed himself to public service. Missourians have now elected him to two statewide offices in less than 3 years, and they have expressed that confidence in him.

With great frequency, I run into students both JOSH and Erin had when they were both teaching at the Law School at the University of Missouri, and they always tell me Erin was the best teacher they ever had and often

tell me JOSHUA was the best teacher they ever had. They must not have had a class with Erin yet. But I am delighted that they are both part of the discussion that will lead America forward. I look forward to engaging in that discussion with them and partnering in the things we can find to do together and getting a chance to represent our strong, unique State that I think is ready to merge into a greater future, whether that is with all the healthcare and ag research we see happening, the GEOINT focus that is coming into our State because of the new NGA, the National Geospatial Intelligence Agency facility being built there.

This is a time of great opportunity. I am glad to have the chance to share part of that opportunity and look at that future with my colleague JOSH HAWLEY and certainly want to join others in welcoming him officially to the Senate today as he makes his maiden speech to the Senate.

I yield back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I want to join with my colleague, the senior Senator from Missouri, and congratulate the junior Senator from Missouri on some wonderful remarks.

I came into the Congress with Senator BLUNT from the House of Representatives over 20 years ago, which I guess makes us the old guys around here, but it warms my heart and gives me great hope for the future to see the caliber and the quality of people who are entering public life in the form of people like Senator HAWLEY.

He is somebody who not only brings great intellect, great passion, and great conviction, but he is a principled leader who is here for the right reasons and profoundly wants to make a difference for the future of this country. In his remarks, he touched upon the genius of our Founders, and that is that average Americans—working men and women in this country—have an opportunity to make a difference with their voices and with their votes by entering the public arena and being a part of our democracy. That is really what this is all about. That is what our work should be about every day, is empowering them to do a better job in raising their families and serving their communities.

I certainly look forward to continuing our work with the new Senator from Missouri and with the rest of our colleagues here as we embark upon that task. I hope we can be successful in restoring that vision our Founders had for what this country should be and in each day waking up and thinking about the fact that it is not about us; it is about what we do to secure a better and brighter future consistent with that brilliant past we have been so blessed by because of those who have come before and have been willing to enter public life and make a difference.

So thank you and congratulations to Senator HAWLEY. It is a great honor to

serve with you, and we look forward to working with you in the days and weeks and months ahead to serve the very people you talked about in your remarks.

NATIONAL MILITARY APPRECIATION MONTH

Mr. President, May is National Military Appreciation Month, a chance for us to honor the service of those who have kept our Nation free for 243 years.

For me, when I reflect on our military men and women, there are always two things in the forefront of my mind: my dad, Harold Thune, and the men and women of Ellsworth Air Force Base in South Dakota and the South Dakota National Guard.

My father was a fighter pilot who flew Hellcats off the USS *Intrepid* in the Pacific theater during World War II. I came to know the “greatest generation” through my dad—their humility, their quiet service, their patriotism, and their deep dedication to the cause of freedom.

I have come to know the men and women of today’s military through Ellsworth and through South Dakota’s National Guard and the great work, the extraordinary work they do day in and day out, the professionalism, the skill, the talent, and the dedication they bring to the work of defending America and America’s freedoms.

Ellsworth has been on my mind in particular this week because right now the Air Force is conducting a large force exercise involving B-1 bombers, B-2s, B-52s, F-16s, C-17s, KC-135s, JSTARS and AWACS, and, for the first time, F-35s.

My acquaintance with Ellsworth began during my time as a Member of the House of Representatives, but I really got to know the base and what it meant to the Rapid City area shortly after I became a Senator.

Just a few months into my first term in the Senate, Ellsworth found itself targeted for closure by the Base Realignment and Closure Commission. That summer of 2005 was a long one as we mobilized to protect the base. I don’t think I missed a BRAC hearing in DC that summer. It didn’t matter whether Ellsworth was on the agenda; I wanted to be there in case the chance to advocate for Ellsworth arose.

Thanks to the efforts of a lot of dedicated people, we were victorious. We demonstrated to the Commission that Ellsworth was a vital national security asset and that moving the B-1 fleet from Ellsworth would actually cost money. We also made the case that the United States shouldn’t put all of its eggs in one basket, that it shouldn’t consolidate all of its assets in one location.

By August, we had succeeded in having Ellsworth removed from the closure list. Since then, the congressional delegation, Ellsworth, and community leaders have worked hard to build up the base so that we never again find ourselves in that same position. In 2007, we saw the Air Force Financial Services Center open at Ellsworth. In

2011, we saw the arrival of the 89th Attack Squadron and its command and control stations for MQ-9 Reapers. In 2015, a decade-long mission paid off with the expansion of the training airspace for the base. The Powder River Training Complex is now the largest training airspace in the continental United States. It is undoubtedly partly thanks to this airspace that Ellsworth was just chosen not only as the home for the B-21 training mission, the first bombers to the fleet, but operational squadrons as well.

Once on the chopping block, Ellsworth is going from strength to strength, and South Dakota is deeply proud to host this crucial base.

Ellsworth’s airmen have played an essential role in the armed conflicts of recent years. Ellsworth’s pilots have engaged targets in the Middle East using Predator and Reaper remotely piloted aircraft for vital reconnaissance, search and rescue, and strike missions.

The Thunderbirds of the 34th Bomb Squadron and the Tigers of the 37th Bomb Squadron have flown countless missions, conducting strikes, providing deterrence, and delivering critical close air support.

During Operation Odyssey Dawn, B-1s from Ellsworth launched from South Dakota, flew halfway around the world to Libya, dropped their bombs, and returned home—all in a single mission. This marked the first time in history that B-1s launched combat missions from the United States to strike targets overseas.

During my time advocating for Ellsworth, I have had the chance to learn a lot about aircraft and the incredible capabilities of the U.S. military, especially the capabilities of the U.S. Air Force. But the greatest part of representing Ellsworth has been the chance to meet with and get to know its airmen, from the wing commanders and other base leaders to the airmen who care for the planes.

Ultimately, no matter what technology we have, the strength of our fighting force comes down to our military men and women. It is because of the men and women we have that the United States has the strongest fighting force in the world.

Members of the military are a special breed. At an age when many are focused on graduation ceremonies or summer vacations, they take a different path—a path that challenges them mentally and physically, that pushes them to their limits and then asks them to go further, that asks them to forget their own needs and to focus only on what they can do for others, and that asks them to forgo comfort for sacrifice, up to and including the sacrifice of their lives. At 18, at 21, these warriors pledge to lay down their lives for the rest of us, and they make that pledge again every day of their service, every morning when they wake up and head to work, whether that is the repair base at Ellsworth or a battlefield half a world away.

I am profoundly grateful for the honor of representing some of the men and women of the U.S. military here in the Senate. We owe our soldiers, sailors, airmen, marines, and Coast Guard a debt we can never repay.

As Military Appreciation Month continues and Armed Forces Day approaches, we can take the time to remember—to remember that we go about our lives in peace and freedom every day because of members of the U.S. military who are standing watch for us. May God bless the members of the U.S. military, and may God continue to bless the United States of America.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

ABORTION

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I want to start today by saying I am really appalled by the extreme, cruel, shameful abortion ban that was passed yesterday in Alabama. That legislation is nothing short of an attack on women, and it is part of a larger effort we are seeing today around the country to take away the constitutional right of women to safe, legal abortion and allowing politicians to make decisions for women about their bodies, their health, and their lives instead of trusting doctors and women.

I want every woman reading the news this morning and wondering what this means for you, your family, and for your granddaughters to know I am with you, and I am going to keep fighting for you every step of the way.

NOMINATION OF WENDY VITTER

Mr. President, I want to turn to speak about my opposition to Wendy Vitter’s nomination, which is yet another step extreme politicians are taking to undermine women’s rights and access to healthcare.

I oppose Wendy Vitter’s nomination to the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Louisiana.

President Trump and Vice President PENCE have made it clear that they want to pack the Judiciary with far-right judges who will turn back the clock on reproductive rights, and this nominee is no exception.

Time and again, Mrs. Vitter has advocated against women’s reproductive rights using inflammatory language and falsehoods. She has demonstrated a keen sense of partisanship and a poor sense of judgment, starting with her initial response to the Senate Judiciary Committee’s questionnaire.

Mrs. Vitter left out information about her past statements in her response to the committee—the kinds of serious submissions Republicans have objected to with other nominees. I am

not talking about a small memory lapse. I am talking about nearly 200 additional pages that had to be added to her response once they were brought to light. I am not talking about insignificant statements, things that are hard to find or easy to forget. I am talking about campaign ads, panel discussions, political rallies. I am not talking about innocent uncontroversial comments. I am talking about the fearmongering of an activist who is entirely unfit for the Federal bench.

Mrs. Vitter initially failed to disclose her remarks at a political rally opposing the construction of a Planned Parenthood clinic, remarks where she claimed Planned Parenthood—which, by the way, provides low-cost healthcare like cancer screenings and STI screenings and contraceptive care to millions of people. She claimed Planned Parenthood is responsible for killing 150,000 women a year. That is careless, it is reckless, and it is wrong. It is incredibly poor judgment for somebody who is being considered for a lifetime judicial appointment.

She also failed to disclose the time she moderated a deeply dishonest panel called “Abortion Hurts Women’s Health.” Mrs. Vitter prompted panelists to peddle misinformation about women’s health, encouraging a discussion that falsely suggested abortion is linked to cancer and infertility. One panel spoke at length about a deeply inaccurate brochure she had authored called “How the Pill Kills.” As you can tell from that title, the brochure was loaded with glaring falsehoods, like the false claim that birth control causes breast cancer or that women on birth control are more likely to die a violent death. In response to that speaker’s long string of very dangerous lies about women’s healthcare, Mrs. Vitter encouraged the attendees to download the brochure, bring it to their doctors, and ask them to put it in their waiting rooms.

It is incredibly alarming that a nominee for the Federal bench would be so willing to voice her support for such dangerous propaganda, especially when that same nominee is unwilling to voice her support for one of the landmark civil rights cases in our country’s history, *Brown v. Board of Education*.

During her confirmation hearing, Mrs. Vitter was asked whether *Brown v. Board* was decided correctly. It wasn’t a trick question. Many past judicial nominees, including Chief Justice Roberts, have been able to answer it. Mrs. Vitter refused.

This week, we are going to celebrate the 65th anniversary of the *Brown v. Board* decision. Do Republicans really want to mark this occasion by confirming a judge who has voiced more support for outright lies about women’s health than for the historic decision that struck down State-sponsored segregation? This should be simple. Someone whose statements and record fail to support the *Brown v. Board* decision cannot be trusted with the respon-

sibility of deciding the historic cases of tomorrow. Someone who has worked to spread misinformation about contraceptives and undermine the constitutional right to safe, legal abortion that is enshrined in *Roe v. Wade* cannot be trusted to fight for the truth or uphold women’s reproductive rights. In other words, someone like Wendy Vitter cannot be trusted with a lifetime seat on a Federal bench.

I urge my colleagues to join me in rejecting this nomination. While President Trump and Vice President PENCE may keep sending us these far-right nominees and Senate Republicans may keep jamming them through under the radar, Democrats are not going to stand by or stand down. They may try to push our courts to the right. We are going to keep pushing back. We are going to keep holding a spotlight on these nominees and making clear just how extreme they are, and we are going to keep fighting for women and men and families in this country.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. SMITH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

MENTAL HEALTH

Ms. SMITH. Mr. President, when I first came to the Senate, I knew I wanted to make mental health one of my top priorities. As a Minnesotan, I am proud of the way our Senators have led the way on this important issue, from Paul Wellstone to Al Franken, to AMY KLOBUCHAR. I am honored to have the chance to further our proud legacy when it comes to improving our mental health system, but that is not the only reason I have chosen to make mental health a focus.

I am glad it has become a more prominent issue here in Washington, but I have noticed it usually comes to the forefront in the context of some unthinkable tragedy. When a high-profile celebrity takes his or her own life, we immediately want to reach out to other people who are suffering in silence. Of course, we do. That is not a bad thing.

We can’t repeat the number often enough. If you are having thoughts of suicide, please, please call the National Suicide Prevention Lifeline at 1-800-273-8255. Even if you aren’t suffering from acute mental illness, put that number in your cell phone so you can, someday, help someone who is.

On the other hand, when a profoundly disturbed person commits a horrible act of violence, we immediately want to intervene before the next time it happens. Of course, we do.

When we bring up the need to improve our mental health system as the answer to the epidemic of mass shoot-

ings in America, though, we are making two huge mistakes. First, we are ignoring our responsibility to address a much more direct cause of these tragedies—guns. Second, we are unfairly and falsely stigmatizing mental illness.

Here is another thing we can’t say often enough: It is exceedingly rare that one’s mental illness leads one to commit acts of violence. In fact, one is much more likely to be a victim of violence than to be a perpetrator, and we must not make it harder for people to seek help by falsely tagging them, as we do, as being potentially dangerous.

Yes, these tragedies are reminders that we need to spend more time talking about mental health, but let’s have the right conversation. For most people who struggle with mental illness in America, the struggle is not about life or death; it is about the quality of the lives we lead. Mental health is a continuum, and many of our fellow citizens fall somewhere along this continuum. These millions of Americans deserve our attention, and these millions of Americans deserve our help.

The other reason I want to focus on mental health care while I am here in the Senate is that I am one of them. When it started for me, I thought I was just having a bad day or, really, a series of bad days. While growing up, I had always been a pretty cheerful kid, but at some point during my second year of college, I had started to find it harder and harder to cope with the daily challenges of life. Actually, it had been my roommate who had noticed that I had not been myself and hadn’t been myself for a long time. She had suggested that I talk to someone over at the Student Health Services. It had been a completely foreign idea to me, and I had responded in the way a lot of people would have—“I have this.” Eventually, I had realized that maybe I had been wrong about that.

It was really hard to make that phone call, walk over to the counselor’s office, and sit in the waiting room. I didn’t know what to expect, and to be honest, I was embarrassed. The counselor’s name was Charlotte. She was nice, had common sense, and wasn’t patronizing or judgmental. She just asked me some simple questions about how I was feeling, and I remember what a relief it was just to talk about it. Over the course of a few months, Charlotte gave me some ideas about how to cope a little bit better with the challenges I was facing, and I would always walk out of her office feeling a little bit more courageous and a little bit more hopeful.

Did I live happily ever after? Well, not quite. That is not how mental illness works. There isn’t a box for when you are healthy and a box for when you are not. Like I said, it is a continuum, and you try to get a little closer to the healthy end every day.

At one point in my thirties, though, I found myself sliding back in the wrong direction. There was nothing unusually traumatic going on in my life.

I had a career, and Archie and I were raising our two sons. We were busy, and we were tired, but that is the way it is when you are a young parent. Still, something was wrong.

All who have suffered from depression have their own metaphors to describe it, but most can identify with the sensation of the color just sort of draining out of your world. The things that used to give you joy don't give you joy anymore. The things that you used to love to do may just make you exhausted. Basically, you are just trying to slog through the day. Of course, when you feel this way, just making it through the day is tough. I found myself struggling to be a good mom, a good wife, a good friend, a good colleague. I just felt off all the time—clumsy and slow. I forgot things and got angry at the drop of a hat.

See, the thing is, depression messes with your memory. I will never forget when my young son asked me quietly and cautiously: "Mom, are you OK?" It was a spiral. The worse things got, the more frustrated I became, but I couldn't get it together. Down and down I went until I could no longer see hope on the horizon. I was never suicidal, but I struggled to function. I definitely wasn't living my best life. I really wasn't living at all.

That is the reality of mental illness for millions of Americans. I am one of the lucky ones. I was lucky that my college had excellent mental health resources and that my roommate cared enough about me to urge me to take advantage of those resources. I was lucky that when my depression came back with a vengeance, I had health insurance that covered treatment. There was a therapist named Susan with the skill and the expertise to help me.

Susan asked me a few questions:

How are you sleeping?

Terrible.

Are you forgetting things?

All the time.

She then suggested that I take a diagnostic test, which basically consisted of answering questions like those. Even then, I was resistant. People often say that depression lies, and the biggest lie depression tells is that what is wrong with you is you. So you resist getting help because you refuse to accept that there is anything happening except that you stupidly forgot it was recycling day again.

I went ahead and I did the diagnostic test, and Susan came back and said: Yes, you are clinically depressed, so let's talk about what we can do about it.

One thing I would say to people who are resisting going in for that appointment is that even after I got that diagnosis, I was still in control. When Susan brought up the idea of medication, it was a suggestion and not an order. I will admit it—it was a suggestion I had a hard time with. I didn't want to become a different person. I didn't want some pill messing with my brain. What if it didn't work and I got

worse? On the other hand, what if it did work? Would I really be better, or would it just be an illusion of feeling better?

Susan convinced me to give it a try, and I was lucky again when the first medication we tried worked. I didn't feel better right away. There was no big milestone moment where I woke up and everything was great again. But I remember feeling like I was slowly coming out of a fog. The color started to seep back into my day a little bit more every day. I began to reengage with my family and my friends and my work, and I could see hope on the horizon again. After a couple of years on medication, I slowly ramped down, and I haven't had to get treatment since.

As I said, there is no happily ever after when it comes to mental illness, but happier is possible. If anyone needs proof, just talk to me.

So that is my story, but really it is the story of millions of Americans. I chose to share mine—first in an op-ed in the Rochester Post-Bulletin and now here on the floor of the Senate—because I want to urge anyone who struggles with depression or anxiety or substance abuse or post-traumatic stress disorder or any other mental health issue to reach out and seek help.

Destigmatizing and demystifying mental illness is just the beginning. Everyone can be a friend to those in need by urging them to take advantage of the resources that are available to them, but the 100 of us here in the Senate have a responsibility to make sure those resources are available to everyone. We can't afford to leave holes in the net we build to catch people when they fall, especially when one of the biggest holes is in our schools.

I have spent a lot of time over the last months having conversations with teachers and administrators in public schools across Minnesota. Time and again, when I ask them "What keeps you up at night?" they come back to the mental health of their students. They talk about the causes—everything from increased social pressure that comes from social media to the trauma of losing a parent to opioids—but they also tell me what the crisis really looks like at ground level.

A principal in St. Paul told me about the regular phenomenon of an ambulance pulling up at the school doors, rushing to the aid of a student who has suffered a break. It has happened more than a half a dozen times at his school alone this year. Meanwhile, the principal in Parkers Prairie—a town in Otter Tail County of just over 1,000, people—tells me that she sees students experiencing homelessness and other trauma, students dealing with PTSD, and students with eating disorders. Just this year, she has had three students end up in the hospital for self-harming. They have a heroic social worker who comes in but only every other day because they have to share her with another school in the district.

School psychologists across Minnesota tell me they are struggling to

keep up with the number of kids who need urgent intervention to make sure that, for example, their behavioral issues don't become so significant that they get them kicked out of school altogether.

As for kids whose issues are very real but not so acute—like the ninth grader whose anxiety makes her sick to her stomach every day—they wind up stuck on waiting lists for treatment. And that is even before psychologists can do any active outreach to the students who haven't reached out for help.

That is why last month I reintroduced my Mental Health Services for Students Act. This bill would create a grant program for school districts looking to expand the mental health services they are able to offer to students by partnering with community mental health system organizations.

If we are going to get our arms around this crisis, we need to train more teachers, administrators, and members of the school community, including parents, to recognize when kids are struggling and to connect them with help. If we here in the Senate are serious about addressing mental health in our schools, we should pass this bill without delay.

A comprehensive approach to mental health means improving the system all along the age continuum. Over in the HELP Committee, we will have an opportunity this year to reauthorize the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act, or CAPTA. And I have a bill, sponsored in the House by my friend Representative DEAN PHILLIPS, that would improve the delivery of mental health services within our child welfare system. For example, our bill would make sure that young, at-risk children get important developmental screenings when they need it.

We are learning that childhood trauma can be a major factor in future mental illness. The more we do to address the underlying trauma, whether it is poverty, the death or incarceration of a loved one or a parent, or sexual abuse, the better we address those issues, the better chance we will have of turning the tide on this epidemic.

The mental health crisis isn't only affecting our kids; it is affecting our parents too. According to a study by the Centers for Disease Control, one in five adults age 55 or older experiences a mental health issue, and a third of them never receive treatment. Men over the age of 75 have a higher suicide rate than any other age group. The social isolation that too often comes with aging or caring for a loved one isn't just unfortunate; it is a public health risk.

Just as we have learned to reach out to the veterans in our lives and in our communities to let them know we are there for them if they are struggling, we should do the same for our elders. As the HELP Committee takes up the reauthorization of the Older Americans Act this year, I will be working to do my part.

Our mental health system should be there for people at every age, from nursery to nursing home. It should be there for people everywhere along the mental health continuum, offering everything from preventive care, to ongoing therapy for chronic conditions, to crisis support for those in acute distress. It should also be there for people in every ZIP Code, and unfortunately, some of the biggest holes in our system can be found in rural areas.

As a Senator, I am proud to serve on the Agriculture Committee. I frequently meet with farm groups, and today mental health is one of the first topics to come up. Farming is an inherently stressful profession, especially these days, when the numbers for suicide prevention hotlines regularly appear in farm publications. But we need to include the entire rural community, from bankers and pastors to grocers and fertilizer sellers. We need to include them in this conversation, and we need to make sure that when people do reach out for help, there is help there for them.

Unfortunately, rural communities in general are often underserved by mental health professionals compared to cities and suburbs. Many still have inconsistent access to the internet, meaning that even online resources can be out of reach for someone who is struggling. That is why, in the last farm bill, we set up a rural health liaison in the Department of Agriculture—someone who understands the specific needs of rural communities and is charged with paying attention to a crisis that has too often lurked beneath the surface.

Last year, Senator MURKOWSKI and I worked together to pass a law that would provide mental health professionals in the National Health Service Corps with greater flexibility in where they practice and deliver care, increasing the resources available in underserved rural communities.

I hope my colleagues will join me in continuing to take action to address the mental health crisis, and I hope that sharing my own story will make it easier for more Americans to add their voices to this fight.

Still, there is no magic cure for depression. There is no magic bill to solve this problem. Mental health is a reality of life for millions of people in our country, and we can't legislate it away. If we work to help more Americans bring their struggles out of the shadows into the sunshine, if we reach out to people in need and connect them with people who can help, and if we understand the factors that make people vulnerable to these problems and focus our energies on making sure the net is there to catch them if they fall—if we do these things, then we can take steps in the right direction, one right after the other and one day at a time.

I still remember what it felt like in those weeks and months after I began to treat my depression—the sense of empowerment that came with finally

taking my mental health into my own hands, the renewed energy that came with finally feeling like today is better than yesterday and maybe tomorrow will be even better yet, and the joy that came with finally seeing hope on the horizon once again. So even in the midst of this public health crisis, I believe there is hope on the horizon for the millions of Americans who struggle with mental illness, but they are counting on us to make this hopeful vision a reality.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

REMEDY ACT

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, if you watched "60 Minutes" on Sunday, you would not have been surprised that there was a segment relating to prescription drug pricing. Everywhere we turn, somebody is raising the question about why we are paying so much for prescription drugs and why the cost of these drugs has gone through the roof.

We want to encourage research. We want to encourage innovation. We understand that these are profit-making companies, so we understand we will pay for that. But what we are seeing in terms of the pricing of drugs across America now is inconsistent with any of the history that we have had. It seems as if pharma believes that if they own a drug, they can charge whatever they can charge, and no one will question them.

It makes a difference. Blue Cross Blue Shield, the largest health insurer in my State of Illinois, analyzed the cost of care in our State and nearby and asked: What is driving the increase in health insurance premiums? The cost of prescription drugs, even more than the cost of inpatient hospital care.

Look at all of those big hospitals and all of the important work they are doing and expensive procedures they are involved in. All of that cost does not equal the rising cost of prescription drugs. That is why our health insurance premiums are going up, so it is understandable that more and more of us are talking about this and trying to find practical ways to approach it that might make things better.

Can you consider one policy that might have the support of Democrats and Republicans, the American Association of Retired Persons, the American Medical Association, the American Hospital Association, 88 percent of Americans, and the Trump administration? What in the world could that be? Here it is: a measure I introduced in 2017 to require pharmaceutical companies to disclose the prices with new prescription drug advertising.

Last year, Senator CHUCK GRASSLEY, Republican of Iowa, and I teamed up to pass a measure in the Senate to require pricetags on the television ads. We were stopped in conference by a single House Republican.

Think about those television ads. What do they tell us in those ads? For 60 seconds, as fast as they can talk, they tell us everything under the sun. If you are allergic to XARELTO, do not take XARELTO. Certain negative things may happen if you take this drug or the other drug. On they go for 60 seconds without stopping. Yet they never disclose the price of the drug.

After Senator GRASSLEY and I put our bill in last year, I got a call from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, Alex Azar. He decided he wanted to pick up on our effort and join us. Think about that for a minute—a Republican Senator, a Democratic Senator, and the Trump administration agreeing on something. It turns out, he thinks it is a good idea, and I do too.

If we had price disclosure on these ads on television, it might open the eyes of a lot of people as to what it costs. What is the most heavily advertised drug on television today? HUMIRA. Why was HUMIRA invented or discovered? To treat arthritis, particularly psoriatic arthritis. Guess what they discovered. It also had a side benefit they didn't anticipate. You know the little red patch on your elbow—psoriasis? If you take HUMIRA, all of a sudden, that little red patch goes away. So if you are watching the ads on television, some of them are about arthritis, but some of them show ladies sitting by swimming pools with flawless skin because they are taking HUMIRA. It is very interesting.

There is one thing they leave out. Do you know what HUMIRA costs? It costs \$5,500 a month. This red patch on my elbow may trouble me when it comes to the swimsuit competition, but I am not going to spend \$5,500 to deal with it. I think they ought to have to disclose the price of the drug. We take their prices; we do not make up the price. The price they declare as pharmaceutical manufacturers—we believe that is the one that should be advertised.

On Monday, Senator GRASSLEY and I introduced the bill to codify this rule that the Trump administration is pushing for price disclosure and to ensure its long-term implementation. We are happy to have on board with us Senator LAMAR ALEXANDER, Republican of Tennessee, and Senator KING, Independent Democrat from Maine. Disclosing prices in drug ads is a simple step to give patients a break at the pharmacy. We have to do a lot more. I think this is a good starting point, though.

American patients and taxpayers pay the highest prices in the world for most medications. Eli Lilly, out of Indianapolis, IN—they make a drug called Humalog. It is for diabetes. It is an insulin drug that can cost up to \$329 per dose here in the United States. Humalog, insulin, diabetes—the cost is \$329.

What does the same vial of the same drug made by the same company cost

in Canada? It costs \$38. It is \$329 here and \$38 there.

In 2017, Canadians could purchase AbbVie's HUMIRA, which I mentioned earlier, for \$20,000; for Americans, \$40,000. The worst part of this price disparity is that American taxpayers are the ones paying to develop these drugs in the first place. Our tax dollars at the National Institutes of Health provide the clues and the direction for these companies to take our federally funded research and turn it into a valuable drug, a valuable medical device, and then charge us more than any other place in the world.

All 210 drugs approved by the Food and Drug Administration between the years 2010 and 2016 received funding from the National Institutes of Health, supported by nearly \$40 billion by U.S. taxpayers each year. I am all for that, incidentally—funding the NIH and leading to this research. But make no mistake, these breakthrough drugs start at the National Institutes of Health at taxpayers' expense. So American taxpayers get hit twice. We pay for the initial research, which leads to the drug, and then we, of course, pay for the drugs at the highest levels.

The heart of the problem is that our system does not function as a free market. There are too many forces at work when it comes to prescription drugs that limit competition. Often Big Pharma charges as much as they can get away with because they manipulate the patent system to avoid competition.

The theory used to be that if you discovered the drug, you could sell it exclusively for, say, 20 years, and then everybody could take your formula, make generic drugs, and there would be open competition so that the price would go down. That is not how it works.

The core issue is that roughly 10 percent of brand name, patent-protected drugs account for 80 percent of spending in America. The overwhelming prescriptions are for generic drugs, which are affordable drugs, but it turns out that even though 90 percent of the prescriptions are for generic drugs, they account for only 20 percent of all the spending. It is that 10 percent of brand name drugs that account for 80 percent of all prescription drug spending because they are so expensive.

In what other industry does the price of the consumer product increase year after year after being introduced on the market? Maybe a collector of artwork or baseball cards but certainly not when it comes to something that is a life-and-death commodity like a drug.

The point is, I don't believe our Founding Fathers envisioned a scheme where Sanofi's Lantus, insulin that was approved in the year 2000, would receive 45 additional patents after it was approved by the FDA, providing a massive 37-year monopoly by Sanofi on this insulin product. During that time, the price of insulin has increased from

\$35 to more than \$270 because Sanofi has successfully bought lower cost generic competitors, and it is not just Lantus or insulin.

Celgene's cancer drug, REVLIMID, has been awarded 96 patents, many of which were awarded after the initial FDA approval. As a result, REVLIMID, effectively, has gone 40 years without competition.

The same goes for Pfizer's nerve pain drug, Lyrica. You have seen that one advertised on TV. I have. That entered the market in 2004. Lyrica has received 68 patents, including filing more than 2 dozen after initial FDA approval. They are gaming the system to avoid competition to keep their prices high.

In fact, the top 12 best-selling drugs in America each have an average of 71 patents. Why do they get a new patent? Because they have decided that instead of a 150-mg tablet, there will be a 75-mg tablet, and they get a new patent. Or they put a new coating on the outside of the pill or they have a new manufacturing technique. They get the patent. They have exclusivity in the market for another extended period of time.

The top 12 best-selling drugs in America each have an average of 71 patents, and 74 percent of all new drug patents are for drugs that are already on the market. They are gaming the system.

We can and we should reward innovative research so that companies can earn a profit for good work and big ideas. But an abusive manufacturer should not be allowed to game the government patent system while being shielded from competition.

This month I am going to give what I call my Pharma Fleece Award. I made a special sign here so that pharma would know what we are talking about. This month we are going to give this Pharma Fleece Award to Celgene, Pfizer, and Sanofi for stacking excessive secondary patents to block generic competition. The net result, of course, is that American consumers pay more for their products.

To address this, I introduced legislation last month with Senator CASSIDY, Republican from Louisiana and a medical doctor, called the REMEDY Act. Our bipartisan bill reduces incentives for Big Pharma to "evergreen," which is a technical term in this application. It is an effort to amass endless quantities of follow-on patents that shield blockbuster drugs from competition from generics. You see, under an act, a law known as the Hatch-Waxman Act, when a generic drug manufacturer seeks approval from the FDA, they are routinely blocked by a maze of patents held by the brand name company.

The generic company has the option to say whether they think the patents covering the brand name drug are not valid or relevant. If so, that can trigger a patent infringement lawsuit. When this happens, the FDA issues a 30-month freeze on the generic company's application to hash out the issue. The problem with this 30-month freeze is it

extends the monopoly period for the drug again, and it incentivizes the filing of secondary follow-on patents that may not add to the safety or efficacy of the drug.

This automatic 30-month freeze on competition encourages pharma to amass large numbers of secondary patents and block generic companies from putting on the market a drug that would be in competition with their brand name drug. No matter how weak the patent is, how peripheral it may be—like the coating on a pill that I mentioned earlier—it works. For 30 months, there is another delay before there is competition.

The REMEDY Act, which Senator CASSIDY and I introduced, would restrict this 30-month freeze of FDA approval so that it applies only to primary substance patents. This removes an incentive for brand name manufacturers to continue to game the system by filing excessive follow-on patents, and it makes it easier for low-cost generic competitors to come to market.

Big Pharma is gaming the system at the expense of American patients, at the expense of the American health system, and at our expense when it comes to health insurance premiums. What are we going to do about it? Well, it turns out, we happen to be working in a place which makes laws, the U.S. Senate. We are supposed to take a challenge like this and do something about it—not just lament the fact that prescription drug pricing is out of control, but actually do something.

Lucky me, I serve on the Senate Judiciary Committee, which has authority over many of these issues, particularly when it comes to patent law. There are things we can do as members of the committee to bring down prescription drug pricing.

Honestly, if you follow the U.S. Senate, we can do something other than a nomination, which is all we have done around here for a long, long time. I am sure the American voters are happy to see us work on nominations, but they would be much happier if we worked on the high cost of prescription drugs. We have done little or nothing on this subject, other than talk about it for the last few months.

Senator MCCONNELL, the Republican leader, has decided not to bring legislation to the floor of the Senate anymore. That is just from the days of yesteryear when we actually debated a bill, offered amendments, had votes. People showed up on the floor because we were doing something.

Look at it now.

American patients need help from the high drug prices, not more unqualified, divisive nominees but actual legislation to help American families. What a break it would be if the U.S. Senate became the U.S. Senate again.

I hope Senator MCCONNELL will allow us to put a bill on the floor of the Senate. It would be a great celebration here in the Senate. I think Republicans and Democrats would enjoy the opportunity to actually come to the floor,

have a debate, and pass a bill that may become a law that ends up helping Americans. For many of us, that is the reason we ran for office, and I hope we can return to that very soon.

NOMINATIONS

Once again, this week the Republican Leader has scheduled no legislation for votes on the Senate floor.

Instead, our Republican colleagues are spending another week rubber stamping President Trump's nominees.

This week, the Republican majority scheduled votes on three Trump judicial nominees. Each of these nominees has expressed views that are ideological and extreme.

First there was Michael Truncale, nominated to the District Court for the Northern District of Texas. Mr. Truncale gave a speech in 2011 where he outrageously called President Obama "an un-American imposter."

He described the Supreme Court's decision in Shelby County that gutted the Voting Rights Act as "a victory." He has called for defunding Planned Parenthood and said that he opposes the bipartisan DREAM Act.

He has called the Environmental Protection Agency a "job killer" and called for eliminating the Departments of Education and Energy.

Mr. Truncale also gave a radio interview in 2012 thanking the Tea Party movement "for what it has meant to our country and to our Republican party."

Despite all this, only one Republican Senator, Senator ROMNEY, voted against Mr. Truncale.

Then there's Ninth Circuit nominee Kenneth Lee of California, who has been advanced by Republicans over the objection of both home State Senators. That never happened before until this year, but this is now the fifth time we have seen a nominee advance with no blue slip.

Mr. Lee initially failed to provide dozens of his controversial writings to the Senate Judiciary Committee.

I remember when President Obama's Ninth Circuit nominee Goodwin Liu initially failed to fully disclose articles he had written to the Judiciary Committee. Republican members of the Committee said it was "potentially disqualifying" and said it showed either incompetence or an attempt to hide his writings.

Senate Republicans ended up filibustering Goodwin Liu's nomination. Yet every Republican member of the Judiciary Committee voted for Mr. Lee's nomination. The double standard is obvious.

When we were finally able to review Mr. Lee's writings, we saw he routinely expressed extreme views. Here are just a few examples:

He wrote: "Charges of sexism often amount to nothing but irrelevant pouting."

He said: "homosexuals generally are more promiscuous than heterosexuals, and thus their risk factor [for AIDS] increases exponentially."

He called affirmative action "liberals' most sacred shibboleth."

And he called multiculturalism a "malodorous sickness."

Then there is Wendy Vitter, nominated to the District Court for the Eastern District of Louisiana.

Like Mr. Lee, Ms. Vitter also initially failed to disclose more than 100 speeches and documents to the Judiciary Committee.

The matters she failed to disclose included a panel she moderated in 2013 at a Louisiana Right to Life conference. At this panel, she told the audience to urge their doctors to put in their waiting rooms a brochure entitled "The Pill Kills." This is a brochure about how birth control pills supposedly kill women.

Ms. Vitter also claimed in a 2009 speech that we are "throwing out our Constitution" by counting the full population in the national census.

All three of these judicial nominees have expressed extreme ideological views that raise serious questions about their judgment. Yet Republicans are rubber stamping all three of them to lifetime appointments on the federal bench.

Then there is President Trump's nominee for Deputy Attorney General, Jeffrey Rosen. Mr. Rosen simply does not have the right qualifications for this important job.

The Deputy Attorney General runs the day-to-day operations of the Justice Department and oversees its law enforcement components.

At this critical moment, we need a Deputy Attorney General who is familiar with the Justice Department, who has experience in overseeing criminal investigations and prosecutions, and who is committed to the Department's role of enforcing the law independently without fear or favor.

Mr. Rosen has no experience working in the Justice Department or handling criminal cases. When I questioned him about core DOJ functions and agencies he will oversee if confirmed, he wasn't familiar with them and said he would have to get up to speed.

For example, when I met with him and asked him about the landmark First Step Act, he said he had "begun getting informed about it."

When I asked him about the Deputy Attorney General's role in overseeing the Federal Bureau of Prisons and addressing their critical staffing shortages, he said he wasn't familiar and couldn't comment.

When I asked him about voting rights and voter suppression, he said he hadn't had occasion to study the issue.

When I asked him about the DEA's role in setting opioid production quotas, which he will oversee, he didn't know about it.

When I asked him about DOJ's role in immigration matters, including his priorities for the immigration courts he will oversee, he said he looked forward to learning more about it.

Mr. Rosen was a longtime colleague of Attorney General Barr at a law firm,

and he has held positions in other government agencies like the Department of Transportation. But that does not make him qualified to be the Deputy Attorney General.

Because my Republican colleagues used the nuclear option to change the Senate rules, there is now less time for the Senate to debate controversial nominees like Mr. Truncale, Ms. Vitter, and Mr. Rosen.

But the American people see what is going on. They see the rush by President Trump and Senate Republicans to confirm nominees who are ideological or who lack the right qualifications for the job.

I oppose these nominees. And I regret that the Senate's advice and consent process has become an exercise in Republican rubber stamping. This institution can, and should, do better.

I see that my colleague from Texas is here on the floor, and I don't want to take any more time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LANKFORD). The Senator from Texas.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding rule XXII, at 5:30 p.m., all postcloture time on the Lee nomination be considered expired; further, that if confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action. I ask that following disposition of the Lee nomination, the Senate vote on the cloture motions for the Vitter, Bulatao, and Rosen nominations; finally, that if cloture is invoked on those nominations, the confirmation votes on the Vitter and Bulatao nominations occur at noon on Thursday and the Rosen confirmation vote occur at 1:45 p.m. on Thursday, May 16, and that if confirmed, the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

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

(The remarks of Mr. CORNYN pertaining to the introduction of S. 1480 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. CORNYN. 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. LANKFORD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROMNEY). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LANKFORD. 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. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASIDY). Without objection, it is so ordered.

MILITARY APPRECIATION MONTH

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I am going to be on the floor with some of my colleagues in the next hour.

I thank my colleague from Iowa, Senator ERNST—Lieutenant Colonel Ernst, by the way, of the Iowa National Guard—for organizing the series of discussions we are going to have in the next couple of minutes on the Senate floor that will focus on Military Appreciation Month. I think we are all going to talk about how wonderful our military is, and we will probably do a little bit of bragging about our different States and how we support and appreciate our military so much.

I like to come down on the floor and talk in superlatives about my State, the great State of Alaska. It is true that most Senators love to talk about their States in all of their superlatives, which is good. We are proud States. We each think we live in the best State in the country. We all believe that. I happen to think my State is the best State in the country.

In talking about our military and its support and Military Appreciation Month, we certainly have a large military presence in Alaska. We have about 32 military facilities and 5 major installations. Roughly, 10 percent of the population is either in the military or is a family member of someone who is in the military.

I like to say that Alaska actually constitutes three pillars of our Nation's military might. Whether the attacks be from Kim Jong Un or the Iranians, we are the cornerstone of missile defense, which are the missiles and the radar that protect the entire country from attacks. This all resides in Alaska. We are the hub air combat power for the Asia-Pacific and the Arctic, and we will have over 100 fifth-generation fighters—F-22s, F-35s—by the end of next year. We are also a vital platform for some of America's best trained troops to be deployed anywhere around the world because of our strategic location. Alaska also boasts the largest number of veterans per capita of any State in the country. These are the facts, and they are all good.

What is so unique about Alaska—and, I would say, as in most States—is how proud we are of our military and how much the communities of Alaska—big communities, small communities—support the men and women who serve in the military. It is almost a part of our DNA in Alaska. Let me just give you one example.

I was in a group of community leaders in Delta Junction, which is in Alaska's interior. It is actually near Fort Greely, where we have our missile defense fields. It is right on the outskirts of what is called the JPARC, which is the biggest air training range in the entire United States. The airspace is actually the size of Florida. There is great training, and we have Red Flag

exercises. Our men and women in the Air Force, in particular, do some wonderful training there.

We were in this community meeting, and some Air Force pilot was flying low and fast. He probably broke the sound barrier because there was a giant sonic boom. It shook the whole building. It shook the whole meeting room. Now, I would say, in most States, that would probably result in having people complain and call their Congressmen and Senators in their being mad about what the military would be doing—shaking the buildings with sonic booms because they would be breaking the speed of sound as they would be training. Yet the mayor of Delta just looked at me and said, “The sound of freedom.” There were no complaints, just support.

Let me give another example.

In so many of our smaller Native communities—Native villages—across Alaska, one sees what I refer to as special patriotism. Alaska Natives and the lower 48 American Indians serve in the military at higher rates than any ethnic group in the country. That is a special patriotism because—let's face it—these great American patriots weren't always supported by their government when they came home after fighting in World War II or in Vietnam.

As a matter of fact, there was a documentary that was produced about the community of Hoonah, AK, which is in Southeast Alaska. The film was called “Hunting and Wartime.” It was about the fact that almost every single male high school senior in the late 1960s in these small communities went off to fight in Vietnam—almost every one of them.

That is special patriotism. This support for the military isn't a recent phenomenon in Alaska. In 1942, during World War II, Alaskans oversubscribed their war bond quota by 300 percent, which surpassed that of every State in the Union.

So many Senators—Democratic and Republican—are going to come down to the floor and talk about our Military Appreciation Month, as they should. There is some talk in the country about the 1 percent and the less than 1 percent. Well, the 1 percent I really care about is the less than 1 percent of young men and women who still, today, raise their right hands to support and defend the Constitution and to defend our liberty, knowing it could even cost them their lives by their joining the U.S. military.

We all have wonderful veterans and wonderful men and women in the military whom we support in the U.S. Senate. I tell my constituents that the one thing we are focused on doing is making sure, when you send your son or daughter to join the military, that it is the top military in the world, the most ready military in the world, and the most capable military in the world.

One thing we are doing is reversing a dangerous trend. From 2010 to 2015, defense spending for the U.S. military

was cut by almost 25 percent during the second term of the Obama administration—25 percent—and readiness plummeted. We are changing that because no man or woman in this country who volunteers to support and defend the Constitution by joining the military should be joining a military that is not at the highest level of readiness and lethal in terms of its getting the job done. So I am going to pass this on to some of my colleagues here. As the Senator from a State where communities support our military so much, I just want to thank all the members, regardless of where you live, for the great work you do and to let you know that the Senate supports you with all its heart and soul.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. TILLIS. Mr. President, while my friend and colleague from Alaska is still on the floor, I want to thank him for his many years of service as a marine.

I am here to talk about North Carolina and Military Appreciation Month. We have a special relationship with members of the military and their families in North Carolina. We have a million veterans in the State. Literally hundreds of thousands of people serve in the military.

You may have heard of the Global Response Force. The Global Response Force is out of Fort Bragg. When there is a crisis anywhere in the world, whether it is a military conflict or a relief effort, it is the 82nd Airborne that goes out to the green ramp down in Fort Bragg, NC, and goes wherever they need to go, sometimes with 48 hours' notice.

Just down the street from there, we have the marines at Camp Lejeune. The marines who are based in Camp Lejeune and Cherry Point and New River constitute about 45 percent of all the marines serving in the Marine Corps.

We can go up to Seymour Johnson Air Force Base, and we have a proud number of men and women in the Air Force who are part of a base that will be the home to the new KC-46, a next-generation tanker.

To say we have a close bond with the military is an understatement. We love them, and we love their families.

I chair the Personnel Subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee, so I have an opportunity to have a direct role in showing appreciation to not only the men and women who are serving in the military but also their spouses. It is a tough job. They are serving too.

As we think about Military Appreciation Month, let's make sure we are, first and foremost, thinking about not only those brave men and women who have sworn the oath to defend and protect our Nation but also their families, who are an integral part of their being capable and ready to do the job.

I also want to make sure we don't lose sight of the veteran population—a

million of them in my State alone. One-tenth of our population are veterans.

We should also talk about the National Guard and the reservists. If you take a look at a State like North Carolina, we have had a number of people in the National Guard who have been deployed multiple times to Iraq and Afghanistan—some of the most dangerous places you could be. They do it with courage, and they do it with honor. During Military Appreciation Month, I think we should pay special attention to this special group of people. I hope that every day of the year, each and every one of you shows them the appreciation and the respect they deserve.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. President, like my colleagues and like people from around the country, North Dakotans are very proud of our military heritage. In fact, North Dakotans sign up at a rate four times the national average. I think you will hear that theme throughout the Midwest especially.

I am grateful to Senator ERNST for her leadership today as we stand and do something we ought to do every day. It is something we ought to do in church when we are sitting next to them in the pews and when we are talking to our neighbors who are serving or their spouses or family members. We are saying: Thank you. Forgive us for not saying it more often. Frankly, part of why we don't say "thank you" more often is because we go about our business in complete comfort, unaware of the dangers around the world because you all do your jobs so very well. Thank you. Thank you. Thank you.

Mr. President, North Dakota is home to two Air Force bases. I recently finished a tour of the military bases in North Dakota, and I want to speak briefly about the airmen at those two bases.

Grand Forks, ND, houses the 319th Air Base Wing, known as the Warriors of the North. Just last Saturday, Air Force Secretary Heather Wilson visited Grand Forks and redesignated this base as the 319th Reconnaissance Wing. This is one of only three of its kind. I am continually impressed with the mission of the Global Hawk. The Global Hawk mission that is headquartered out of Grand Forks is remarkable. I believe that Grand Forks is a place that is well-positioned for the future of warfighting.

To the west of Grand Forks a couple hundred miles is the community of Minot. Minot, ND, is home to the 5th Bomb Wing and the 91st Missile Wing at the Minot Air Force Base. This is interesting because, of course, the bomb wing operates the intercontinental ballistic missiles and the B-52 bombers at the same base. That is two of the three legs of the nuclear triad we hear so much about. You are not going to find

a stronger proponent of the nuclear triad than you will in me because it is the only base of its kind.

As the base's motto goes, "Only the best come North." Our greatest defense is in detouring our adversaries, and certainly the nuclear triad is important to that. Every day, the airmen in Minot wake up with literally the weight of the world, in many cases, on their shoulders. So for their service and their willingness to stand in the gap in the defense of the world, I am immensely grateful and always impressed.

Of course, I would be remiss to not also mention the airspace station in Cavalier. I think it is the Air Force's smallest base, but it is a very important installation. As we debate in this Chamber the need for a modernized space force, understanding the work this base does has further compelled me to stand in support of a modern, capable military unit able to defend the emerging domain that space has become. A special thank-you to those 40 or so airmen in Cavalier who do an incredible job far from home and in many cases far from a lot of other people around them.

On a more personal note, I want to say "thank you" to the military families and spouses of those stationed in North Dakota, as my colleagues have done. As we know, in a family, everybody serves. In a small community, everybody serves together. They come from all over the country, and they bless our local communities and our State with their work in North Dakota. They deserve a very special thanks for that service.

Our military community is not, of course, defined solely by our Air Force bases; it is also defined by our incredible Army and Air National Guard in North Dakota. In Fargo, for example, I am going to highlight this one unit—the 119th Wing of North Dakota's Air National Guard, known as the Happy Hooligans. They are frequent recipients of the Air Force's Outstanding Unit Award. In fact, earlier this year, they received their 20th Outstanding Unit Award. This is an award that is given to the units that distinguish themselves by exceptional service and outstanding achievement. No group better exemplifies that than the Happy Hooligans. In fact, no unit has received more Outstanding Unit Awards either in the active Air Force or in the Guard than the Happy Hooligans. Congratulations.

While we are talking about the Guard, I want to say a special thanks not only to the families—because, as I said, they all serve—but in the Guard, there are a lot of people who serve, including their employers. I don't think we say "thank you" to the employers often enough who accommodate—no, facilitate—no, encourage the incredible military personnel who do a great job for us on the homefront, as well as when called into action beyond our borders.

The mission of the National Guard is to provide ready units, individuals, and

equipment supporting our communities, our States, our Nation.

If I might elaborate a little bit on homeland issues, just a few short years ago, our State called on our National Guard to meet that mission. We were abandoned by the Federal Government, and the North Dakota National Guard was deployed to help keep the peace. It is appropriate today, on this Peace Officers Memorial Day, that we recognize this relationship. The National Guard was deployed to keep the peace as out-of-State activists with no interest, really, in North Dakota—they flooded our State to violently protest the legally permitted Dakota Access Pipeline. Absent Federal help, our Governor called on our National Guard as a last resort.

You would think that would have some serious ramifications. Well, the reality is, because of the quality of our guardsmen, they did what the previous administration would not—they stood up for the rule of law, and they stood in the way of radical protesters even while their own families were targets of the radical protests, the harassment of radical protesters from everywhere other than North Dakota. They put their lives at risk and did it without provocation, without escalation, and with a calming presence. They didn't run from their orders. They didn't balk at their commands. They answered the call to peacefully and professionally defend our State from the chaos that descended upon us.

Again, "thank you" is inadequate. It is all we can do today. I would just compel people to say "thank you" more often. As you see that neighbor, as you see that person sitting next to you, make it a point to say "thank you" out loud, in front of friends.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Thanks to the Senator from North Dakota.

The Senator from Iowa.

Ms. ERNST. Mr. President, during Military Appreciation Month, we honor the men and women who wear our Nation's uniform, those who have worn it in the past, and those who have sacrificed their lives for our freedom.

As a Senator and a combat veteran with over 23 years of service between the Army Reserves and the Iowa Army National Guard, I am grateful to have the opportunity to get to know so many patriotic and selfless Americans, and Iowans are well represented in those ranks. Nearly 9 percent of our State's adult population are veterans. The national average is just above 6½ percent. From World War II to the global war on terrorism, Iowans have served with honor and distinction.

Military Appreciation Month is also a time to recognize our military families who sacrifice so much and faithfully support our men and women in uniform. They keep things running during long deployments and help during the transition back to civilian life—they help that family member—and, of course, long, long after. So to

all of our military families in Iowa and, of course, across the Nation, thank you for choosing to serve.

This month is also a good opportunity for those of us in the Senate to highlight some of the work we are doing to support our servicemembers, our military families, and, of course, our veterans. Next week, the Senate Armed Services Committee will be starting our yearly national defense authorization bill process. In anticipation of that process, I will be joining my Democratic colleague from Arizona, Senator SINEMA, to introduce two new bills to address military sexual assault—one to improve prevention and the other to streamline prosecution.

I will also be introducing a bill with Senator WARREN that will explore ways to better track traumatic brain injuries sustained by our warfighters. Helping our servicemembers with injuries sustained in battle is a top priority of mine. We owe it to our wounded warriors to seek out game-changing treatments and to help them heal and recover.

As the chairman of the Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities, I will also use the NDAA process to ensure that the bill fosters technological advancements to better equip our warfighters for success.

Military Appreciation Month is an important reminder of the daily sacrifice made by our servicemembers, our military families, and our veterans. It is also a solemn time to remember those who made the ultimate sacrifice to keep America free, safe, and prosperous. We have many of our own Members who have served in the military, and I want to thank them all very much. So for those of us who have worn boots, we take a look at this legislation and find ways that we can better support those who serve.

In the Senate, members of our military, families, and veterans have our support and our gratitude, not only today but every day.

I know the folks back home in Iowa feel the same.

So from all of us to all of you who have worn the uniform and those who have supported those who have worn the uniform, thank you for your service, and God bless you.

God bless our great State of Iowa, God bless the great United States of America and those men and women who make it possible to be free.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PERDUE). The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, first of all, let me associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from Iowa.

It is so important for all of us, particularly those of us who have had occasion to serve, to really pay attention to what is going on. This is Military Appreciation Month, and it is very significant, what is going on. Every month should be Military Appreciation.

As the chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee and as a veteran,

it is my great honor and responsibility to support our warfighters during and after their service.

Whenever they were needed, they were there, and so we have to do a better job in supporting them. We went through 8 years of not adequately supporting the military, and it is something that many of them are suffering from now.

Now, next week, as it was pointed out, we are going to do the Defense authorization bill. It is not very often you can stand here and say we are going to introduce a bill, and we know it is going to pass. The reason we know it is going to pass is because it has passed for the last 58 years. So this one is going to pass.

I can remember a few years that we actually had to go into September to get the Defense authorization bill passed. In the event it got to the end of December, and the same thing would be true this coming year, then we would have hazard pay that wouldn't be paid, and we would have flight pay that wouldn't be paid. There would not be adequate funding to take care of any of that.

So we can't let that happen, and we are not going to let it happen.

I am a little confused now because a month from today we will actually mark up that bill in the U.S. Senate. Yet the House isn't going to do it, it is my understanding, until the middle of June.

Then I also heard that they may, over in the House, actually do the appropriations bill first.

Well, if you do the appropriations bill before you do the bill we will be marking up, the NDAA, then there is no reason to even do the NDAA from the House perspective.

So we do know that good things are going to happen. We are going to implement the national defense strategy. We have talked about the national defense strategy several times on the floor and on how we have done, I think, a very good job in putting this together. Most importantly, we are supporting our All-Volunteer Force.

I may be the last person on the Senate Armed Service Committee who still believes in compulsory service.

I often wonder what would have happened in my life if I hadn't been drafted. I always remember coming back at Christmastime, Eisenhower was President, and I was enrolled at the University of Mexico, and I looked in the mailbox and there was a card. It was from the President, and I thought how nice of the President to remember me at Christmastime. It was my draft notice. So that changed my plans, and I often wonder where I would be today if I hadn't had that experience.

We are going to provide the Armed Forces with adequate funding, and I hope we will find a budget solution. We can't do it with a continuing resolution. We have asked all of our leaders in the hearings what would happen to us if we did a continuing resolution,

and it just wouldn't work. I think we all realize that.

It puts people who are budget hawks, like me, and military hawks in a very awkward situation because we have a situation where, as a result of the 8 years of Obama, we have a thing called parity so that for every dollar you put in the military, there has to be a dollar that goes to the nondefense programs. This is something that doesn't work. So the continuing resolution, we all know, is something that should not be an option.

The responsibility carries a great weight now. We ask our men and women in uniform to do more in the face of danger and more in a dangerous and unpredictable world than at any time.

I think the Trump administration is right. They try to categorize the two threats that are out there, one being the threat of the rogue nations that are out there, and we are talking about North Korea and some of these other nations. At the same time, we also have the major threat of the great power threat, and this is one we face, and we know that. Yes, we are used to dealing with the threats of the rogue nations, but after the 8 years of the Obama administration, we watched Russia and China forge ahead of us in many areas. Hypersonic weapons are a good example, and that is something that is taking place now.

So during that period of time, during the last 5 years of the Obama administration, the amount of money that we had to run our military with was reduced by almost 25 percent. Now, we have made up a lot of this in fiscal year 2018 and in fiscal year 2019, thanks to the Trump administration. We have increased that funding back up to \$700 billion, then again \$716 billion, and this time I think we are going to be at \$750 billion.

There is some dispute as to what the exact figure will be, but nonetheless we have started to rebuild. So we will be modernizing our forces, including our nuclear arsenal now, in order to maintain our military superiority—or to regain is a better word than maintain because we have actually lost some of our superiority—well into the future. Our Armed Forces have long been the best in the world, but we have problems now in trying to rebuild, and that is what this is all about.

So we will support our troops and their families who sacrifice a great deal to protect our Nation. This includes making meaningful reforms to privatize on-base housing. We went through this housing trauma just the other day. We found out a lot of people are not being treated properly. A lot of the spouses of our members and our members are living in housing that is totally unacceptable, but we came to that realization and we are correcting that now and that is going to be corrected even further in the Defense authorization bill that we will mark up a week from today.

So we want to thank every man and woman who ever put on a uniform and those who are doing this in defense of the country, congratulate them and pay particular attention to them and support them in every way we can.

The fabric of our Nation is stronger because of the guys in uniform and those who have been in uniform, and we will endure for the years to come because of their service. God bless all of the men and women in uniform.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I come to the floor as part of Military Appreciation Month. It is a time, clearly, to remember our brave service men and women, to reflect on their faithful service to this country and to recall the many sacrifices our troops and their families have made and continue to make in defense of this great Nation.

Many of us will be heading overseas for the 75th anniversary of D-day to commemorate the efforts of an incredible group of allies on the fateful day and the weeks and the months that followed.

As I stand here today, I think of those soldiers, and I think of my wife Bobbi's dad, Bob Brown—currently 92 years old, living in Thermopolis, WY, longtime postmaster. He still drives Meals on Wheels, as he says, "for the old folks."

He was called to Europe in World War II, and he is one of those few who was in World War II in the European theater as well as in Japan as part of that first occupation and then called back to Korea as part of the 2-300 who continued in the fight for our freedoms.

He continues today to serve our United States. His wife, Jerry, who went through all of this in Thermopolis, WY, knows the sacrifices he and so many have made.

My dad, World War II, Battle of the Bulge. I still carry his dog tags from the Battle of the Bulge with me. I have them with me today on the floor of the Senate, and I carry them with me when I go to see our troops overseas.

He is the guy who had to quit school in ninth grade because of the Depression. In World War II—and I have gone through some of his old papers—I found pictures of him and a number of members of the artillery who were part of the liberation of France.

From the time I was a little boy, he would say: John, you should thank God every day because you live in America. You don't know how fortunate you are.

We are so blessed to live in this great country, and it is to the men and women who continue to protect this land, who fought for our freedoms—my dad, his wife, Louise, the sacrifices they have made on behalf of all of us.

Today we honor all of our Armed Forces, the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, the Coast Guard, the Marines, the National Guard.

In particular, today I want to salute the members of the Wyoming Army

National Guard because they are now deploying to the Middle East. Some 300 Wyoming soldiers from six units will be sent to the Middle East between January and September—the largest Wyoming deployment in nearly a decade.

The deployments began in January with the G Company of the 2nd Battalion, 211th Aviation, a medical evacuation company—the most deployed unit in the Wyoming Guard.

The medevac unit that was sent to Afghanistan includes Wyoming soldiers from Bear River, from Casper, from Carpenter, from Guernsey, from Cheyenne, Laramie, and Wheatland.

This past week, Wyoming Governor Mark Gordon participated in a sendoff ceremony in Casper for 130 Wyoming National Guard troops headed to Texas ahead of a 9-month deployment to the Middle East.

The Wyoming troops from the 2nd Battalion of the 300 Field Artillery, the "Cowboy Cannoneers," the group my father-in-law, Bob Brown, was part of—they are from more than two dozen communities from Casper to Lovell, to Cheyenne, to Moorcroft. This Guard unit will serve under the U.S. Central Command covering Iraq, Afghanistan, Kuwait, and the United Arab Emirates.

Wyoming and the entire Nation owe an incredible debt of gratitude to these fearless fighters for our freedom.

God bless the U.S. Armed Forces, God bless our troops, our veterans, and God bless the United States of America.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. Mr. President, I am proud to speak today in honor of Military Appreciation Month.

Our men and women in uniform are true heroes. They risk their lives every day to protect our freedoms and our way of life.

I had the opportunity to serve in the U.S. Navy during the Vietnam war, and my adopted father was one of the few who made all four combat jumps in the 82nd Airborne during World War II.

As Governor, I made it my mission to turn Florida into the most military- and veteran-friendly State in the Nation, and we succeeded. We championed important legislation and funding to support priorities that matter most to Florida's military families, and we took every opportunity to recognize veterans for their service.

Florida has 20 military bases and 3 unified commands—more than almost any other State. As Governor, I met regularly with Florida's base commanders to see how I could help support their missions and their troops. As a Senator, I continue to host base commander meetings to make sure our military has every resource they need.

America is blessed with the protection of the strongest military in the world. Our military provides not only for the safety of our country but also leads in supporting our allies and pro-

tecting freedom and democracy across the globe.

For decades, we have invested in building our military into the most lethal fighting force in the history of the world, but we live in a dangerous world, and we must avoid complacency.

Our military readiness was diminished by budget cuts and the sequester under President Obama, which reduced defense spending across the board. The dysfunction in Washington has many consequences, but a significantly weakened military is the most dangerous.

Our military superiority is never guaranteed. Russia and China continue to build up their militaries with a single goal in mind: to dominate the world stage.

To avoid a national security emergency, we must act now. That is why, as a member of the Armed Services Committee, I am fighting to match the President's request of \$750 million in defense spending, and I am fighting to secure a pay raise for our men and women in uniform—our heroes.

I have also sponsored the Pay Our Coast Guard Act to make sure military pay is never affected by a government shutdown.

We must also work together to pass disaster relief funding immediately, which will help rebuild Tyndall Air Force Base following the devastation of Hurricane Michael.

I will never lose sight of one of the most important roles I have as a U.S. Senator: to protect and serve the families of our Nation. None of us should lose sight of that.

I look forward to working closely with each of you to invest in America's greatest asset—the men and women of our Armed Forces.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, I would like to echo the sentiments my colleagues have expressed in appreciation of the men and women who serve in our Armed Forces.

While it may seem like the Members of this Chamber, much like America itself, are strongly divided on issues of national policy, I can say, without a doubt, that we are all united in support of our troops and their efforts to protect and defend our Nation and its ideals. That is why I am appreciative of the opportunity to join with my colleagues today to thank the soldiers, sailors, airmen, marines, and coastguardsmen working tirelessly to protect the American people from the multitude of threats that face our Nation.

The men and women who wear our Nation's uniform selflessly serve. They are fully aware of the risks they face. Despite that, they bravely put themselves in harm's way to defend our country, ideals, and allies around the world.

They didn't choose this life to seek recognition, awards or honors. Like those who wore the uniform before

them, they chose the path of a higher calling. They chose it as a way to use their talents for the greater good. The men and women who serve in our military embody what it means to be a giver.

I know my fellow Arkansans share my gratitude and appreciation for all of our military personnel and their families who sacrifice at home while their loved ones are abroad.

Arkansas has a storied military heritage and a long and proud history of supporting our Nation's defense. Troops stationed in the State served our country honorably even before it was admitted to the Union. Today, Arkansans are stationed around the globe, and our personnel at the Little Rock Air Force Base, Camp Robinson, Ebbing Air National Guard Base, Pine Bluff Arsenal, and Fort Chaffee continue to make the Natural State proud.

We highlight their service during the month of May, which includes six military-related national observance days, as a way to express our gratitude. That gratitude endures in perpetuity.

We simply cannot thank our servicemembers enough for the tremendous sacrifice they made to ensure that we continue to live in the greatest, freest country that the world has ever known.

As the son of an Air Force master sergeant, I learned at a young age about the sacrifices our men and women in uniform make. I also learned very early on that military families face unique challenges. It truly is a family affair.

My father joined the National Guard while he was in high school, and while still in high school, his unit was shipped out to prepare for World War II. He remained in the Air Force long after the war was over, serving over 20 years in uniform. The example set by my father's military career—and the lessons we learned growing up in a military family—helped my siblings and me to prepare for a productive service-centered life. The experience taught us one of the most valuable lessons which I continue to carry with me today. Through their service to our country, the men and women of our military are part of something much bigger than themselves.

My father was not only my hero, but as a World War II veteran, he and his fellow servicemembers in my hometown of Fort Smith were embraced in the same manner by the community as a whole. The respect and admiration our community displayed for military members was not faked or forced. It was genuine.

It remains just as strong today in communities across our great Nation. While those displays may be more publicly visible during National Military Appreciation Month, the feelings of respect, admiration, and gratitude will carry on long after the end of this month. Our Nation is eternally grateful for the sacrifice of every servicemember working to keep America safe, strong, and free.

It is a real honor to be down here with my colleague from Arkansas, and we greatly appreciate your service. Congratulations on your book, which tells the story of Arlington and what a very special place it is—truly hallowed ground.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, we are here in the middle of National Military Appreciation Month. So I am pleased to join my colleagues in showing our Nation's gratitude for every single soldier, sailor, airman, marine, and coast-guardsmen who is serving or has served our Nation with honor.

This month is specially dedicated to our Armed Forces, but, of course, we have ample reason to celebrate and appreciate them year-round, because our troops serve year-round and around the clock and willingly accepting limitations on their own freedom and comforts so their fellow Americans can live in freedom and security.

Right now, thousands of American troops serve in dangerous conditions overseas far from home. Even now, at this moment, our troops are engaged in combat, surrounded by the enemy, fighting courageously.

We are all thankful and proud of their service and indebted for their sacrifice. But it is not only them. Two weeks ago I had the privilege of attending a medal ceremony in Arkansas where seven veterans of the Korean war were honored for their service and for actions they took in defense of our freedom nearly seven decades ago, so that these long-ago actions were not forgotten.

One week ago, I had the opportunity to thank our military spouses—the unsung heroes of our Armed Forces—for their work raising families despite the hardships of military life.

Those are just a couple of events from the last couple of weeks. Yet they are multiplied countless times every day across our country and around the world wherever our troops and their families are present. At airports, troops returning from overseas are greeted with hugs and cheers. The remains of our fallen heroes are greeted with odd silence.

At dinners and restaurants, a uniform or even a veteran's hat will sometimes still earn a veteran or soldier a free meal from a grateful neighbor and fellow citizen.

Here in Washington, honor flights for our veterans still get police escorts with flashing sirens, and children salute those veterans, sometimes asking innocently about their memories at battle.

Across the river at Arlington National Cemetery, sentinels of the Old Guard stand at attention and walk the mat around the clock and in all weather—just as they have for the past 82 years—to ensure that those unknown soldiers and every person whose headstone graces those beautiful rolling fields rest in eternal peace.

I am proud to live in a country that honors its military in such a fashion, but, more importantly, I am proud to live in a country whose military is worthy of such honor. So to every soldier, sailor, airman, marine, and coast-guardsmen, I extend my gratitude, my respect, and my thanks to you and your family for your honorable service, not just today, not just this month but every day.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, in the United States we are known as the land of the free. There is a reason for that. It is because we are the home of the brave. Our military men and women represent the very best of America. In fact, the good Word tells us that "Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends."

When a young man or a young woman volunteers to serve, he or she is writing a blank check made payable to the United States of America for an amount up to and including their life. In Montana, we are very fortunate to have so many heroes hail from our great State, including many who now work on my staff and on behalf of the people of Montana. Great Montanans like Christy Hagler, Denny Lenoir, Robin Baker, and Jim Korth. We are all so very fortunate to have Dillon Vaden and Doug Pack on staff here in DC currently serving in the Marine Corps.

Thank you for your service to our country. Thank you for your service to the people of Montana.

In fact, just last fall, I had the honor of visiting the men and women of Kalispell's 495th CSSB while they were deployed in Afghanistan. They flew over to Kabul and to Bagram Air Base. I had a chance to spend time with these great Montanans.

Just a few months ago, I had the privilege of welcoming these same soldiers home after they had been deployed for 9 long months. These men and women had been far away from their families and from their friends across the holidays. Many of them were with us that night on the tarmac as they were risking their lives to protect our freedom. Seeing them reunited with their loved ones was a powerful experience for both Cindy, my wife, and me. It is one that I will never, ever forget. But the sad reality is that some of our Montana heroes do not make it back. SSG Travis Atkins is a Bozeman native. In fact, Travis and I both went to the same high school. He was recently awarded the highest military distinction in this country by President Trump, and that is the Medal of Honor.

You see, Sergeant Atkins willingly laid down his life when he tackled a suicide bomber to shield the blast from his fellow soldiers in order to save their lives—a true hero. The sacrifice he made for his country and his fellow soldiers will never be forgotten.

Over in Fort Harrison, MT, MSG Jesse Edinger of the Army National Guard has been welcoming home the fallen since 2006. He knows what sacrifice looks like. He is no stranger to combat, having served three deployments to Iraq and Afghanistan. He earned his national instructor certification and has taught over the years hundreds of soldiers within his region to be honor guard trained. He has also performed more than 1,100 military funerals for Montana veterans, which included the service for SSG Travis Atkins.

While we all appreciate our brave men or brave women who serve in the military every day, this month is Military Appreciation Month. This month is about giving these men and women the added appreciation they richly deserve.

I will continue to advocate for policies that strengthen our military and give our men and our women who serve the strategic advantages they need to win.

Thank you to all who serve and to all who have served. On behalf of a very grateful Nation, we honor you, and we appreciate you.

I yield back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, the month of May is Military Appreciation Month. It is a time when we as a country can come together, pause, and recognize the sacrifices of those who have raised their right hands, worn the cloth of our country, and continue to serve the world's greatest military day in and day out.

They have exceptionally long days and difficult tasks. Sometimes they fight the fight of boredom while hanging out and guarding a spot. Sometimes they are in exceptionally stressful full-on combat mode. They are prepared for both.

Throughout the month of May, there are actually six different days of observation to honor our Nation's military and their families, who have sacrificed so much: Loyalty Day, Public Service Recognition Week, Victory in Europe Day, or V-E Day, Military Spouse Appreciation Day, Armed Forces Day, and, of course, at the end of the month of May, a pause for Memorial Day. All of these observances within 1 month, in May. It is a clear sign that our military is one of the most important cornerstones of our country and that their sacrifice is unmatched. So we should honor and celebrate it.

In addition to our servicemembers and veterans, I hope all Americans also recognize the service of their family members while their husband, wife, son, daughter, mom, and dad are wearing the uniform. They could be gone for months at a time on multiple deployments.

I had the opportunity to meet with many family members in Oklahoma. Their spouse, mom, dad, son, or daughter has been deployed multiple times

into several different theaters. While they are fully deployed, their family waits, and it is a long and difficult wait. It is tough for the family.

For those who serve in our National Guard, it is tough on employers. It is tough on their personal finances. It is a stressful environment. For those folks who have done it and continue to serve—that 1 percent of our Nation that defends the other 99 percent of our Nation—we could not be more grateful for them and for their family members.

To our Gold Star families, those who are left behind to continue the legacy of those who have made the ultimate sacrifice, we thank you for your service and for your love of country.

As a nation, it is our duty to continue to support our Gold Star families, to encourage them, to check on them, and to live life with them.

Just last week, I introduced legislation with Senator CARPER to expand certain educational benefits to the survivors of guardsmen and reservists who have died as a result of their service. This is the least we could do as a nation to walk alongside those Gold Star families.

Over 33,000 Active-Duty Guard, Reserve, and Active-Duty personnel are currently assigned in Oklahoma. We have Oklahomans serving our country and protecting our interests, literally, all over the world right now. We are home to Altus Air Force Base, Tinker Air Force Base, Vance Air Force Base, Fort Sill Fires Center of Excellence in the McAlester Army Ammunition Plant, as well as countless different National Guard locations all around the State. We train and equip our soldiers, airmen, sailors, and marines, and I am proud of the Oklahomans who wear the uniform.

As we continue this Military Appreciation Month, I hope all Americans take the time to remember that 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, whether you are awake or asleep, someone is on guard watching our Nation right now, and someone is defending our freedoms right now. Whether you are hearing about Military Appreciation Month while you are at work, while you are at play, or while you are at rest, someone is not resting right now. They are defending your freedoms, and we are grateful.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado is recognized.

REMEMBERING KENDRICK CASTILLO

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, Kendrick Castillo was an 18-year-old senior set to graduate high school at the end of the week when his life was tragically cut short. On Tuesday, May 7, Kendrick Castillo sat in his British literature class, just like any other day in school, when two schoolmates burst into a classroom at the STEM school in Highlands Ranch and opened fire.

When faced with the unthinkable, Kendrick acted out of pure heroism as he put his classmates' lives before his own and charged the shooters. A class-

mate of Kendrick's described his heroism by telling NBC News about his actions, "giving all of us enough time to get underneath our desks, to get ourselves safe, and to run across the room to escape."

Brendan Bialy, a classmate who charged the assailants with Kendrick, told ABC News:

Kendrick Castillo died a legend. He died a trooper. I know he will be with me for the rest of my life.

John Castillo reflected on his son's actions by saying:

He did what he had to do, and I knew that was my son's nature. That was who he was.

Kendrick Castillo displayed courage well beyond his years. He was a member of the robotics club and wanted to study electrical engineering in college and loved spending his free time fishing and camping.

Today, Colorado mourns the loss of a hero as we say good-bye to Kendrick Castillo. As his friends, family, and community all gather at Highlands Ranch for a final farewell, we must pledge to never forget this young man. Kendrick Castillo lost his life saving his fellow classmates. The students of the STEM school in Highlands Ranch experienced an absolute tragedy and showed fearlessness well beyond their years as they took charge in the face of danger.

Now is the time to come together in tragedy to rise above it and remind every single student at that school that we love them, we are with them, and we will never forget them.

I also want to take a moment to honor the first responders who, once again, displayed true bravery in their response to this tragedy. The deputies of the Douglas County Police Department, South Metro Fire Rescue, and all of the neighboring first responders on the scene acted quickly to help stabilize the situation and lead the students and faculty to safety.

This week is National Police Week, a fitting time to reflect on those who protect our sons and daughters every day.

NATIONAL POLICE WEEK

Mr. President, in Washington, DC, this week, we are celebrating National Police Week, a time we take each year to thank law enforcement for protecting our communities and to remember the cost of providing this comfort.

Today, thousands of officers and their families will gather on the west front lawn of the Capitol to participate in the 38th Annual Peace Officers' Memorial Service, an event to honor all of those we have lost in the line of duty.

I hope the camaraderie and support they have experienced during the ceremony and throughout the week will bring a bit of comfort to law enforcement and our law enforcement community. I also hope it demonstrates the tremendous gratitude that we all have for these sacrifices.

Police Week also serves to show the law enforcement community that the

lawmakers in Washington have their back. We will continue to help departments all over the country afford lifesaving equipment, like bulletproof vests to help as many officers as possible return home safely every day. In fact, just this week, the Senate is working on legislation to make sure we are providing lifesaving equipment through the Bulletproof Vest Grant Program. We are also working on legislation this week that will help address mental health needs, not just for law enforcement officers themselves but for their families, as well, because we know the pressure and strain that this duty can create and put upon the family.

I know my colleagues in the Senate will join me in thanking the many officers who have joined us in Washington this week. Their bravery and courage allow all of us to enjoy the safety and security we so often take for granted. It should not take a tragedy for any of us to reach out to a police officer, EMS, or a firefighter, to thank them for their work, and to let them know their bravery does not go unnoticed.

Yesterday I had the honor of joining the Colorado memorial ceremony at the fallen officers' memorial. There have been 320 Coloradans over the years who have been added to the fallen officers' memorial. That is 320 too many. Four were added this week: Adams County deputy Heath Gumm, El Paso County deputy Micah Flick, Las Animas County sergeant Matthew Moreno, and Littleton police officer Kevin Denner.

One of the most poignant moments at the ceremony yesterday was the comment made by a police officer who spoke to a widow of a fallen officer, who said: Support for the law enforcement community is needed long after the bagpipes have played. I think that is what we have to do as colleagues together. While the pomp and ceremony memorials end, it is after the bagpipes have finished that we must continue to stand with the men and women on that blue line of service to our communities.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COTTON). The Senator from Wyoming.

HEALTHCARE

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I come to the floor to address again today the Democrats' one-size-fits-all healthcare scheme. It is a radical plan to take over all of healthcare in America and to take away health insurance from millions of Americans.

Still, nearly every Senate Democrat running for President and 109 Members of the House of Representatives, Democrats all, have backed one-size-fits-all healthcare. Last week, former Senator Heidi Heitkamp of North Dakota had words of wisdom for her fellow Democrats. She writes in the Washington Post: "Most Americans are satisfied with the healthcare they receive and do not want their coverage options

taken away and replaced," as she said, "with a one-size-fits-all government program."

I agree. The fact is, according to the Census Bureau, 90 percent of Americans have healthcare coverage. Of those, 200 million are covered by private health plans, and 180 million have employer-provided healthcare coverage. Most say that their current plan works well for them.

The 180 million Americans covered through their jobs work hard. These people go out every morning and support their families. According to a survey released last year, the vast majority of people with employer-provided coverage—71 percent of them, to be precise—like their current healthcare plans.

So who exactly are those workers on employer-sponsored plans? Well, many are union members. They negotiate their health coverage through their union representatives. Many are public employees, Federal and State employees, people who serve this country. So why do Democrats who support one-size-fits-all healthcare want to outlaw proven, popular, and predictable health coverage for millions of these working families?

Democrats certainly seem to be putting politics above principle. What is more, they clearly believe that Washington knows best. But shouldn't we be asking what these hard-working Americans who have good private health insurance want? Well, shouldn't we ask them what is best for them and what is best for their families?

Let's take the Teamsters Union, for example. In an article published in 2017, the Teamsters said:

The availability of high-quality health care has been a top selling point for those who belong to unions. It is a benefit these workers have bargained for, and oftentimes they have sacrificed higher pay for these excellent insurance benefits.

Let me underscore this point: The Teamsters Union believes their health benefits are excellent, and maybe Democrats should ask the United Steelworkers about their insurance coverage. If you go to the steelworkers' website, you will find their answer: "The Steelworkers Benefit Plan . . . provide[s] high-quality, affordable health and welfare benefits to USW [United Steelworkers] members and their families."

Basically, if you are a union worker watching this debate right now, you need to know that Democrats in Washington are coming for your hard-earned healthcare benefits. Make no mistake. Under the one-size-fits-all healthcare legislation offered by Senator BERNIE SANDERS and so many Democrats running for President, this high-quality health insurance program and their insurance will cease to exist.

It is no wonder that last year some high-profile public sector unions started sounding the alarm about losing their health benefits. When New York State debated a Sanders-like proposal

to take over healthcare, who raised the loudest objections? Well, it was the public sector unions, of course.

So again, we have millions of union workers, Federal and State employees, and their families, all with excellent healthcare benefits that are on the Democrats' chopping block. Instead of helping fix the Nation's healthcare problems, Democrats are looking to destroy what is actually working.

Remember, it is more than union workers and public sector employees who are threatened. Democrats' one-size-fits-all healthcare plan is gunning for retired military members' health insurance as well. We are talking about the TRICARE health insurance program for military families. There are more than 9 million military families enrolled in TRICARE. Our servicemembers have earned their TRICARE coverage through years of faithful service defending this Nation. I believe one of our greatest responsibilities is to provide for those who protect this Nation, both those who currently serve and our retired servicemembers.

Back home in Wyoming I talk with servicemembers, with veterans, nearly every weekend. These proud Americans want me to make sure that TRICARE works for them and to protect and strengthen benefits that work and that they have earned through their service. Still, far-left Democrats don't want to listen to reason. They are hell-bent on a one-size-fits-all approach to healthcare.

It is especially ironic that Democrats even want to ban ObamaCare plans—the plans they voted for and put in place. It has been less than a decade since Democrats passed ObamaCare, and now they want to repeal it and replace it, basically saying that ObamaCare has failed.

For years I have come to the floor to discuss the shortcomings of ObamaCare. Every time Republicans have offered to improve healthcare, we have heard from the Democrats that ObamaCare is off-limits and they can't possibly make any changes to that law. Now that the Democrats are running for President, suddenly they are singing a different tune. They are done defending ObamaCare. In fact, Democrats are happy to repeal ObamaCare so they can replace it with a one-size-fits-all healthcare plan for America.

Senator Heitkamp is actually warning them not to cast aside ObamaCare and start all over again with a one-size-fits-all plan.

Well, let me just say as a doctor, as a physician who has taken care of patients for decades, my focus continues to be on improving healthcare for American patients and their families. Americans want to focus on real healthcare reforms that make a difference for them and their families in terms of the cost and in terms of the quality of their care. These are the issues that Republicans are working on right now: protecting patients with

preexisting conditions, lowering prescription drug costs, and ending surprise medical bills.

Surprise medical bills are bills patients receive that come out of nowhere. These bills are an unfair financial burden on many families, completely unexpected medical costs that they can't afford and aren't expecting. Just last week I was at the White House with President Trump announcing a plan to help patients by ending these surprise bills.

Republicans also remain committed to protecting patients with preexisting conditions and to lowering the cost of prescription drugs.

Democrats have a choice to make. They can follow the far-left Democrats pushing their radical one-size-fits-all approach to healthcare. Again, this extreme scheme will mean the loss of health insurance coverage for millions and millions and millions of hard-working people, union workers and their families, our veterans, people who helped protect and save this country, Federal and State employees and their families, and all of the Americans who are currently enrolled in ObamaCare plans.

The better option for Democrats is to work with Republicans on common-sense, bipartisan solutions, real reforms that improve healthcare for all Americans. Let's reject one-size-fits-all healthcare that will make Americans pay more to wait longer for worse care.

That is the key. One-size-fits-all healthcare, I will tell people listening in today, means that you will pay more to wait longer for worse care. It is time to reject one-size-fits-all care for Americans. Let us work together to give all patients the care they need from a doctor they choose at a lower cost.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I came to the floor to speak about rising tensions and potential challenges with Iran, but after my distinguished colleague's remarks and as a Member of the Senate Finance Committee who helped write the Affordable Care Act, I wouldn't want to have my silence be an acceptance of his views.

For nearly a decade Republicans have sought to tear down the Affordable Care Act, which some derisively call ObamaCare, with no substitute, with no plan. This administration is actually in a Federal court, arguing that the law is unconstitutional—the very law that gives protections to everyone in this country who has a preexisting condition, such as a child born at birth with some heart disease, a husband who had a heart attack, a woman simply because she is a woman and before was discriminated against because she was a woman. Somehow that was a preexisting condition and allowed insurance companies to charge twice as much as their male counterparts in the

same age group and same geography. It was the Affordable Care Act that ended that discrimination and created the protections.

It was the Affordable Care Act that ended lifetime caps so that if you had a major illness such as cancer, before you hit the ceiling on your insurance and you were one illness away from bankruptcy—the Affordable Care Act ended lifetime caps so that if you had a serious illness you were still covered.

The Affordable Care Act created the possibility for our children to be able to stay on our insurance until the age of 26. That was not the law before.

The list goes on and on. So it is that which Democrats have been about and, expanding upon that, the opportunity to create a universal system for everyone—something we all desire.

IRAN

Mr. President, as important as that issue is, I have come to the floor in alarm to demand answers by this administration about Iran, about its policy, about what intelligence the administration has. For more than a week we have seen press reports and heard rumors about the "threats" to U.S. interests and possibly American citizens by Iran.

For more than a week I have been demanding, along with others, that the administration provide senior level officials to brief Members of the U.S. Senate.

For more than a week, the administration has ignored these requests. For all intents and purposes, it has refused to provide Members of Congress with information critical to our national security—information it says indicates that American citizens and American assets may be in harm's way.

After specifically requesting information on security posture at our diplomatic facilities in Iraq on Monday, this morning, I read from press reports that the administration is ordering the departure of staff from our Embassy in Baghdad and our consulate in Erbil. As the ranking member—the senior Democrat—of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, it is outrageous to be learning about the evacuation of an Embassy from media reports. There are only two reasons to make such an order: We have credible intelligence that our people are at risk, or there is some type of preparation for military action against Iran.

This behavior is unacceptable. By refusing to provide Members of Congress with critical information, this administration is blatantly disregarding the fundamental governing structures of the United States as outlined in our Constitution.

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee is charged with writing the laws that authorize the use of military force and of oversight of the State Department and the safety of those who work there. The administration must provide this committee with the information we need to judiciously and appropriately make policies.

While I hear there is a briefing for all Senators rumored for next week, that is not confirmed, nor is it an acceptable timeline. Next week may be too late. We do not need another Iraq weapons of mass destruction moment that led us to one of the worst, most disastrous military engagements when there were no weapons of mass destruction to be found. We need clarity. We need answers, and we need them now. We cannot make foreign policy and national security decisions while flying in the blind.

Make no mistake—I have no doubts that Iran continues to be a bad actor in the region and throughout the world. Iranian leaders continue to support dangerous proxy actors throughout the region. Iran continues to violate arms embargoes. Iran continues to oppress its own people. Indeed, I have spent the better part of two decades developing legislation and policies to stop Iran's quest for a nuclear weapon and attacks against our allies, including Israel.

Working across the aisle, often cajoling and prodding the executive branch and our allies, Congress led the effort to build an extensive economic and political pressure campaign to force Iran to the negotiating table. Our allies in Europe, Asia, and across the world, most of whom share our concern about Iran's ability to develop a nuclear weapon and its broader maligned activities, have been critical to this effort.

When building a policy to effectively confront an adversary, you must have an end goal, you must have clear objectives, and you must take actions in pursuit of those objectives. With Iran, our objective was to ensure that Iran never develops a pathway toward a nuclear weapon. So I am all for putting on as much pressure as we can, but that requires also having a clear way of showing how it can be alleviated. There must be a viable, tenable, diplomatic track. If I were to put you in a room, lock the door, throw away the key, and tell you there is no way out and no way to survive, you would sure as hell start looking for ways to fight and break down that door.

For a campaign of maximum pressure, when the moment of maximum leverage is reached, it must be seized. That requires working with our allies to offer a real, diplomatic path to negotiations.

British Major General Chris Ghika, the deputy commander of the American-led coalition to fight the Islamic State, has called into question some of the credibility of the intelligence our officials say we have regarding Iranian-backed forces in Iraq.

Yesterday, Spain pulled a frigate from a U.S.-led naval group that had been scheduled for a joint training mission 2 years ago, saying the original mission had changed.

Our allies are critical not just in confronting Iranian malign activity but in securing our interests across the world.

Let me conclude with two points.

Now is the moment to invest in a diplomatic surge to meaningfully engage our allies and Iran in serious negotiations to end its pathway toward nuclear weapons and its malign activities.

Second, Congress has not authorized war with Iran. The administration, if it is contemplating military action with Iran, must come to Congress to seek approval.

I call on every Member of this body on both sides of the aisle to assert our institutional and constitutional prerogatives and demand information from this administration, demand classified briefings. When matters this serious are at stake, we have to demand more. We cannot and we will not be led into dangerous military adventures. The administration must provide this critical information to Congress, and it must do so immediately.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

NATIONAL POLICE WEEK

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. President, I think many of our colleagues here in the Chamber know that Senator ALEXANDER and I host a breakfast on Tuesday Mornings called Tennessee Tuesday. This week at the breakfast, one of our Tennesseans said: I have seen so many men and women in law enforcement uniforms in DC. What is going on? Is this normal?

It gave me the opportunity to say: Actually, this is National Police Week, and this is a week we set aside to honor those men and women who are in law enforcement.

There are tens of thousands of police officers and sheriffs and highway patrolmen across our country. My hope is that each of us will stop this week when we see them and say “thank you” to them for the service they provide our communities, because when it comes to fighting so many of the issues that affect our communities on a day-to-day basis—the issues we face because of drugs and drug trafficking, human trafficking, gangs—it is our local law enforcement that is on those frontlines, and we say “thank you” to them.

This year in Tennessee, three officers have lost their lives. During this week, we remember them and express our gratitude to their families for their service and their sacrifice. We lost Trooper Matthew Elias Gatti from the Tennessee Highway Patrol, who died on Monday, May 6, 2019; Sergeant Steve Hinkle from the Sullivan County Sheriff’s Office, who died on Tuesday, February 26, 2019; and Police Officer Nicholas Scott Galinger from the Chattanooga Police Department, who died on Sunday, February 24, 2019. As I talk to our sheriffs and police chiefs and patrol captains, I know there are many more who have been injured, and we remember them.

We also say “thank you so much” to the families of these men and women who have chosen—you know, they real-

ly are called. This is their calling to public service, and we thank them for answering that call and that they choose to serve in our communities to keep us safe so that we know our communities are a place where we can rear our families, where we can enjoy camaraderie with family members, with friends, with our churches.

I will tell you, as I was thinking about this week, I thought, there are so many moms and grandmoms who I think are pretty much like me. Many times I will say I am a “security mom.” I want to make certain that my children and my grandchildren are safe, that our children are safe when they go to sporting events and when they go to school. We say a prayer when they get behind the wheel of a car. We are so grateful that there are law enforcement officers who are there at public events to keep them safe, who watch out if they are going to be speeding on the road and provide the security that is so essential to our way of life.

I have the opportunity as one of these security moms, if you will, to serve on our Senate Judiciary Committee. Just last week, Chairman GRAMM brought forward three bills that we approved. These are things that are going to help law enforcement officers and their families—providing mental health support for law enforcement and their families, which is vitally important, and, of course, lifesaving bullet-proof vests, which are now essential, and ensuring that our first responders get the benefits they have earned by standing for that duty. When they get ready to retire, those benefits are going to be there.

This week, I have joined Senator CORNYN on his Back the Blue Act, and I thank him for his leadership. I think many of us who stand in this Chamber know that we stand to back that “thin blue line”—that line is the difference between order and chaos in our communities. This bill is going to create new penalties for killing or assaulting law enforcement officers and will protect officers from lawsuits when they intervene to stop a violent crime. It is a commonsense provision, and I am pleased to be in support of this bill.

As we talk about law enforcement and security and having safe communities, we also need to remember our Customs and Border Patrol agents and officers who are on the southern border. When you talk about being a security mom, of course you are going to talk about economic security, healthcare security, job security, and national security, but border security is a part of that. It is a way that we work to keep our communities safe.

We all know there is a humanitarian crisis on the southern border. Much of it is fueled by cartels that are big business. They deal in drug trafficking and human trafficking. It is our first responders who address this in our communities and on our city streets. The issues and the lack of security at that

border have created an environment where now, at this point, every State is a border State and every town is a border town because those problems that come across the southern border with the human trafficking, with the drug trafficking, with the gangs—all of this ends up on the streets in your community.

We are working on legislation that we hope is going to help with this situation. It will target traffickers of unaccompanied minors in the care of Health and Human Services. One of the things that has not happened and needs to happen is that Health and Human Services and Homeland Security need to be able to share all of the information they have on individuals who are bringing these unaccompanied children, individuals who say “I am a next of kin,” individuals who say “I am here, and this child is coming to me.” We want to make certain they are in the country legally. We want to make certain they have a relationship with these children so that we are protecting and looking out for the security of these children and making certain they are not being trafficked.

As we talk about our children, some of the trafficking—of course, much of the trafficking takes place in the virtual space. It takes place online. It seems impossible, but that is what happens with the human trafficking and the sex trafficking. The adverse impact that this has on young girls and women is horrifying.

Because of my work to prohibit these traffickers from working online, we are pushing forward with privacy legislation. You and I do not want our children to be followed online. That is what is happening, and it is why we need to make certain that moms have the tools they need—that parents have the tools they need—to guard the privacy of their families online.

I recently introduced the BROWSER Act. This is legislation I introduced while I was in the House of Representatives. It is one of the first bipartisan privacy bills we have had. The BROWSER Act will require you to give your consent if you are going to opt in and allow someone to share your information, to have access to your sensitive information.

In this Nation, we have a history of respecting informed consent, and that is what we are saying—that individuals need to give their consent to a company before that company looks at their private information or, worse yet, data mines or, worse yet, shares that information about those individuals with third parties—people they do not know, people they have never seen, people they never will see. Then that tech company—guess what—sells ads. It is paid with your information.

The BROWSER Act also prohibits companies from denying their services to users who refuse to waive their privacy rights. You have a right to privacy, and these companies should not deny you their services because you

say: You cannot share my information. You cannot share my sensitive information. I am not going to opt-in to allow you to do that, big tech company. I am also going to opt-out on non-sensitive data. I am not going to allow you to do that. I do not want my children followed, and I do not want you to be following me. I do not want you to sell my information. I do not want my spam to run crazy with ads and information I do not want.

Individuals deserve their privacy. Americans deserve to know they are protected and have that privacy in the online universe. They deserve to know they are not going to be followed and they are not going to be tracked.

While we are talking about technology, I'd like to bring attention to the global race for 5G, or fifth-generation wireless technology. You are hearing a good bit about this. It doesn't matter if it is in our commercial sector or in our military sector; we are at the forefront of this debate to make certain that we win this race on 5G—that China does not get a foothold, that Huawei does not penetrate our delivery systems—and to make certain that we win this race just like we did the race to 4G, which brought forward a lot of the technologies we all use and take for granted, like those devices we hold in our hands on which we receive our emails, make our phone calls, send text messages, pull up maps, get to a favorite site on which we want to make a purchase, and log on to social media accounts. This is all from a handheld device, and it is what 4G brought us. Well, 5G is going to be as revolutionary as going from analog to digital, and we are going to stay on top of this to make certain we win this race.

Because of this, we have a couple more pieces of legislation that I am going to discuss on the floor at a later date. We have the SECURE 5G and BEYOND Act. Senator CORNYN has the lead on that. I have the SUPPLY CHAIN Act, which will be focused on security in the virtual space and make certain that we will be rooting out these threats that may come to our supply chain and affect our private sector or our governmental sector.

We know it is imperative that, yes, we win the race in 5G but that we protect our networks and that we secure them so the American public knows that its information is not being exploited.

As a mom who values and puts a priority on keeping children and grandchildren safe, it is an honor for me to come to this floor to salute the men and women of law enforcement and to talk about what we need to do every single day from this Chamber to protect our Nation's security and to protect our citizens.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

REMEMBERING RICHARD LUGAR

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I honor the life and legacy of the late Senator Richard Lugar.

My colleagues and I in the Senate were deeply saddened to hear of the passing of our dear colleague and friend. His selfless service and tireless dedication to the State of Indiana and to this Nation inspired many to follow in his footsteps and govern using his principled commitment to the rule of law and desire for constructive compromise.

From an early age, Senator Lugar understood the value of hard work and dedication to what was important. He became an Eagle Scout and was the valedictorian of his classes in both high school and college. He was later a Rhodes Scholar at the prestigious University of Oxford in England. Senator Lugar's commitment to his education served him very well later in his career as a distinguished statesman.

As a fellow Eagle Scout, Senator Lugar knew that the knowledge and skills gained in Scouting always had a use and were a central part of the Boy Scout motto "Be prepared." He learned early on the importance of core Scouting values, such as trust, loyalty, courtesy, reverence, and the rest. He displayed these values not only in his nearly four decades-long career in the Senate but also as a loving husband and father to Charlene, his wife, and their four sons.

These critical skills also served him well as the mayor of Indianapolis. As a former mayor myself, I know the need for every citizen to play an active role in the day-to-day lives of their towns and cities. Senator Lugar understood this, too, and the value in working together to make our cities, States, and Nation better places. As mayor, he envisioned the unification of the city of Indianapolis with the surrounding Marion County, and he did it. He ushered in steady, uninterrupted economic growth for that region.

In a nearly four decades-long career in the Senate, it is difficult to pinpoint Senator Lugar's greatest achievements. However, I think it is safe to say that some of his most important work came as chairman or ranking member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Under his steady leadership and acute attention to detail, the committee considered critical issues at a milestone in the future of world diplomacy and democracy.

Senator Lugar's contributions were instrumental in, as its name suggests, the formation of the Nunn-Lugar Cooperative Threat Reduction Program in 1991, which was intended to dismantle nuclear warheads at the close of the Cold War. This program was enacted at a critical moment in the Soviet Union's dissolvent. If action had not been taken by Congress at this important juncture, dangerous nuclear weapons from the former Soviet Union could have been at risk of falling into the wrong hands.

These efforts laid the groundwork for the implementation of future programs that have been responsible for dismantling hundreds of nuclear warheads, bi-

ological weapons, and dangerous missiles. Quite simply, Senator Lugar's work changed the course of history—toward a safer world for the generations that followed.

I had the honor of working with Senator Lugar when I was on the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee. He was instrumental in the origination and legislation of President Bush's program, named the President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief, or PEPFAR for short. PEPFAR was life-changing legislation for those stricken with potentially fatal diseases like HIV and AIDS, tuberculosis, and malaria. Unlike many foreign assistance programs that do not impact those directly on the ground, PEPFAR taught people how to avoid contracting the HIV/AIDS disease and provided countries with the ability to care for their citizens who were already infected.

Senator Lugar was also a committed man of faith. As a member of the United Methodist Church, his moral compass was guided strongly by his faith. He was always one to do what he thought was right rather than what was the easiest.

The United States is a better place because of Senator Lugar's tireless service and commitment to what is right. I and Diana, my wife, send our deepest condolences to his loved ones and know he will find eternal peace and happiness in knowing he had a profound effect on all who knew him as a colleague, as a father, and as a friend.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANCHIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. BLACKBURN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMERICAN MINERS ACT

Mr. MANCHIN. Madam President, I rise today to call for immediate action on the American Miners Act.

We have an obligation to the miners across America who served our Nation by providing us with the energy throughout our greatest advancements. They deserve to know that their pensions, which they rightfully worked for, will be funded fully, and they deserve to have accessible healthcare, which was guaranteed to them as well.

As the Senate fails to act, we continue to put our retired miners' healthcare and pension benefits in jeopardy yet again.

I have been working with everyone and from every angle in order to prevent our miners from losing their healthcare and retirement benefits, but, once again, they are facing a deadline that puts their whole livelihood at risk.

This has been a long fight, and it is far from over. Everyone who has joined me on this journey understands that

fighting for working people is what we were sent here to do.

These retired miners are walking the halls and fighting for what is rightfully theirs. I am doing this for them and their families. I promised them that this body would not abandon them, and I refuse to let them down.

The 1974 Pension Plan will be insolvent by 2022 if we do not act now. Miners who receive their healthcare through companies who went bankrupt in 2018 are at risk of losing coverage in the coming months if we fail to act soon. Unlike many other public and private pension plans, the 1974 Pension Plan was well managed and 94 percent funded prior to the crash of 2008. However, the 2008 financial crisis hit at a time when this plan had its highest payment obligations due to retirements.

If the plan becomes insolvent, these beneficiaries face benefit cuts, and the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation will assume billions of dollars in liabilities.

To address this, we have to shore up the 1974 Pension Plan, which is heading for insolvency due to the coal company bankruptcies and the 2008 financial crisis; ensure that the miners who are at risk due to 2018 coal company bankruptcies will not lose their healthcare; and extend the Black Lung Disability Trust Fund tax at \$1.10 per ton of underground-mined coal and 55 cents per ton of surface-mined coal for 10 years.

West Virginia has more retired union miners than any other State. More than 27,000 retirees live in West Virginia alone.

I have two letters that I would like to read into the RECORD that explain what we are dealing with in all parts of our State.

This is Roy from West Virginia, and he says:

I am a 63 year old, 3rd generation coal miner. I started in the mine 3 days prior to graduating from high school. Unfortunately, I had to find other employment in 1999 after 27 years of mining because my mine shut down. Although the job that I was hired at paid a lot less (75% less), I felt that we would survive because of the promise of lifetime healthcare.

When I went into mining, I felt that if I put in my time, I would be taken care of in my older years. Now that I am approaching that stage of my life and am faced with the fact of healthcare concerns of people my age group, I am fearful of losing the security that my pension and health benefits will provide to me and my wife of 43 years.

Fourteen years ago, my wife was diagnosed with severe rheumatoid arthritis. The cost of her medications alone would total more than my pension income, making retirement an impossibility. The idea of her not being able to receive the proper treatment for her condition is not an option. If necessary, I will continue to work to provide the medical care that she needs and deserves.

Senator Manchin, for the concerns that have been mentioned in this letter, I deeply appreciate the support that you have lent to the passage of the Miner's Protection Act and hope that your fellow legislators will consider the same.

This is Lisa from Fraziers Bottom, WV:

My husband was employed by a UMWA represented mine for the 34 years he worked in the mining industry. He worked a 6 day workweek. He turned down some very promising job offers because we were always led to believe that after 20 years of UMWA service, we would have family insurance for life. A large part of the reason he stayed loyal to the mining industry was because of the retirement pension and family health insurance we would have upon his retirement.

He was injured on the job in 2013 and was unable to return to work. We had the comfort of knowing that he would be able to receive his pension and that the two of us would have no worries about health insurance.

In April 2015, I was diagnosed with breast cancer that spread to my lymph nodes. I had chemotherapy from May 2015 to November 2015, followed by radiation that lasted until February 2016. I was hospitalized three times during treatment, had to undergo a lot of diagnostic testing, and a blood transfusion. Unfortunately, I was unable to finish my treatment due to this rigorous and intense treatment damaging my heart. I have to follow up with regular treatment by a cardiologist and now have frequent testing to make sure the cancer hasn't come back.

Another side effect I have from having had chemotherapy is chemo-induced peripheral neuropathy that effects both my hands and feet. My medications cost several hundred dollars a month. I am 53 years old and unable to work due to all the side effects from my having cancer. My medical bills and medications have cost many thousands of dollars and I don't have to worry about anything other than getting well, thanks to the UMWA insurance we have.

Since my husband can no longer work and I too am unable to work, our income has taken a downward turn. The security of having this insurance means the world to us. We [are] neither asking nor expecting nothing other than what we were promised. Please, please pass this Senate Bill, not only for the two of us, but for the many other UMWA retirees and spouses that are also in the same situation.

We have countless letters that come in on a weekly basis, and it is basically stories. The thing I would want to make sure that all my colleagues know and all of America knows is that the miners provided the energy that built the industrial might that we have—an industrial revolution. They built the factories. They mined the coal and made the steel to build the factories, and they built the guns and ships that defended this country. They have given everything they have had, and this was a promise by the U.S. Government in 1946.

Because of the bankruptcy laws that erupted and basically evolved over the 1980s, they were left with nothing, and that is what they have. They didn't take home in the paycheck extra money. They didn't take home anything else except the promise and guarantee that they would have their healthcare and the benefits of a pension.

The average pension for a miner retired is less than \$600, and most of those are for widows. This is something that we promised. This is something we worked for, we are fighting for, and I am not going to give up until this promise is fulfilled.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

PRESCRIPTION DRUG COSTS

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Madam President, I rise today to join my colleagues in calling for necessary and long-overdue changes in how our country addresses the cost and affordability of prescription drugs.

You are going to hear today from, in addition to myself, Senator BLUMENTHAL, Senator SMITH, and Senator Kaine, as well as Senator DURBIN, who spoke on these issues earlier, to highlight this egregious public health issue facing our country.

It is unacceptable that lifesaving treatments and cures are increasingly out of reach for the people who need them the most. That is why the Senate must act now to pass legislation that would lower the cost of prescription drugs. Healthcare represents one-sixth of our economy, and out-of-pocket costs account for over 10 percent of our Nation's healthcare spending, from consumers to hospitals and nursing homes.

One report found that between 2012 and 2016, the price of branded prescription drugs increased 110 percent. That is not 11 percent; that is 110 percent. Even drugs that have been available for decades, like insulin, are no longer affordable. It is outrageous, it is dangerous, and it has real consequences for real people.

For most Americans, this is deeply personal. I know it is for me. I will never forget the frightening day when we learned my daughter had a nut allergy. She was a toddler, and we were actually in a cabin. We were out in the middle of nowhere, and she ate a cashew for the first time. Her throat started to close up, although we didn't really know that was what was happening.

I still remember us driving as fast as we could through the woods for about 45 minutes to the closest emergency room, where finally they were able to help her. That was when we discovered that she had a nut allergy.

She now keeps an EpiPen with her at all times. So when the price of an EpiPen increased by three times the original amount, I knew just how dangerous that cost increase would be to the people who rely on the medication, and I spoke out.

It wasn't just me. It was moms and dads across the country who spoke out. They spoke out by writing letters. They spoke out on email. They spoke out on their Facebook pages. They spoke out on social media. It was literally a nationwide effort to take this on. We successfully worked to bring that cost down, but companies shouldn't just respond when there is outrage over social media.

By the way, not every drug has a constituency like that of parents who have

kids that have nut allergies. There are a lot of rare drugs for which maybe only hundreds of families understand what a price increase means. There are drugs that have constituencies who are disabled or people who aren't going to be able to basically mob the halls of Congress to make a change.

Besides that, I don't think that is how we want to make change, anyway. Wouldn't it be better if we responded in a policy way, in a bipartisan way, and simply made some changes to the policies of our government and of our country to bring down the price of prescription drugs—not just the drugs that are most famous but for all drugs.

There are many examples of why prescription drug pricing is now out of control and why we have to take action. For instance, a Wall Street Journal article reported that the price for a multiple sclerosis drug went up 21 times in a decade—21 times. No one could explain that except that it allows the company that makes that drug to profit big time.

A Stat News story reported that the price for a leukemia drug was raised four times over the course of a single year, and it now costs nearly \$199,000 a year.

We know that the price of certain insulin products rose 700 percent, accounting for inflation, in two decades. When the State of the Union happened this year, I invited a guest, and that guest was a woman named Nicole Smith Holt, and it was her son, a young man named Alec, who was a 26-year-old restaurant manager. He worked in my State. He worked hard. He was a good guy, and he was on his parents' health insurance until he was 26. When that health insurance ended, when he could not get that health insurance, he then had to pay for the insulin himself since he was a diabetic. It was \$1,200 a month. He was unable to afford his insulin. So what did he do? Sadly, he did what too many people are doing in America right now. He started rationing that insulin. He rationed that insulin, and he died waiting for his next paycheck. He was a restaurant manager in the suburbs of the Twin Cities.

His mother sat at the State of the Union, looking down at the President, looking down at the Congress, to make the point that she needed action, and in the memory of her son Alec, she was going to make sure that action happens.

Congress has a duty to act, and the President should support these efforts. Committees in the House of Representatives, for the first time, have already advanced proposals to reduce the cost of prescription drugs, and we should be moving similar legislation here in the Senate.

Yes, it is true that there are two pharma lobbyists for every Member of Congress. That is a fact, and for years they have felt that they owned Congress. That has to change. They do not own me, and they do not own the people who are speaking up today.

STOP STALLING ACT AND CREATES ACT

Madam President, two of the bills the House Judiciary Committee have already advanced with bipartisan support are companions to bipartisan legislation that I am leading in the Senate with Senator GRASSLEY: the Stop STALLING Act, which addresses the abuse of the FDA petition process by pharma companies, and my bill to crack down on anti-competitive pay-for-delay agreements.

In addition to these commonsense measures, the House Judiciary Committee also passed a version of the bipartisan CREATES Act, which Senator LEAHY and Senator LEE and others have led and which I have been a co-sponsor of for years, to deter branded drug companies from withholding testing samples to develop new generics.

Recently, on "60 Minutes," there was a story of the work that is being done in Connecticut in response to what is going on between the generic companies and the pharmaceutical companies. That is what these bills get at—to get products out on the market, to stop the pay-for-delay, in which Big Pharma pays off generics to keep their products off the market.

Yes, we should take up these bills. It is very important, but we must do more. We must also make sure that Medicare negotiates for prices. Right now there is literally a ban on negotiation, so 43 million seniors cannot get the benefit of less expensive drug prices. That doesn't help just 43 million seniors if we lift that ban; it also helps everyone in America because they are such big purchasers of prescription drugs that it will bring down the cost for everyone.

The other bill I noted was the one about the petitioning process that was designed to allow interested parties to raise legitimate health and safety issues related to generic drug applications, but for years branded drugmakers have filed sham petitions to delay the FDA's approval of the competing generic drugs.

Studies show that the FDA denies more than 90 percent of petitions relating to generics and that more than 10 percent of generics between 2011 and 2015 were filed by branded pharmaceutical companies. Our legislation would help to deter those who engage in sham petitioning. According to the CBO—the Congressional Budget Office—that would save U.S. taxpayers \$117 million over the next 10 years.

These are ideas that have been out there for a long time. These are things that we believe would make a major difference.

SAFE AND AFFORDABLE DRUGS FROM CANADA ACT

Madam President, another one I would like to mention is a bill that I first introduced with the late Senator John McCain to allow Americans to bring in certain safe, less expensive drugs from Canada. I have continued this bipartisan effort by introducing

the Safe and Affordable Drugs from Canada Act. Senator GRASSLEY has now taken the place of Senator McCain, and we have introduced that bill.

LIFEBOAT ACT

Madam President, finally, we should act to hold drugmakers accountable for the opioid crisis they helped to create by passing the LifeBOAT Act, led by our colleague Senator MANCHIN, who was just in this Chamber, which would establish a permanent funding stream to provide and expand access to treatment for addiction. It is only fair that the companies made wealthy from addiction be held responsible to fund a pathway for recovery. There are many options, and, alone, none of these will fix this problem. But, together, along with other legislation that has been proposed by my colleagues, we can make a difference. We can no longer pretend this is happening. It is time for us to make a dent, to bring down the cost of prescription drugs, and to stop coddling the pharmaceutical companies.

This is about, as I mentioned, Nicole and her son, whom she no longer can share time with. He has left us, but she will not let it go.

This is about Jessica, a mother whose specialty drug costs to treat her arthritis are \$50,000 a year.

This is about a woman from Crystal, MN, who told me "I am practically going without food" to pay for her prescriptions. This is happening in America.

Madam President, I note that my colleague Senator BLUMENTHAL is here, and I know that he has remarks as well.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Thank you, Madam President. I will be speaking in just a moment, but I understand the minority leader, Senator SCHUMER, is on his way to speak before me, so he should be here within moments.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. While we await for Senator SCHUMER, I want to mention just a few examples of what we are talking about here with drug prices—a woman named Paula. Paula has been prescribed a treatment for her multiple sclerosis. It costs over \$5,000 a month. She has been getting copay assistance from a grant but does not know how she is going to afford it and whether she is going to be able to afford her lifesaving medication.

Julie, another example, is covered under her husband's employer plan. She currently has to pay a \$500 copay for a drug that she needs—the same drug that was once offered in a generic form for \$50, a fraction of the new cost. The generic drug has been discontinued, creating an impossible choice between paying \$500 or not filling her prescription. Because of the high cost, she goes without this drug.

Diane—Diane has an EpiPen for bee stings and is unhappy with the high cost. She says:

Now that I am retired, it is horrific how I have to buy them in a pack of two, and they cost more than before. The prices have just skyrocketed. Every year I throw away something that is so expensive that I cannot use. It is way overpriced.

Angie, from Savage, MN, is a mother, a wife, and a teacher. In May of 2018, she was admitted to a hospital, where MRI scans showed brain lesions. She was eventually discharged from the hospital and was instructed to follow up with a neurologist. She received a multiple sclerosis diagnosis. She was prescribed a new medication that is also one of the most effective drugs available today for treating MS. Payment for the expensive drug was denied.

These are just examples of the people we see every day.

I yield the floor.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, first, I want to thank the Senator from Minnesota—the senior Senator—for all of the great work she has done in working to reduce the high cost of drugs for the American people.

THE MIDDLE EAST

Madam President, on a much different subject but a very important one—Iran and the Middle East—I have returned to the floor this afternoon amid several concerned reports about the Trump administration's position on Iran.

Earlier this week, it was reported that the administration's national security team discussed a plan that would deploy at least 120,000 U.S. troops in the Middle East. Today we learned that personnel were removed from the U.S. Embassy in Iraq. The President himself initially denied there was a plan and then seemed to confirm the reports by saying that he would "absolutely" send troops, and, if he did, "it would be a hell of a lot more than 120,000."

The news comes as quite a surprise to the American people, who have grown quite tired of wars in the Middle East, of the loss of life and fortune when there is so much that has to be done in America.

The American people deserve to know what is going on here. We are talking about not only putting 120,000 troops in harm's way in this possible deployment but also about the safety and the actions of the thousands of troops we have stationed in the Middle East right now.

So I am calling on Acting Defense Secretary Shanahan and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, General Dunford, to come testify before the Senate Armed Services Committee in an open setting before the end of the week. The hearings that are done in secret do not inform the American people of what is going on, and they are entitled to know because the lessons of history teach us that when things are done in secret, behind closed doors, mistakes can be made and momentum built for a course of action that the Nation ultimately regrets.

So I repeat: The American people deserve to know what is going on. If the President and Republicans in Congress are planning to take the United States into a conflict, even a war in the Middle East, the American people deserve to know that, and they deserve to know why.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Madam President, I want to begin by thanking the minority leader for bringing this issue as straightforwardly and as clearly as he has. As a member of the Armed Services Committee, I demand to know from the Acting Secretary of Defense and other relevant officials why we have deployed these American military assets, including an aircraft carrier group, a number of bombers and Patriot missile units to one of the most dangerous parts of the world, where they may unexpectedly provoke act of war.

We are on a dangerous path without a strategy. We are embarked on a course of potential war without informing the Congress or the American people. We have demanded repeatedly that we be briefed, and it must be in public.

This situation has reached a point of potential conflagration. The tinderbox of the Middle East is no place to operate on impulse or whim. That is the appearance this administration has created by lacking a clearly articulated strategy for the American people to know and assess. On the Armed Services Committee, we have asked repeatedly for this kind of information, and so far the administration has refused to provide it. So this kind of open hearing is necessary to be open information for the American people, and they deserve and need no less.

PRESCRIPTION DRUG COSTS

Madam President, I turn now to a topic that is of great consequence to the American people for their health and their economic well-being.

As we all know and as the senior Senator from Minnesota, my great friend AMY KLOBUCHAR, has very eloquently and powerfully described, the high cost of essential medicines in this country is a national disgrace. It is immoral. For the greatest country in the world to compel ordinary Americans to choose between covering the cost of their rent and putting food on the table or paying for their medicine needed to stay alive is absolutely abhorrent and unacceptable.

The only people who benefit under the current system are the high-paid executives, whose pay is increased even more by this unjust and intolerable system. It yields them greater profit without any greater help to the American people.

It has to stop, and the good news is, we have bipartisan agreement that it must stop. After years of disagreement, we are starting to see Republicans and Democrats coming together and con-

fronting the skyrocketing cost of prescription drugs. Drug companies' price-gouging, their manipulation of their monopolistic power to raise those prices and make the industry's practices noncompetitive and to exclude even new products from coming to market—all of these abuses have become so extreme and so outrageous that there is now bipartisan consensus that we need to stop it.

I am proud today to support the Affordable Prescriptions for Patients Act. It is a bipartisan piece of legislation, and it will finally put a stop to some of the most egregious monopolistic and predatory tactics within the drug industry. These tactics would make even the robber barons of the Gilded Age blush with guilt and embarrassment for the obvious anti-consumer effects that impact the average American.

These patent abuses go by colorful names like "patent thicketing" and "product hopping," but these names obscure their very pernicious purpose. Patent thicketing and product hopping are only the tip of this monopolistic iceberg. While these terms may be unfamiliar to many Americans, almost everyone is familiar with the harmful effects these predatory practices produce.

The fault here is with the people who take advantage of shortages and market power. They exploit them in the same way that anti-trust abuses have been done over the decade, and they are the reason we have anti-trust laws. Now, to confront this even more egregious example of abuses of market power, we need these new laws.

According to one study in 2017, across the top 12 grossing drugs in America, drugs companies filed an average of 127 patent applications per drug. By creating a thicket, a genuine thicket of patents around their drugs, drug companies are able to double the number of years of market exclusivity that they have before a competitor can enter the market.

During this time, these drug companies are able to charge consumers extraordinarily high prices for drugs they desperately need. If you use HUMIRA or have rheumatoid arthritis, you should be deeply concerned about patent thicketing. According to one study, the manufacturer of HUMIRA has filed 247 patents so it can exclude competitors from the market. It keeps those competitive adversaries from producing drugs and can do so for a total of 39 years. During those 39 years, the cost of HUMIRA in the future—they will do it for 39 years—is just going to keep climbing. According to reports, between 2012 and 2015 alone, the average amount that Medicare and Medicaid spent on each patient using HUMIRA more than doubled—from \$16,000 to \$33,000. Things will only get worse in the years to come.

Rheumatoid arthritis patients are hardly the only ones who should be concerned about patent thicketing. A large number of patents have been filed

to protect the market exclusivity of drugs that treat conditions like cancer, stroke, blood clots, diabetes, multiple myeloma, and macular degeneration.

Patent thickets will keep competitors off the market. It will cost consumers thousands, perhaps hundreds of thousands of dollars, each year. It isn't only the patients who use the drugs who suffer these effects; we all pay the cost of higher insurance when those insurers have to pay higher costs for drugs. It hits all of us, not just the patients who suffer from these medical conditions.

Unfortunately, this obviously anti-competitive practice is not the only way drug companies abuse the patent system to keep drug prices high. Just before the protections for their first drug expire, brand-name drug companies pull a bait-and-switch, pushing consumers onto a new, slightly different drug. That means any generic competition coming to market will struggle to penetrate the market, and consumers will be stuck with the brand-name drug for even longer, likely at a significantly higher cost. In this way, the brand-name company succeeds in gouging customers and keeping their profits growing. That is their objective—not better product, not better health, not better patient experiences, only higher profits.

One of the most famous examples of product hopping—the practice I have just described—concerns Namenda, a drug to treat Alzheimer's. This drug was produced by a company called Actavis. When Actavis originally released Namenda, it was usually taken by patients twice a day, but a number of years before Namenda's market exclusivity was going to expire, Actavis went to the FDA to approve a new version of Namenda, this one taken just once a day. A new drug? No. A different way of taking it? Maybe. To improve patient health? No. To increase profits? Yes.

Although the FDA had approved this drug in 2010, Actavis strategically waited 3 years to introduce this, with the apparent goal of extending its exclusivity in the U.S. market. Once the new drug was introduced, Actavis pushed all of its customers onto it, while pulling the old drug from the market. As a result, Actavis was able to continue charging monopoly prices on essentially the same drug long after Namenda's first patent was expected to expire.

We have reached the time to stop patent thicketing and product hopping once and for all. We have reached the time to bring sanity and fairness to the drug market so consumers can see lower prices.

I am proud to be joining with Senator CORNYN of Texas to introduce the Affordable Prescriptions for Patients Act. It will fight these abusive practices and give consumers some much needed relief from higher drug costs. I thank Senator CORNYN for his leadership. We joined in this partnership, and

it has taken many months to draft and introduce this measure. I thank his staff, as well as my own, for all of their hard work on this bill reaching this bipartisan consensus.

This legislation will embolden and encourage our anti-trust forces to pursue pharma companies that are getting away with anti-competitive practices. It will also give clear guidance to our courts to allow them to quickly and easily distinguish between product hopping and patent thicketing from truly innovative, truly inventive conduct that benefits patients.

This legislation makes sure that any company caught redhanded engaging in these harmful practices will have to pay and be held accountable.

This legislation will also lower healthcare costs for millions of Americans by increasing competition in the market. If we pass this legislation, millions of Americans may no longer have to choose between food on the table, their rent payment, and the medicine they need and deserve. That is a choice no one should ever have to make in the greatest country in the history of the world.

We cannot allow drug companies to continue their monopolistic practices and predatory abuses that only increase the profit of those companies. We cannot allow those drug companies to reap massive personal benefits for their executives, while Americans are struggling to make ends meet. I urge the Senate to immediately take up this legislation to protect American patients today.

I happily yield the floor to my colleague from Minnesota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Ms. SMITH. Madam President, I rise today to join Senator KLOBUCHAR and my colleagues on behalf of all Minnesotans and Americans who struggle to afford their prescription drugs.

The increasing price of prescription drugs is a top concern for Americans and Minnesotans. Every day, companies are launching new treatments at astronomical prices, and they are spiking the price of older drugs, like insulin. Americans are taking notice of this greedy behavior that puts patients last.

The No. 1 issue I hear about from Minnesotans is the cost of healthcare and specifically the cost of prescription drugs. Every day, Minnesotans inspire me to fight to lower the price of prescription drugs, Minnesotans like Rachael Malmberg, a military veteran with cancer.

Before Rachel battled cancer, she battled teams on the ice, playing hockey for the University of Minnesota and the U.S. Olympic Team. Rachael's daily medicine is stabilizing her cancer, but it comes at a great cost. Even with health insurance, she still pays \$9,000 a month. For Rachael, affording her prescription drugs is a matter of life or death.

I have also talked with Minnesotans like Nikki Foster, a mom living with

multiple sclerosis in Brooklyn Park, MN. Nikki received her MS diagnosis only 3 months after running her first half-marathon. The diagnosis was frightening, and Nikki wondered if she would ever be able to run again. I am happy to say that 4 years later, Nikki is walking and running just fine. Her progress is due largely to the treatment regimen her doctors prescribed. However, with the rising price of her primary medication, Nikki wonders how long she is going to be able to afford it. When her medication was first introduced to the market in 2004, the price was around \$16,000 a year. Today, it is more than \$80,000.

Without significant changes in the formulation of her medicine, the price has skyrocketed 440 percent. Those higher prices translated to higher monthly costs and a constant source of worry for Nikki.

Finally, I am inspired by the memory of Alec Smith. Here is Alec's story. Alec transitioned off his mom's health insurance at age 26. He was a type 1 diabetic, so he depended on insulin to survive. Without insurance, Alec faced a \$1,300-a-month cost for managing his diabetes. Most of that was driven by the high price of the insulin. Alec had a good job, but his diabetes treatment was eating up nearly 45 percent of his monthly salary, and that is on top of regular expenses for food and rent and other basic necessities. So Alec did what he had to do. He rationed his insulin to make ends meet. Unfortunately, less than a month after his 26th birthday and less than 1 month after he transitioned off his mom's insurance, Alec passed away. He was the victim of insulin rationing.

Colleagues, we are at a crisis point. Thousands of people like Alec are rationing their prescriptions so they can afford them, and sometimes they are literally paying with their lives. Patients with health insurance, like Nikki and Rachael, are facing higher and higher out-of-pocket costs, and seniors are being forced to choose between paying for groceries and paying for their medicine.

In the wealthiest country in the world, this is unacceptable. It is morally wrong that the pharmaceutical companies are raking profits off of skyrocketing prices while Americans struggle to pay for their prescription drugs. That is simple to understand, but the industry would have you believe otherwise.

Their first argument. Well, drug pricing is so complex; it is impossible to understand; and Congress should study the problem. I would argue this complexity serves a function. Complexity obscures all the ways the drug companies are gaming the system to drive up profits. Colleagues, we can't be paralyzed by complexity. We need to create more transparency in drug pricing.

So then the pharmaceutical companies come back with their second argument. They say high prices are the result of altruistic purposes, like investing in research, development, and innovation, but, colleagues, remember, it is taxpayers, not drug companies, who are subsidizing the basic research that leads to innovation and new cures through the National Institutes of Health. Innovation can't help people if it is too expensive to afford.

So then comes their closing argument. We aren't the problem, say the drug companies. It is the PBMs. It is the insurers. It is everybody else but us. I would argue that everyone has a role to play. Lots of companies profit from high drug prices all along the supply chain. That needs to be fixed, and all of these players need to be held accountable. Pointing fingers and shifting blame will not bring down high drug prices. Comprehensive solutions will.

In the coming weeks, I will be reintroducing the Affordable Medications Act, which is a comprehensive solution that targets the multiple causes of the skyrocketing price of prescription drugs, and a number of my Democratic colleagues are working with me on this bill. It would increase transparency and hold pharmaceutical companies accountable for their role in setting high prices. My bill would make prescription drugs more affordable by allowing Medicare to use its buying power to negotiate lower prices, just like we already do with the Department of Veterans Affairs.

My bill goes further by penalizing drug companies that spike prices and allowing for the safe importation of lower cost drugs from other countries like Canada. My bill would spur innovation by creating a fund for new antibiotics and funding for clinical drug trials, and it would protect competition by blocking unfair, anticompetitive drug monopoly practices. This bill would eliminate the blame game and put patients at the center of the solution.

Now, I recently introduced bipartisan legislation with Senator CASSIDY to help bring low-cost biosimilars, like insulin, to the market. I am working to reintroduce legislation that would limit the ability of the big brand name drug companies to keep lower cost generic drugs off the market.

Many of these proposals have bipartisan support. Many more should, but we haven't brought any of these bills up for a vote in the Senate. I urge my colleagues to take up these proposals and the drug pricing bills making their way through the House right now as we speak. Alec, Nikki, Rachael, and all of our constituents don't have the luxury of waiting for Congress to break through legislative gridlock until they can afford what they need to live.

Thank you, Senator KLOBUCHAR, for drawing attention to this issue and for inviting me to join with you today.

I yield to my colleague from Virginia, Senator KAINE.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia is recognized.

Mr. KAINE. Madam President, I rise with my colleagues to just tell stories I am hearing from Virginians. Having completed a campaign last November, I was out doing a lot of listening and have continued to do a lot of listening since then. In your own mind, you kind of categorize the stories, and, first, above all else, are stories about healthcare. I hear stories about a lot of things, but I hear stories about healthcare probably as much as all other areas combined. In the area of healthcare, the issue of the price of prescription drugs is No. 1.

Hundreds of Virginians have reached out to me to let me know about the high cost of prescription drugs and how that affects not only their health but even their ability to put food on their table or a roof over their heads. Today I want to share some stories from Virginians and then talk about some commonsense legislation and a present opportunity to bring drug prices down.

Andrew from Great Falls shared this story with me. His father was being treated for CML, which is a leukemia that is effectively curable, and he was prescribed the drug Gleevec. Now, this story goes back a little bit, and here is what Andrew said:

In the United States, Gleevec costs approximately \$159 to manufacture for a year's dose.

That is the manufactured cost.

In India, a generic version of this drug costs about \$400 a year to purchase for use. In Canada, the price is around \$8,800 a year for a generic of the drug, and \$38,000 a year for the branded drug. In the United States, there is no available generic, and the brand name drug's marketing cost is \$146,000 a year. This is not a drug that consumers can simply choose to take or not take—to be blunt, they will . . . literally die of cancer if they don't take it.

Now, since Andrew wrote me the letter, a generic has been approved in the United States that has provided him and other families relief, but for a long period of time, \$146,000 in the United States for a drug that costs \$159 to manufacture, and the price to patients in other countries is dramatically less.

Daniel from Martinsville in Southern Virginia wrote to me about the high price of insulin, which is a common theme, I know, for all of us here with constituents.

He writes:

I paid \$505.00 for 3 bottles of Humalog Insulin . . . at Walgreens. This is a three month supply, but another Eli Lilly insulin is required by my wife in order for her to avoid death [and that is hundreds of dollars more].

Laurie from Norfolk wrote to me to share her story. Laurie has rheumatoid arthritis, and she lives on Social Security. She writes:

The drug company wants \$65,000 for the drug. With my Medicare part D, they only want \$8,000—[that is good, but that is] over 1/3 of my annual income [as a senior on Social Security for one drug]. I have applied for the drug companies patient assistance program [because] the pain is too great. I can't use

my hand without the drug. The drug companies are getting away with robbery. We need Medicare to have the authority to negotiate drug prices.

Ron from Arlington, just across the Potomac, wrote me after he went to renew a prescription he had been taking for more than a year.

That is an outrageous increase of 100 percent or \$100 more out of my pocket for exactly the same thing [every time I buy it]. I am a retired federal employee on a limited income and I am locked into this insurance plan for the rest of the year. So I have to take \$100 more out of my pocket to obtain the exact same thing.

Every time he buys it, 100 percent increase in the price.

Marie from Virginia Beach wrote me about a drug that costs \$375,000 a year. She writes:

Without the drug I most likely will be bedridden. I cannot afford the exorbitant price. . . . I recognize the recovery cost of research is the main expense, since manufacturing cost is extremely cheap, but when the sufferers cannot afford your drug, then what have you gained?

Medicare is prohibited from negotiating the price of prescription drugs. Medicare Part D enrolls over 43 million seniors nationwide, giving the program incredible bargaining power if it could only be used for their benefit.

Many seniors are on fixed incomes. The average senior gets Social Security. Their median income is \$28,000, so an \$8,000 drug cost is one-third to a quarter of their income. In the wealthiest Nation in the world, seniors should not have to choose between paying for their medication and putting food on the table or heating their home. So many of these seniors tell me about getting medication and then thinking: If I cut the pill in half and just take half a dose, maybe I can save some money—but that then comes at an incredible reduction in the efficacy of the prescription you are taking to control your healthcare condition.

This is why I joined with Senator KLOBUCHAR, and I appreciate her organizing this group of us on the floor today, to introduce the Empowering Medicare Seniors to Negotiate Drug Prices Act, which allows Medicare to negotiate drug prices. This is simple, basic, best business practice. Everybody will negotiate prices. Why should we bar the Medicare Part D Program that provides a prescription drug benefit to 43 million people—why should we bar them from negotiating for drug prices?

According to a recent analysis, Medicare would have saved \$14.4 billion. That is billion with a "b." Medicare would have saved \$14.4 billion on just 50 drugs in 2016 if the program had paid the same prices as the Department of Veterans Affairs, which is allowed to negotiate. That is a whole separate level of absurdity. Why would we, as Congress, allow the Department of Veterans Affairs, as they buy these same drugs from the same manufacturers, to negotiate and get a volume discount but tell the Medicare Program they

can't? We actually know how much money we would save because of allowing the Veterans Affairs Department to negotiate, which they should be able to, but why would we then handcuff Medicare Part D and not allow them?

If Medicare would have saved \$14.4 billion just in those 50 drugs in 1 year, that is \$14.4 billion that could be used for better healthcare, the deficit reduction, tax relief, Pell grants, education expenses. There is also a savings not just to Medicare but to patients that would also be in the billions.

Every corner pharmacy negotiates the price of prescription drugs. Every Walmart does. When they are buying prescription drugs to sell in their pharmacy, they negotiate based on volume. It makes no sense that the Federal Government is not allowed to do the same thing.

Another area is biologic medicines. They represent a new and very promising area of treatment. I do want to stop here and say I am not one of these people who use a big broad brush and say pharmaceutical companies are bad. Why are we living longer? Why is the average age going up and up and up? It is going up and up and up because of better medical care, and much of that medical care and improvement is innovation in the pharmaceutical industry, so I am not on a campaign to say pharmaceutical companies are bad. They are producing lifesaving prescriptions that are easing suffering and prolonging life. It is just that the price Americans pay for those drugs is so far out of whack with what other nations do, and one of the things that is innovative, that is great is biologic medicines.

When competing products—they are called biosimilars—attempt to enter the market, they often find it impossible to navigate the thicket of patent laws that protect the branded product because they lack access to readily accessible information. So when biosimilar manufacturers are able to uncover the web of patents, expensive litigation too often results in patents being found to be invalid or unenforceable.

That is why I joined with Senator COLLINS from Maine on a second bill to introduce the Biologic Patent Transparency Act. Our bill promotes patent transparency by requiring manufacturers of approved products to disclose and list patents covering their products with the FDA in what we call the FDA Purple Book. The legislation encourages manufacturers to apply for patents sooner, allow prospective biosimilar manufacturers to challenge weaker or invalid patents earlier in the product development process to eliminate waste, and the legislation will help us bring needed biosimilar treatments to patients faster and ultimately help lower drug prices.

Finally, a word about insulin. Over 30 million people—that is like the combined population of about 19 or 20 States—live with diabetics in the

United States, and insulin is a critical and life-sustaining daily treatment for 7½ million of those people. Yet, between 2012 and 2016, spending on insulin nearly doubled, even while there was little change in the actual use of insulin. So what explains that?

The price hikes we have experienced have caused Virginians who need these drugs, whose stories I have indicated, to endure severe financial hardship, ration their supplies, or even skip the needed medication.

In February, I joined all my Democratic colleagues on the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee, where I sit with Senator SMITH, who preceded me, and we sent a letter to three insulin manufacturers requesting information about recent price increases, how the revenue contributes to research and development, and what companies are doing to help patients access affordable insulin.

In closing, I said there are not only good ideas in Senator KLOBUCHAR's bill and in others, but there is also a good time. In the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee, our Chair, Senator ALEXANDER, and our ranking member, Senator MURRAY, have indicated that one of the bills we want to work on this year is a bill of single-shot strategies to reduce medical costs. It is not going to be the rewrite of the healthcare system. Senator ALEXANDER and Senator MURRAY were heard to describe that if we can do a bill with a series of singles, that would be a very good thing. So we will work together as colleagues to come up with a series of strategies that could bring healthcare costs down, and we have an opportunity in this bill to have some of those provisions deal with provisions just like those I have described that can reduce the cost of prescription drugs.

I am proud to join my colleagues to share stories of Virginians. It is probably the single-most frequent complaint I hear, and it is a complaint we can do something about.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRAMER). The Senator from Minnesota. Ms. KLOBUCHAR. I thank the Senator from Virginia for his thoughtful remarks and the Senator from Connecticut, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, as well as Senator SMITH, my colleague.

The time for action is now. We have all cited numerous examples of people who, literally, are taking drugs that, in the case of insulin, was \$17 a vial and is now \$1,213 a month. That is simply outrageous. We have people who can't afford drugs that they used to just take as commonplace, and there were no changes made.

So for me, a lot of this is what happens when you have monopolies, what happens when you don't have competition. So the answer is to look at all of the measures we could take to ensure that there is better price negotiation and more competition. One of them, as Senator KAINE mentioned, is Medicare

negotiation, unleashing the power of 43 million Americans. That is a lot of people. Seniors are good at getting deals. That is 43 million people. Yet they are banned from negotiating with Medicare to get better deals for themselves. That should change.

We need less expensive drugs from other countries—safe drugs. That would certainly create more competition. We had bipartisan support for a proposal like that. Senator GRASSLEY and I have the bill that would take one country, Canada. In Minnesota and in the Presiding Officer's State of North Dakota we can see Canada from our porch. The point is that we see those less expensive drugs right across the border. We should be able to have that competition.

Then, look at the CREATES Act and some of the other ways of stopping pay-for-delay and stopping, as Senator BLUMENTHAL was describing, these patent abuses to try to make sure we have more competition. I think there is starting to be general agreement on this issue that we have to take on these pharmaceutical prices. The time for describing the problem is still here because it seems like some of our colleagues don't get it, but the time for action is certainly now.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

NATIONAL POLICE WEEK

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, this week, as we know, our Nation observes National Police Week, a time when we pay tribute to our law enforcement officers, especially those who died in the line of duty. Today I rise to honor their dedication and their significant and tremendous sacrifice.

On Monday evening, thousands of people gathered on the National Mall to pay tribute to the 371 officers who gave their lives in the line of duty. Four officers from Kansas were among those memorialized on Monday.

Last June, Wyandotte County sheriff's deputies Theresa King and Patrick Rohrer were shot and killed while preparing to transport a prisoner. Theresa King joined the Wyandotte County Sheriff's Office in 2005. A working mother of three children, Theresa, or "TK," was known for coming to work every day with a smile and a willingness to help out in any way that she could. She is a founding member of the Kansas City-based Lancaster-Melton Peacekeepers Civitan Club, a group of law enforcement officers and their families dedicated to honoring slain officers.

Patrick Rohrer, a husband and father of two children, joined the Wyandotte County Sheriff's Office in 2011. Patrick was known as a dedicated deputy that never lost his sense of humor and often peppered his colleagues with his favorite "Star Wars" quotes. He was also known for his competitive spirit.

Patrick had been a varsity letterman on the swim team at Shawnee Mission

Northwest High School. His family's motto became "Keep on Swimming."

I will echo Wyandotte County's Sheriff Don Ash's words in memorializing the deputies: "Theresa and Patrick were heroes in every sense of the word" when they put "their lives between a cold-blooded killer and the citizens they swore an oath to protect."

In September, Deputy Sheriff Robert Kunze of the Sedgwick County Sheriff's Office was fatally shot during an encounter with a suspect in a stolen vehicle. He, too, was a husband and father who had served with the Sedgwick County Sheriff's Office for 12 years and had previously served with the Shawnee County Sheriff's Office for 6 years.

Robert Kunze's impact on the department was made apparent when Sedgwick County's Sheriff Jeff Easter referred to his death as the loss of a "family member." Robert was known as an exceptional law enforcement officer and has been remembered by his colleagues as having a contagious laugh that always made others feel welcome.

This year we also memorialized Jefferson County undersheriff George Burnau, who died in the line of duty on April 29, 1920. His dedication set an example for generations of law enforcement officers in Kansas and around the country, those that followed him.

I would like to honor one additional law enforcement officer who is serving on my staff as a Department of Justice fellow. ATF Special Agent Matt Beccio has become an integral part of our team over the past year, giving sound advice on issues relating to Justice and traveling to Kansas to meet with local law enforcement officials. His firsthand enforcement experience and passion for bettering the lives of law enforcement officers across the country have been tremendous assets to our office. This week Matt led members of my staff in participating in Police Week's 5K memorial run alongside Kansas law enforcement and their colleagues from across the country.

Thank you, Matt, for your dedication and for using your role in our office to better support your colleagues in law enforcement.

During National Police Week and throughout the year, we are reminded that law enforcement needs our support. We must provide them with the resources they need to do their jobs. As chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee that funds the Department of Justice and, particularly, those law enforcement grants, I am committed to doing so.

We know we must provide the tools that law enforcement needs to build and strengthen the bonds of trust with those they serve and provide our best efforts to address the underlying challenges and the challenges of our society and of our country that face each and every community.

We honor the service and sacrifice of our Nation's fallen law enforcement officers, not only for the sake of those

who have departed but as a reminder to all of us that remain.

May God bless our law enforcement officers and protect them from harm as they faithfully perform their duties each and every day.

65TH ANNIVERSARY OF BROWN V. BOARD OF EDUCATION

Mr. President, on the 65th anniversary of the Supreme Court decision on *Brown v. Board of Education*, I rise to pay tribute to the Topeka, KS, families, led by the Browns and all Kansans who took part in challenging the injustice of racial segregation.

For 60 years, leading up to *Brown*, much of America adhered to the Supreme Court ruling in *Plessy v. Ferguson* that established the doctrine of "separate but equal." However, when applied to school buildings and the education of our children, nothing about it was equal.

In 1951, Linda Carol Brown was in the third grade and would walk six blocks to a bus stop that would take her to Monroe Elementary, more than a mile away from her home, despite the fact that Sumner Elementary was seven blocks from her home. Even after repeated applications for attendance at the neighborhood school, the Browns and other families were rejected. They were rejected because of the color of their skin.

In that year, 13 parents, led by Linda's father Oliver, filed suit against the Topeka Board of Education on behalf of their 20 children. Combining other cases throughout the country, Thurgood Marshall argued on their behalf before the U.S. Supreme Court—the Court that he would later join as a Justice.

On May 17, 1954, the Supreme Court unanimously issued its landmark decision announcing that *Plessy's* "separate but equal" doctrine violated the Fourteenth Amendment. While full integration would take years to accomplish, the events set in motion by these determined parents were irreversible, and they are worthy of our respect and honor today.

Nowhere was this truer than in the city where it all started. Before the case had even reached the Supreme Court, the Topeka Board of Education began integrating its primary schools.

Kansas had its pre-Civil War bloodshed to determine whether the Territory would enter the Union as a free State or slave State, and Wichita was home to one of the first sit-ins to integrate drugstore lunch counters. But it is *Brown v. Board of Education* that is our State's greatest connection to the Nation's pursuit of racial justice.

That these events happened in Kansas reflect the imperfect history of our State and of our Nation, but also the resolve of individual Kansans and national organizations like the NAACP to right wrongs and to make "a more perfect union," as our Constitution contemplates.

On this anniversary of *Brown v. Board of Education*, we remember the

legacy left behind by Linda Brown and her parents. Linda Brown just passed away last year, and we honor her, her family, and all those involved in the civil rights movement.

This legacy is one that requires all Americans—each of us—to uphold the self-evident truth that all men and women are created equal. Let us remember the legacy of *Brown v. Topeka Board of Education*, and in doing so, I ask every American to commit to racial justice and equal opportunity.

DISASTER RELIEF

Mr. President, I rise to speak about the devastation I have seen as I toured flooded areas of Kansas, as well as parts of Missouri, Nebraska, and Iowa, and the need for Congress to pass a disaster bill to provide assistance to impacted agricultural producers.

Kansas farmers and ranchers have endured several challenging years. Since 2013, net farm income has been cut in half due to low commodity prices. The flooding across Kansas and the Midwest has been one more setback in the long list of challenges facing our farmers and ranchers.

In the days following the worst flooding, I visited areas of Kansas that were underwater. I saw farm ground that cannot be planted or put into use until significant time, effort, and resources are invested in restoring that land. Continued rainfall across the State and region has threatened to cause additional flooding in many areas as well as delayed planning for many farmers.

It is important and it is necessary that Congress meet the challenge of providing assistance to those producers, many of whom lost everything. As negotiations continue on a disaster bill, I would like to highlight the importance of providing funds for the Emergency Conservation Program and amending the current disaster program to help cover the cost of lost stored grain.

The Emergency Conservation Program was authorized to help producers restore land damaged from natural disasters, including floods. Kansasans are, unfortunately, familiar with ECP as a result of assistance our State received to help rebuild fences following the devastating wildfires of 2017 and 2018. However, this program does not currently have sufficient funds to cover producers impacted by this year's floods.

I asked Secretary Perdue about the ECP budget shortfall at a recent Ag Appropriations Subcommittee hearing, and as expected, he gave his full endorsement and support for Congress to provide funds for ECP in this disaster bill. Secretary Perdue recognizes that funds must be provided to ECP and other ag disaster programs to help producers restore damaged land and remove flood debris. Congress must also provide assistance to producers who lost stored grain due to floods.

Oftentimes, the farmer's income or revenue is not money in the bank but instead grain stored in a bin waiting to

be sold. With market uncertainty due to trade disputes, farmers have more grain in storage than usual, waiting for prices to increase. When that grain is wiped out by floods, it is similar to the family's savings account being drained of its cash.

Currently, disaster programs are not equipped to help these producers who lost a year's worth of work and income when their stored grain was damaged or destroyed. Congress has the opportunity in the disaster bill to give USDA the authority to cover the loss of stored grain and to help these producers get back on their feet.

While faced with these great challenges, farmers and ranchers continue to provide the food, fuel, and fiber to our Nation and the world. Agriculture is one of the most demanding ways of life. It is full of uncertainty, but it is also a very noble calling.

It is imperative that Congress pass a disaster bill to help producers who lost goods to floods and other disasters and to make certain farmers and ranchers across the Nation know that we appreciate what they do to provide for our Nation.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I would ask unanimous consent that Senator PORTMAN and I be recognized for up to 25 minutes.

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

RETIREMENT SECURITY

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, shortly, I am going to be joined by Senator PORTMAN. The two of us have been working for well over a decade on retirement savings issues. When both of us were Members of the House of Representatives, we worked on pension legislation together. It was unusual at that time to have a Democrat and a Republican working together.

There was a great deal of discussion about tax reform at that time, and it seemed like neither the Democratic nor Republican leadership was interested in dealing with retirement savings at that point. Yet Congressman Portman and I joined forces, recognizing the need to strengthen retirement savings in this country. We authored a bill known as the Portman-Cardin bill. It was more of a process than it was legislation. We brought all stakeholders together, and we sat around, listened to each other, and came to a consensus bill that was enacted into law and made permanent. It provides greater portability among the different pension plans in this country, recognizing that employees were shifting jobs, and therefore it was necessary for them to be able to protect their retirement savings.

We looked at increasing the amount of money that individuals could put away for retirement. One of the provisions provided for catchup for people over 50 years of age because we recognized that people—particularly

women—who entered the workforce at a later time didn't have as many years to put money away for retirement savings.

We simplified the retirement plans so that small companies could establish a pension plan and have safe harbor, so it was not as complicated to set up pension plans.

We established a saver's credit. We did that because we recognized that the Tax Code itself wasn't necessarily a great enough incentive to get younger and lower wage workers interested in participating in a retirement plan. We found that if an employer put money on the table, most employees would opt to join that pension plan. Witness the Thrift Savings we have here as Federal employees.

We recognized that a lot of the smaller companies didn't offer those types of plans. So we developed the saver's credit, which allowed lower wage workers to be able to get government help with putting money away for their retirement.

Quite frankly, the law that was passed back then did dramatically help the number of people who participated in retirement savings. We also included an automatic enrollment feature, and that also helped dramatically increase the number of people participating in retirement savings.

I give that as background because Senator PORTMAN and I have joined up again in the Senate in an effort to build on the success we had over a decade ago.

We had a hearing this past week, and in that hearing, we brought up the fact that several provisions that Senator PORTMAN and I had been working on are included in the recent legislation, which is legislation that had passed the House of Representatives and passed the Senate Finance Committee in the last Congress and the chairman and ranking member of the Senate Finance Committee have filed in this Congress. That includes many important provisions to improve retirement savings.

We hope that bill will be considered on the floor very shortly. We want to get that done. Yet we recognize that we need to go further than that. For that reason, Senator PORTMAN and I have introduced the Retirement Security and Savings Act this year, and it includes many important provisions. It deals with the fact that we have yet to fully accomplish what we need to for retirement savings.

According to a 2019 GAO estimate, 48 percent of those who are near retirement age—those over 55 years of age—have no retirement nest egg, and 29 percent have no savings or pensions.

Since the great recession, personal savings rates in this country have been flat.

Access to employer-sponsored plans and participation are still at way too low of a rate. For private sector workers, 68 percent have access to plans, but barely over 50 percent actually participate in plans. For part-time workers,

the numbers are much lower—only 39 percent have an opportunity and only 22 percent actually participate in plans. For small businesses, only about 50 percent provide retirement access to their employees, and 34 percent participate. In the lowest quintile—those at the lowest incomes—44 percent have access to retirement savings through their employment; yet only half that number actually participate.

The urgency of this is really underscored by the fact that we have now gone from a landscape that included mostly defined-benefit plans where the employer had a plan for you, that employer took the risks, and you had a guaranteed benefit when you retired—you didn't have to think about how much money you put away because your company was protecting you on retirement with a defined benefit. We have gone from a defined-benefit world to a defined-contribution world.

I am going to yield at this point to Senator PORTMAN to go over the provisions we are including in the Portman-Cardin bill. I believe we will have time, and I will come back and comment on some of the particular provisions.

I want to compliment Senator PORTMAN for his longstanding commitment to dealing with this national need. America's economy is strong, but it is not strong on personal savings and retirement savings, and we need to do better. It has been a pleasure to work with Senator PORTMAN in regard to these issues.

Mr. PORTMAN. Thanks to my colleague from Maryland for yielding to me. It is great to be back on the floor with him talking about retirement savings.

Back in 1996 and again in 2001 and 2006, we passed legislation while we were in the House of Representatives together to encourage people to save more for their retirement by providing more incentives, such as increasing, as an example, the amount you could put aside in a 401(k) or an IRA and catchup contributions and simplifying the rules for small businesses, and we made some progress.

Those legislative initiatives resulted in about a doubling of 401(k) assets and about a tripling of IRA assets but still way too little in savings. Senator CARDIN talked a little about that. Our national savings rate is a problem. Our personal savings rate is a problem. Our economy would be stronger if we had more savings.

The real problem is that people just aren't saving enough for their retirement. Social Security is an absolutely essential safety net. Everybody wants to be sure it will be there into the future. But it is tough to live on your Social Security benefit alone. People need that private retirement savings.

We want to encourage people to save more for their own retirement. What is more important than peace of mind in retirement, knowing that you have the ability to take care of your needs—maybe long-term care needs, maybe

healthcare needs, or maybe just being able to have a comfortable retirement. This is something we are focusing on again.

The Senate did recently pass legislation that helps. It is called the RESA legislation. We both support that strongly, but our legislation builds on that and expands it pretty substantially. Senator CARDIN just talked a little about it. It is legislation that we spent 18 months developing.

We heard from stakeholders all over the country. There is a reason that a lot of people are supporting this legislation, including the AARP, the chamber of commerce, and a lot of people who are in the retirement business—the American Benefits Council and others—because we took our time and went to them and said: Hey, what do people really need right now to expand their choices in retirement to be able to save more?

We came up with four or five different challenges in our current retirement system and then specific proposals to address those.

One is, we have an aging baby boomer population—I am among them, and I think all three of us are, Mr. President—that is not saving enough. That is a concern.

Second is a lack of access to employer-sponsored plans. We want everybody who is in the workplace to have access to a 401(k). Yet, when we look at this, particularly with smaller businesses, a lot of people don't have access or a chance to save.

A 401(k) is great because the employer typically puts in a match for you. So it is not just your money that is at a tax advantage, but, unlike an IRA, the employer puts in a match, and usually they help you with your decisions in terms of what kinds of investments to make with that 401(k).

Third, we found that typically with lower income Americans, there was a real issue with the amount of savings. Who needs money more in retirement than lower income Americans, because that is when they don't have other savings to help them through retirement.

Again, all of this is predicated upon the reality that we are living longer as Americans, longer and healthier lives, so we need more of those assets in retirement.

The final one is inadequate lifetime savings. A lot of people have a 401(k) or an IRA, and when they stop working, they think, this is great. They take the lump sum and maybe spend some of that—maybe buy the boat, maybe go on a nice vacation—and suddenly find, oh my gosh, I am living longer and longer. I hadn't expected to be in my nineties and still here. Yet the trend right now is that people are living longer. We have to ensure that there is longer lifetime savings as people are living longer and healthier lives.

After 18 months working with all these troops on the outside, we came up with 57 different provisions to address these four areas. How do we do it?

First, it allows those who saved too little to set more aside for their retirement.

For seniors—people who are over 60 years old—we have a special catchup contribution. If you are over 60 years old, under our legislation, you have the opportunity to put more aside in your retirement plan. That is important. Contribution limits go from \$6,000 to \$10,000 for workers over age 60 with a 401(k).

Senator CARDIN talked a little about this, but among these baby boomers, based on a 2019 GAO report this year, nearly half—48 percent of all retirees over the age of 55 have no retirement nest egg saved. Some may have a public pension, for instance, but still, when you add that in, 30 percent have neither private retirement savings nor any kind of pension benefits that they are going to get in the future. You have a lot of people out there with nothing. This will help with regard to those individuals.

We also say that with regard to this first issue, it is not just being able to make a catchup contribution, but we tell employers: If you set up a plan that allows you to match 6 percent of pay rather than 3 percent of pay, we will give you a break from some of the onerous retirement rules in a safe harbor.

That will encourage more of those employers to do that. That provides a tax credit to those employers who offer these safe harbor plans. So it gives more generous benefits to employees. We think that is appropriate to help save for retirement. It also helps employees who are struggling to save for retirement and pay off student loan debt, people who are saying: I would love to save for retirement, but how can I do that when I have this student loan debt to pay off?

In Ohio, by the way, the average debt for someone coming out of a college or university is \$27,000. A lot of people don't have enough disposable income to say: I am going to save for retirement and pay off college debt.

What we do here is we say that employers will now be able to make a matching contribution to the employee's retirement account in the amount of his or her student loan payment. So employers can do this. It is a good way to help people pay off their debt, to help the individual pay off their debt. The employer putting a match in for the same amount is also a good way to attract employees. If you are a business owner out there, you will like this because it will give you an advantage in the marketplace by saying: Hey, come work for me. We will help you on your student debt.

The second issue we talked about today is with regard to small businesses. This is important because we know that this is where most people work who don't have access to retirement plans. They work for smaller businesses. Bigger businesses tend to offer retirement plans, very generous

ones. The smaller businesses tend not to.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics survey that Senator CARDIN talked about earlier shows that 68 percent of private sector workers have access to employer-sponsored plans, but it drops to only 49 percent for small businesses. So, if you work for a small business, it is less than half. By the way, it is only 39 percent if you are a part-time worker, which we also address.

The bill takes a number of important steps to help small businesses offer 401(k)s and other retirement plans for the workers. It increases the current law tax credit that is already out there, but it improves it and increases it from \$500 to as much as \$5,000 for small businesses that are starting new retirement plans. It simplifies top-heavy rules for small business plans to reduce the cost of enrolling new employees. It also establishes a new 3-year, \$500-per-year tax credit for small businesses that automatically reenroll all of the participants in the plans at least once every 3 years. This is one of the issues out there. If you don't do auto enrollment—in other words, opt in—and you opt out, you are not going to get the participation rate you want.

By the way, this is legislation that Senator CARDIN and I promoted back in the 2006 legislation that said to employers: Hey, you can do an auto enrollment. The participation then went from 75 percent to about 95 percent because there was auto enrollment. It is good for younger people. If you are just told "Hey, unless you do something, you are going to automatically be enrolled in this 401(k)," that really encourages them to get into retirement savings. All of that is to help these small businesses, and we think it is going to make a big difference.

Third, one of the big problems we face is that plan participation rates for low-income workers are well below what they are for others. So this bill expands access to retirement savings plans for hard-working, lower income Americans. The way we do that—and Senator CARDIN is the expert on this—is to ensure that those people who are of low income have the ability to get into retirement plans with matches. That will incentivize them to get in. Only 22 percent of low-income workers participate in retirement plans today. Again, these are people who need savings the most.

The bill expands what is called the saver's credit. It expands the income thresholds to give more Americans access to increased credit amounts. It increases the government match for low-income savers with a saver's credit. By the way, the saver's credit goes directly into the retirement accounts. I think it is important because you don't want this money wasted, and you don't want it used for other purposes—so-called leakage in retirement accounts. This goes right into retirement accounts. We mentioned that only 39 percent have plans but, again, that only 22

percent participate. So this is important.

It also expands the eligibility of 401(k)s to include part-time workers. This is very important to the AARP and others out there who are looking at these part-time numbers and saying: Oh my gosh. There are only 22 percent who participate. That is it. So we have to do more there. It allows part-time workers who complete between 500 and 1,000 hours of service for 2 consecutive years to be able to join in with a 401(k).

These provisions are all designed to help particularly low-income Americans start to build nest eggs for retirement.

A significant challenge we face—again, as I said earlier—is this lack of lifetime savings. Our bill provides more certainty and flexibility during Americans' retirement years.

Last year, a study by Northwestern Mutual found that 66 percent of Americans believe they will outlive their retirement savings. So two-thirds of Americans are saying: I am going to live longer than my retirement savings. By the way, they are probably right. People are living longer and healthier lives and are running out of their retirement savings. It is a major concern.

We have a number of initiatives to try to provide more certainty and flexibility to seniors in their retirement years. Specifically, the bill increases the age for the required minimum distribution from age 70½, which it is now, to 72 and to 75. So it takes it up to 75 years old. Why is that important? For those of you who are not in retirement, you may not know there is a rule that says you have to start taking your money out of retirement at 70½. Now, if you are like my father, who was working full time at 70½, it was a head scratcher. Why should I take my money out of my 401(k) when I am still working? I ran into a guy like that last weekend in Ohio who said the same thing—that this makes no sense.

What we have said is, OK, we are going to kick it up to 75 years old but that if you have less than \$100,000 in your retirement account, you will not be subject to the minimum required distribution rules at all. This is a great relief to a lot of seniors who are trying to save that money for retirement and don't want to pull it out because, although they may work until 75, they still know they are going to have another, maybe, 20 years to live, and they want to be sure they have that retirement savings in there.

I am really excited about all of these provisions.

I am hearing a lot about this last one. Here is Tom Kermode, from Geauga County, OH, who wrote:

Relief from required minimum distributions would be very helpful in that it affords me and other senior taxpayers the freedom to save to help fund my retirement years. Why should I be forced to deplete my retirement account at age 70½ instead of remaining financially independent?

You are darned right, Tom. Thanks for your letter.

The bill also provides help in other ways. It reduces the current penalty for one's failing to take the required distribution from 50 percent of the shortfall amount to 25 percent in most cases and to as low as 10 percent in some cases if one self-corrects the error.

Finally, in order to help those who are in retirement, the legislation encourages the use of qualifying longevity annuity contracts, QLACs. What are they? They are retirement plans that provide annual payments to individuals who outlive their life expectancies. Basically, think of an annuity or a periodic payment. When you retire, instead of taking a lump sum, you have one of these contracts in which you are able to ensure that you are not going to outlive your retirement savings.

There are affordable options for a lot of Americans who are trying to hedge the risk of outlasting their savings. We should encourage those more, and that is what we do in our legislation.

These are all commonsense reforms. They deal with all four of these challenges that we have seen, as we have looked at the retirement system, that have been based on a lot of input from a lot of people. My hope is that we will be able to get this done.

Our coalition includes the American Benefits Council, the AARP, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the Insured Retirement Institute, Fidelity, Nationwide, T. Rowe Price, Vanguard, the Women's Institute for a Secure Retirement, the International Association of Fire Fighters, the American Council of Life Insurers, and The ERISA Industry Committee, to name a few. There are a lot more too.

We have had the opportunity to work together for a couple of decades now on these issues. I am glad that we are taking this next step to provide additional options for people to build and save for their retirements and to have more peace of mind in retirement.

I yield to Senator CARDIN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, let me again thank my colleague Senator PORTMAN.

He has explained what is included in the Retirement Security and Savings Act that we filed this week. It builds on what has worked, and it takes on new opportunities to increase savings and retirement security.

He mentioned the automatic enrollment, which is the safe harbor here, because Americans make decisions by inaction. Now, with automatic enrollment, they will be in retirement plans and will have the opportunity to opt out.

It increases the saver's credit's eligibility, but, importantly, it makes it refundable, and it deposits it directly into a savings account so that low-wage workers will, indeed, have savings opportunities.

It increases the tax credits for small business so that the burden of setting

up a plan for your employees will be matched with this credit so that more workers will have opportunities for savings retirement.

It expands part-time workers—a group that, today, is underrepresented in retirement savings.

It deals with the student debt issue. I really thank Senator PORTMAN and also Senator WYDEN for their help in recognizing that a lot of young workers would love to put money into retirement, but they have to pay off their student loan debt. So that, at least, can be used as a match by an employer for a savings account.

It also deals with lifetime income. How many people have we run into, as Senator PORTMAN has pointed out, who have outlived their retirements? They didn't expect to live to be 95 and still have active lifestyles. So we significantly increase the opportunities for lifetime income options, as well as what Senator PORTMAN said in dealing with required minimum distributions.

There are a lot of other issues. I think there are 50 issues in the bill. There are a lot of other issues that are important. There are issues that we want to work on, including relating to the recoupment of benefit payments.

The bottom line is that we want to improve the retirement security for Americans. As Senator PORTMAN pointed out, Social Security is very important. It is a three-legged stool. Let's work together to increase private savings in retirement, which is exactly what this bill does.

I think we have 1 minute left, so I yield to Senator PORTMAN.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Maryland for his partnership on this over the years.

Let me just make the obvious point for those who are watching today. I am a Republican, and he is a Democrat. We are actually talking about doing legislation together. It is bipartisan. I would say, in the retirement space, we have tried to keep it nonpartisan because this is so important to the people we represent.

The committee also happens to be represented by a Republican and a Democrat who believe in this. Senator GRASSLEY was the chairman of the committee back in 2001 when we first passed this major legislation to increase what people could save for their retirement. He is the chairman again, and he believes in this. Senator WYDEN is the ranking Democrat, the top Democrat. He also was a former Gray Panthers executive director and also has a provision in our bill that is very important, as Senator CARDIN talked about, with regard to student loan debt.

The constellations are kind of properly aligned. I think the ability for us to get this done might be counter to a lot of the partisanship and the gridlock we see here in this town. This is bipartisan stuff. It always has been. We have spent our time, have done it right, and have used input from all sorts of outside stakeholders. We have the opportunity here to improve our national

savings, which everyone says is important, including the Congressional Budget Office, and to help people have peace of mind in retirement. What could be more important?

Again, I thank my colleague from Maryland for allowing me to join him on the floor to talk about the importance of this legislation.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to take a look at this. I hope they will sign it and be cosponsors on this legislation. Let's get this passed. Let's do it this year.

I yield the floor.

NOMINATION OF KENNETH KIYUL LEE

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise today in opposition to the nomination of Kenneth Lee to the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

Mr. Lee has been nominated to a California seat on the Ninth Circuit over the objections of Senator HARRIS and myself. Neither Senator HARRIS nor I returned blue slips for Mr. Lee; yet the majority moved forward with his nomination, disregarding our concerns.

In doing so, the majority is violating Senate norms and traditions by—for the first time ever—ignoring the lack of a blue slip from the Judiciary Committee's ranking member. Let me repeat: This has never been done before.

There was no need to proceed with Mr. Lee's nomination over our objections.

As has been true of many of my Democratic colleagues, Senator HARRIS and I made it clear to the Trump administration that we were ready to work with the White House to find a consensus pick for this and two other Ninth Circuit California seats.

Sadly, our willingness to work with the administration has not been reciprocated. Once again, the majority is insisting on moving ahead with a nomination, despite the strong objections of both home-State Senators.

Senator HARRIS and I refused to return blue slips for Mr. Lee for two key reasons.

First, Mr. Lee has a long record of controversial writings and statements on race and diversity, immigration, affirmative action, women's rights, and other issues.

Second, Mr. Lee failed to disclose dozens of problematic writings to our in-state judicial commissions and to the Judiciary Committee itself.

That failure raises significant doubts about Mr. Lee's candor and judgment, and it should be concerning to all Members of this body. In fact, when another nominee for the Ninth Circuit, Ryan Bounds, also failed to turn over his writings, his nomination was rejected by the Senate.

Mr. Bounds had failed to identify to Oregon's in-state judicial screening commission at least five articles that took controversial positions on issues including campus sexual assault and diversity at institutions of higher education, whereas Mr. Lee failed to dis-

close either to my and Senator HARRIS's screening commissions or to the Judiciary Committee itself more than 75 articles.

Importantly, several of Mr. Lee's articles demonstrate a continuity between what he wrote and the positions he has continued to advocate well into his legal career.

For example, Mr. Lee was a vocal critic of affirmative action, writing: "Our stance on affirmative action has always been that it ultimately hurts the recipients instead of helping them. . . . Black students will unfortunately be treated as inferiors because people will always assume that they were accepted solely because of their race."

In a 2003 piece, written while he was a practicing attorney, Mr. Lee criticized the Supreme Court's opinion in the Bakke case, which upheld the use of race as one of several criteria to be considered in college admissions.

Mr. Lee wrote that "[t]he Supreme Court can no longer hide behind the wishful thinking of Bakke," which he said "was based on the naive assumption that universities would consider race merely as a tie-breaker."

Mr. Lee has not backed away from his opposition to affirmative action and so the Congressional Black Caucus wrote a letter stating: "While many of [Mr. Lee's] most disturbing writings have come from when he was in college and law school, there is every indication that these views were well-settled and carried through his career."

In a 2005 article, written years after he graduated from law school, Mr. Lee criticized President George W. Bush's plan to allow undocumented immigrants to work legally within the United States.

Mr. Lee wrote: "By describing illegal immigrants as 'hard-working men and women' who are pursuing 'better lives,' [President Bush] blurs the distinction between illegals and those who came to America following the rules."

Mr. Lee's portrayal of undocumented immigrants is both inaccurate and troubling.

Mr. Lee has also taken extreme positions on women's rights. He argued that feminism "is not about extending equal rights and opportunities to women . . . [but] is about adhering to a stifling orthodoxy." He attacked feminists for "support[ing] unfettered abortion-on-demand."

As NARAL put it in a letter submitted to the committee, Lee's writings "suggest a disdain for women that is concerning in any context, but especially so for someone up for a lifetime seat on the federal bench."

In conclusion, I believe Mr. Lee's record shows that he is far outside the legal mainstream.

Given the positions he has taken in dozens of articles and given his failure to disclose writings to my commission and to the Judiciary Committee I cannot support Mr. Lee's nomination to the Ninth Circuit.

I will vote against Mr. Lee and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

LEGISLATION SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to legislative session and be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—H.R. 986 and H.R. 2157

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I understand there are two bills at the desk due for a second reading en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the titles of the bills for the second time.

The senior assistant bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 986) to provide that certain guidance related to waivers for State innovation under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act shall have no force or effect.

A bill (H.R. 2157) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes.

Mr. PORTMAN. In order to place the bills on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I would object to further proceeding en bloc.

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

RECOGNIZING AND SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF NATIONAL SEXUAL ASSAULT AWARENESS AND PREVENTION MONTH

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Judiciary Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 178 and that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 178) recognizing and supporting the goals and ideals of National Sexual Assault Awareness and Prevention Month.

There being no objection, the committee was discharged, and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. PORTMAN. I further ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 178) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of April 30, 2019, under "Submitted Resolutions.")

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR—Continued

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume executive session.

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

Under the previous order, all postcloture time has expired.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Lee nomination?

Mr. ROUNDS. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) and the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) are necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 52, nays 45, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 110 Ex.]

YEAS—52

Alexander	Gardner	Portman
Barrasso	Graham	Risch
Blackburn	Grassley	Roberts
Blunt	Hawley	Romney
Boozman	Hoeven	Rounds
Braun	Hyde-Smith	Rubio
Burr	Inhofe	Sasse
Capito	Isakson	Scott (FL)
Cassidy	Johnson	Scott (SC)
Collins	Kennedy	Shelby
Cornyn	Lankford	Sullivan
Cotton	Lee	Thune
Cramer	McConnell	Tillis
Crapo	McSally	Toomey
Daines	Moran	Wicker
Enzi	Murkowski	Young
Ernst	Paul	
Fischer	Perdue	

NAYS—45

Baldwin	Hassan	Rosen
Bennet	Heinrich	Sanders
Blumenthal	Jones	Schatz
Brown	Kaine	Schumer
Cantwell	King	Shaheen
Cardin	Klobuchar	Sinema
Carper	Leahy	Smith
Casey	Manchin	Stabenow
Coons	Markey	Tester
Cortez Masto	Menendez	Udall
Duckworth	Merkley	Van Hollen
Durbin	Murphy	Warner
Feinstein	Murray	Warren
Gillibrand	Peters	Whitehouse
Harris	Reed	Wyden

NOT VOTING—3

Booker	Cruz	Hirono
--------	------	--------

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table, and the President will

be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the remaining votes be 10 minutes in length.

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

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Wendy Vitter, of Louisiana, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Louisiana.

Mitch McConnell, James E. Risch, Roy Blunt, Mike Rounds, Thom Tillis, David Perdue, John Cornyn, Mike Crapo, John Thune, John Hoeven, Johnny Isakson, John Boozman, Roger F. Wicker, Pat Roberts, Steve Daines, John Kennedy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Wendy Vitter, of Louisiana, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Louisiana, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO), and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) are necessarily absent.

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 51, nays 45, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 111 Ex.]

YEAS—51

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

NAYS—45

Baldwin	Blumenthal	Cantwell
Bennet	Brown	Cardin

Carper	Kaine	Sanders
Casey	King	Schatz
Collins	Klobuchar	Schumer
Coons	Leahy	Shaheen
Cortez Masto	Manchin	Sinema
Duckworth	Markey	Smith
Durbin	Menendez	Stabenow
Feinstein	Merkley	Tester
Gillibrand	Murphy	Udall
Harris	Murray	Van Hollen
Hassan	Peters	Warner
Heinrich	Reed	Whitehouse
Jones	Rosen	Wyden

NOT VOTING—4

Booker	Hirono
Cruz	Warren

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 51, the nays are 45.

The motion is agreed to.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Brian J. Bulatao, of Texas, to be an Under Secretary of State (Management).

Mitch McConnell, Roger F. Wicker, Steve Daines, James E. Risch, Roy Blunt, Tim Scott, Mike Rounds, David Perdue, Mike Crapo, John Thune, John Hoeven, Johnny Isakson, John Boozman, Pat Roberts, John Kennedy, Thom Tillis, John Cornyn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Brian J. Bulatao, of Texas, to be an Under Secretary of State (Management), shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

This is a 10-minute vote.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) are necessarily absent.

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 90, nays 5, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 112 Ex.]

YEAS—90

Alexander	Brown	Coons
Baldwin	Burr	Cornyn
Barrasso	Cantwell	Cortez Masto
Bennet	Capito	Cotton
Blackburn	Cardin	Cramer
Blumenthal	Carper	Crapo
Blunt	Casey	Daines
Boozman	Cassidy	Duckworth
Braun	Collins	Durbin

Enzi	Lee	Rubio
Ernst	Manchin	Sasse
Feinstein	Markey	Schumer
Fischer	McConnell	Scott (FL)
Gardner	McSally	Scott (SC)
Graham	Menendez	Shaheen
Grassley	Merkley	Shelby
Hassan	Moran	Sinema
Hawley	Murkowski	Smith
Heinrich	Murphy	Stabenow
Hoeven	Murray	Sullivan
Hyde-Smith	Paul	Tester
Inhofe	Perdue	Thune
Isakson	Peters	Tillis
Johnson	Portman	Toomey
Jones	Reed	Van Hollen
Kaine	Risch	Warner
Kennedy	Roberts	Whitehouse
King	Romney	Wicker
Lankford	Rosen	Wyden
Leahy	Rounds	Young

NAYS—5

Gillibrand	Sanders	Udall
Harris	Schatz	

NOT VOTING—5

Booker	Hirono	Warren
Cruz	Klobuchar	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 90, the nays are 5. The motion is agreed to.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Jeffrey A. Rosen, of Virginia, to be Deputy Attorney General.

Mitch McConnell, John Hoeven, Roger F. Wicker, Chuck Grassley, James E. Risch, Johnny Isakson, John Barrasso, Steve Daines, David Perdue, Jerry Moran, John Cornyn, John Thune, Richard Burr, Mike Crapo, Pat Roberts, Lindsey Graham, Shelley Moore Capito.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Jeffrey A. Rosen, of Virginia, to be Deputy Attorney General, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO), and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber wishing to vote or to change their vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 52, nays 44, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 113 Ex.]

YEAS—52

Alexander	Blackburn	Boozman
Barrasso	Blunt	Braun

Burr	Hoeven	Roberts
Capito	Hyde-Smith	Romney
Cassidy	Inhofe	Rounds
Collins	Isakson	Rubio
Cornyn	Johnson	Sasse
Cotton	Kennedy	Scott (FL)
Cramer	Lankford	Scott (SC)
Crapo	Lee	Shelby
Daines	McConnell	Sullivan
Enzi	McSally	Stabenow
Ernst	Moran	Thune
Fischer	Murkowski	Tillis
Gardner	Paul	Toomey
Graham	Perdue	Wicker
Grassley	Portman	Young
Hawley	Risch	

NAYS—44

Baldwin	Hassan	Rosen
Bennet	Heinrich	Sanders
Blumenthal	Jones	Schatz
Brown	Kaine	Schumer
Cantwell	King	Shaheen
Cardin	Klobuchar	Sinema
Carper	Leahy	Smith
Casey	Manchin	Stabenow
Coons	Markey	Tester
Cortez Masto	Menendez	Udall
Duckworth	Merkley	Van Hollen
Durbin	Murphy	Warner
Feinstein	Murray	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Peters	Wyden
Harris	Reed	

NOT VOTING—4

Booker	Hirono
Cruz	Warren

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 52, the nays are 44. The motion is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Jeffrey A. Rosen, of Virginia, to be Deputy Attorney General.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to legislative session and shall 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.

GHOST ARMY CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL ACT

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, due to a regrettable clerical error, the senior Senator from Maine, Ms. COLLINS, was not added as an original cosponsor and co-lead of S. 1421, the Ghost Army Congressional Gold Medal Act, when we introduced the bill together on May 9, 2019. I wish to clarify that Senator COLLINS is in fact the lead cosponsor of this important legislation and has been an indispensable partner in this endeavor. I thank her for her leadership in ensuring that the heroic Americans of the 23d Headquarters Special Troops and the 3133d Signal Service Company are appropriately honored for their service as a “Ghost Army” during World War II with a Congressional Gold Medal.

SYRIA

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, today I wish to bring attention to the Assad regime and its Russian and Iranian backers’ latest assault on innocent civilians under a rain of airstrikes and barrel bombs, which has sparked the worst violence in a year and a half in the Idlib and Hama provinces. The regime and its enablers would yet again have us believe that they are striking “terrorists.” However, facts simply bely that worn-out ruse; their airstrikes have hit 18 hospitals in the past 2 weeks alone, denying lifesaving facilities to more than 100,000 people and destroying at least 10 schools, according to NGOs monitoring the situation. Relief workers on the ground assess that Assad’s forces are responsible for scores of civilian deaths over the past 2 weeks, as well as displacing 150,000 desperate and terrified people.

Assad’s barrel bombs and starvation campaign, along with violence from terrorist organizations, has already sent 5 million Syrians fleeing to neighboring Jordan, Lebanon, Turkey, and Iraq. Despite already fragile economic and political systems, these countries have shown an extraordinary openness in hosting those fleeing. It is absolutely critical that those refugees be allowed to return in a manner that is safe, voluntary, and dignified and that they not be forced to return to situations in Syria where they face conscription, retaliation, detention, torture, or murder at the hands of the Assad regime.

In the face of such wanton cruelty and profound suffering, the United States can and must show renewed leadership in Syria, but instead, President Trump froze and then terminated stabilization assistance in Syria. The Trump administration must restart stabilization funding in Syria. Furthermore, Congress can show leadership by passing the Caesar Syria Civilian Protection Act, which would impose new sanctions on the Assad regime and its Russian and Iranian supporters.

54TH ANNIVERSARY OF HEAD START

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I would like to take a moment to celebrate the 54th anniversary of Head Start and the 25th birthday of Early Head Start.

Head Start and Early Head Start provide essential early childhood education services to almost 6,000 low-income children and families in Connecticut. In addition, across the 38 Connecticut centers, over 7,000 children have been able to access healthcare services, 2,000 families have gotten help through crisis intervention programs, and over 800 parents advanced their own education. For these families and

thousands of others across the country, Head Start is a lifeline for struggling families and a stepping stone out of poverty.

Fifty-four years since its founding, the work of Head Start and Early Head Start remains paramount. Children in poverty are more than twice as likely to suffer traumatic childhood experiences such as abuse, neglect, homelessness, and parental substance abuse. Exposure to these kinds of trauma results in greater likelihood of chronic disease, mental illness, and substance use disorders, as well as decreased likelihood of high school graduation and increased likelihood of involvement with the juvenile justice system. We know that children having access to safe and stable environments mitigates these effects and that Head Start is on the front line of providing children with nurturing relationships.

This Saturday, not only do we celebrate the Head Start program reaching another milestone, but we celebrate the hundreds of thousands of dedicated Head Start staff and educators who work hard every day to support and teach the next generation.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

300TH ANNIVERSARY OF LITCHFIELD, CONNECTICUT

• Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize the town of Litchfield, CT, as it celebrates 300 years of local government.

Incorporated in 1719 by an act of the Colonial Assembly of Connecticut, Litchfield was first settled the following year and consisted of a mere home lots. Before long, the town grew thanks to a breadth of small industries, its significant position as part of two stagecoach lines, and its 1751 designation as the county seat.

A beautiful, welcoming place to live and flourish, Litchfield is located in the bucolic hills of western Connecticut and is home to a multitude of historic places of interest.

One of the most notable parts of the town are its historical houses. These remarkable structures are not only fascinating because of their fine, antique architecture and design, but also for their many famous residents. Some held temporary visitors, such as Sheldon's Tavern, where George Washington slept during the American Revolution. Others were the homes of important Connecticut luminaries including Revolutionary War patriot Ethan Allen, Governor and signer of the Declaration of Independence Oliver Wolcott, cofounder of the Litchfield China Trading Company Alexander Catlin, and Continental Army Colonel Benjamin Tallmadge.

Litchfield has a number of other wonderful historical attractions, including the Tapping Reeve Law School. Started in 1775, Tapping Reeve began with Aaron Burr as its first student.

Throughout its 58 years as a functioning law school, it educated over 1,200 students from throughout the Nation. Tapping Reeve counts Connecticut Governor Samuel A. Foot, U.S. Senator John C. Calhoun, Connecticut Governor Roger Sherman Baldwin, and Levi Woodbury, the first U.S. Supreme Court justice to attend law school, among its alumni. Now the restored law school building and Tapping Reeve House are available for public tours, thanks to the Litchfield Historical Society.

The Connecticut General Assembly recognized Litchfield's rich past and important role throughout our State's history by designating the borough of Litchfield a historic district in 1959. Litchfield remains a constantly growing yet still peaceful part of our State, which is highly regarded by residents and visitors alike. I have greatly enjoyed visiting Litchfield on numerous occasions and appreciating its quintessential New England characteristics.

A town with a commendable dedication to its impressive past and a positive, thoughtful look toward the future, Litchfield is an extraordinary Connecticut town. I hope my colleagues will join me in congratulating Litchfield on three centuries of distinction, and I send my best wishes for the town's future success.●

REMEMBERING TYRONE THOMPSON

• Ms. ROSEN. Mr. President, today, it is with both great pride and tremendous sadness that I honor the legacy of an incredible Nevadan, Assemblyman Tyrone Thompson, who was taken from us far too soon, earlier this month. A proud native of Las Vegas, Assemblyman Thompson, a product of Nevada's public education system, graduated from Valley High School in 1985. He then went on to earn his bachelor's degree in criminal justice with a minor in sociology from Northern Arizona University, and he earned his masters of arts degree in organizational management from the University of Phoenix in 2000.

Thompson was first appointed to the Nevada State Legislature by the Clark County Commission on April 16, 2013 as the representative for District 17. During the 79th and 80th legislative sessions, he fought for improvements to our States' public education system as chairman of the education committee. Then, during the 80th session, Assemblyman Thompson's leadership skills were recognized by his peers in the Statehouse when he was appointed majority whip for the Nevada Assembly.

In October 2017, Thompson was inducted into the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences Hall of Fame at Northern Arizona University, his alma mater.

Assemblyman Tyrone Thompson had a heart that was bigger than life. Whether it was tackling homelessness

in our State, increasing access to quality education, mentoring, or fighting to expand social services, Assemblyman Thompson always followed through on his word. Our community lost a champion on May 4, 2019, but Tyrone Thompson lives on through a legacy unmatched in Nevada. He touched countless lives, inspired so many, and planted seeds of selfless acts throughout Nevada.

We honor him and his family as we carry his heart, passion, selflessness, and community-minded spirit with us every day.●

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Ms. Roberts, one of his secretaries.

PRESIDENTIAL MESSAGE

REPORT RELATIVE TO THE ISSUANCE OF AN EXECUTIVE ORDER DECLARING A NATIONAL EMERGENCY TO DEAL WITH THE THREAT POSED BY THE UNRESTRICTED ACQUISITION OR USE IN THE UNITED STATES OF INFORMATION AND COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGY OR SERVICES DESIGNED, DEVELOPED, MANUFACTURED, OR SUPPLIED BY PERSONS OWNED BY, CONTROLLED BY, OR SUBJECT TO THE JURISDICTION OR DIRECTION OF FOREIGN ADVERSARIES—PM 17

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 *et seq.*) (IEEPA), the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1601 *et seq.*), and section 301 of title 3, United States Code, I hereby report that I have issued an Executive Order declaring a national emergency to deal with the threat posed by the unrestricted acquisition or use in the United States of information and communications technology or services designed, developed, manufactured, or supplied by persons owned by, controlled by, or subject to the jurisdiction or direction of foreign adversaries.

Foreign adversaries are increasingly creating and exploiting vulnerabilities in information and communications technology and services, which store and communicate vast amounts of sensitive information, facilitate the digital economy, and support critical infrastructure and vital emergency services, in order to commit malicious cyber-enabled actions, including economic and industrial espionage against

the United States and its people. Although maintaining an open investment climate in information and communications technology, and in the United States economy more generally, is important for the overall growth and prosperity of the United States, such openness must be balanced by the need to protect our country against critical national security threats. To deal with this threat, additional steps are required to protect the security, integrity, and reliability of information and communications technology and services provided and used in the United States.

The Executive Order prohibits certain transactions involving information and communications technology or services where the Secretary of Commerce (Secretary), in consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, the Attorney General, the Secretary of Homeland Security, the United States Trade Representative, the Director of National Intelligence, the Administrator of General Services, the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, and, as appropriate, the heads of other executive departments and agencies (agencies), has determined that:

(i) the transaction involves information and communications technology or services designed, developed, manufactured, or supplied, by persons owned by, controlled by, or subject to the jurisdiction or direction of a foreign adversary; and

(ii) the transaction:

(A) poses an undue risk of sabotage to or subversion of the design, integrity, manufacturing, production, distribution, installation, operation, or maintenance of information and communications technology or services in the United States;

(B) poses an undue risk of catastrophic effects on the security or resiliency of United States critical infrastructure or the digital economy of the United States; or

(C) otherwise poses an unacceptable risk to the national security of the United States or the security and safety of United States persons.

I have delegated to the Secretary the authority to, in consultation with, or upon referral of a particular transaction from, the heads of other agencies as appropriate, take such actions, including directing the timing and manner of the cessation of transactions prohibited pursuant to the Executive Order, adopting appropriate rules and regulations, and employing all other powers granted to the President by IEEPA, as may be necessary to implement the Executive Order. All agencies of the United States Government are directed to take all appropriate measures within their authority to carry out the provisions of the Executive Order.

I am enclosing a copy of the Executive Order I have issued.

DONALD J. TRUMP,
THE WHITE HOUSE, May 15, 2019.

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 10:02 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 bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 2379. An act to reauthorize the Bullet-proof Vest Partnership Grant Program.

At 12:01 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 299. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to clarify presumptions relating to the exposure of certain veterans who served in the vicinity of the Republic of Vietnam, and for other purposes.

H.R. 389. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to pay rewards under an asset recovery rewards program to help identify and recover stolen assets linked to foreign government corruption and the proceeds of such corruption hidden behind complex financial structures in the United States and abroad.

H.R. 1037. An act to increase transparency with respect to financial services benefitting state sponsors of terrorism, human rights abusers, and corrupt officials, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1060. An act to provide regulatory relief to charitable organizations that provide housing assistance, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1313. An act to amend the Implementing Recommendations of the 9/11 Commission Act of 2007 to clarify certain allowable uses of funds for public transportation security assistance grants and establish periods of performance for such grants, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1437. An act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to require the Under Secretary for Management of the Department of Homeland Security to achieve security of sensitive assets among the components of the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1594. An act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to establish a process to review applications for certain grants to purchase equipment or systems that do not meet or exceed any applicable national voluntary consensus standards, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1912. An act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to provide for requirements relating to documentation for major acquisition programs, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2066. An act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to establish the Intelligence Rotational Assignment Program in the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2578. An act to reauthorize the National Flood Insurance Program, and for other purposes.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 389. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to pay rewards under an asset recovery rewards program to help identify and recover stolen assets linked to foreign government corruption and the proceeds of such corruption hidden behind complex financial structures in the United States and

abroad; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

H.R. 1037. An act to increase transparency with respect to financial services benefitting state sponsors of terrorism, human rights abusers, and corrupt officials, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

H.R. 1060. An act to provide regulatory relief to charitable organizations that provide housing assistance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

H.R. 1313. An act to amend the Implementing Recommendations of the 9/11 Commission Act of 2007 to clarify certain allowable uses of funds for public transportation security assistance grants and establish periods of performance for such grants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 1437. An act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to require the Under Secretary for Management of the Department of Homeland Security to achieve security of sensitive assets among the components of the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 1594. An act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to establish a process to review applications for certain grants to purchase equipment or systems that do not meet or exceed any applicable national voluntary consensus standards, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 1912. An act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to provide for requirements relating to documentation for major acquisition programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 2066. An act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to establish the Intelligence Rotational Assignment Program in the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bills were read the second time, and placed on the calendar:

H.R. 986. An act to provide that certain guidance related to waivers for State innovation under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act shall have no force or effect.

H.R. 2157. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-1284. A communication from the Senior Official performing the duties of the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting the report of nine (9) officers authorized to wear the insignia of the grade of major general in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777, this will not cause the Department to exceed the number of frocked officers authorized; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1285. A communication from the Chairwoman of the Nuclear Weapons Council,

transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the President's budget request for the National Nuclear Security Administration for fiscal year 2020; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1286. A communication from the Assistant Director, Senior Executive Management Office, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Assistant Secretary of Defense (Nuclear, Chemical & Biological Defense Program), Department of Defense, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 14, 2019; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1287. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the ongoing bilateral security relationship between the United States and the Republic of Cyprus; to the Committees on Foreign Relations; Armed Services; and Appropriations.

EC-1288. A communication from the Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Commission's fiscal year 2017 FAIR Act Commercial and Inherently Governmental Activities Inventory; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSON, from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, without amendment:

S. 347. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 40 Fulton Street in Middletown, New York, as the "Benjamin A. Gilman Post Office Building".

H.R. 540. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 770 Ayrault Road in Fairport, New York, as the "Louise and Bob Slaughter Post Office".

H.R. 828. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 25 Route 111 in Smithtown, New York, as the "Congressman Bill Carney Post Office".

H.R. 829. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1450 Montauk Highway in Mastic, New York, as the "Army Specialist Thomas J. Wilwerth Post Office Building".

S. 1196. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1715 Linnerud Drive in Sun Prairie, Wisconsin, as the "Fire Captain Cory Barr Post Office Building".

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. TILLIS for Mr. INHOFE for the Committee on Armed Services.

Army nomination of Col. Edward S. Smith, to be Brigadier General.

Marine Corps nominations beginning with Col. Marcus B. Annibale and ending with Col. Brian N. Wolford, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 15, 2019. (minus 1 nominee: Col. Daniel Q. Greenwood)

Army nomination of Maj. Gen. Duane A. Gamble, to be Lieutenant General.

Navy nomination of Rear Adm. Scott D. Conn, to be Vice Admiral.

*Army nomination of Gen. James C. McConville, to be General.

*Marine Corps nomination of Lt. Gen. David H. Berger, to be General.

Air Force nomination of Maj. Gen. Marc H. Sasseville, to be Lieutenant General.

Air Force nomination of Maj. Gen. Eric T. Fick, to be Lieutenant General.

Army nomination of Lt. Gen. Joseph M. Martin, to be General.

Army nomination of Lt. Gen. Laura J. Richardson, to be Lieutenant General.

Army nomination of Maj. Gen. Robert P. White, to be Lieutenant General.

Navy nomination of Vice Adm. William R. Merz, to be Vice Admiral.

Navy nomination of Rear Adm. Ross A. Myers, to be Vice Admiral.

Marine Corps nomination of Lt. Gen. Eric M. Smith, to be Lieutenant General.

Air Force nomination of Lt. Gen. Arnold W. Bunch, Jr., to be General.

Air Force nomination of Col. David A. Harris, Jr., to be Brigadier General.

*Navy nomination of Adm. William F. Moran, to be Admiral.

Navy nomination of Vice Adm. Robert P. Burke, to be Admiral.

Marine Corps nomination of Lt. Gen. Herman S. Clardy III, to be Lieutenant General.

Army nominations beginning with Brig. Gen. Peter B. Andrysiak, Jr. and ending with Brig. Gen. David Wilson, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 11, 2019. (minus 1 nominee: Brig. Gen. David M. Hamilton)

Air Force nomination of Col. Tracy D. Smith, to be Brigadier General.

Air Force nomination of Col. Frank W. Roy, to be Brigadier General.

Army nomination of Maj. Gen. Leopoldo A. Quintas, Jr., to be Lieutenant General.

Army nomination of Brig. Gen. Kenneth A. Nava, to be Major General.

Army nominations beginning with Brig. Gen. Francis J. Evon, Jr. and ending with Brig. Gen. David J. Mikolaities, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 29, 2019.

Army nomination of Brig. Gen. Mark J. Schindler, to be Major General.

Army nominations beginning with Brig. Gen. John F. Hussey and ending with Col. Michael K. Pyle, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 29, 2019.

Army nominations beginning with Col. Nicole M. Balliet and ending with Col. James A. Zollar, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 29, 2019.

Army nominations beginning with Col. Bradley J. Cox and ending with Col. Adam C. Volant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 29, 2019.

Army nominations beginning with Col. Andrew C. Diefenthaler and ending with Col. James M. Jones, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 29, 2019.

Navy nomination of Rear Adm. Sean S. Buck, to be Vice Admiral.

Marine Corps nomination of Lt. Gen. John J. Broadmeadow, to be Lieutenant General.

Marine Corps nomination of Lt. Gen. Brian D. Beaudreault, to be Lieutenant General.

Marine Corps nomination of Lt. Gen. George W. Smith, Jr., to be Lieutenant General.

Marine Corps nomination of Lt. Gen. Robert F. Hedelund, to be Lieutenant General.

Army nominations beginning with Brig. Gen. Rodney L. Faulk and ending with Col. Wanda N. Williams, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 30, 2019. (minus 1 nominee: Col. Jed J. Schaertl)

Air Force nomination of Maj. Gen. David S. Nahom, to be Lieutenant General.

Air Force nomination of Lt. Gen. Marshall B. Webb, to be Lieutenant General.

Army nominations beginning with Col. Jack M. Davis and ending with Col. Mark W. Thompson, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 2, 2019.

Army nomination of Brig. Gen. Jeffery D. Broadwater, to be Major General.

Mr. TILLIS for Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, for the Committee on Armed Services I report favorably the following nomination lists which were printed in the RECORDS on the dates indicated, and ask unanimous consent, to save the expense of reprinting on the Executive Calendar that these nominations lie at the Secretary's desk for the information of Senators.

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

Air Force nomination of Christopher B. Athearn, to be Colonel.

Air Force nominations beginning with Erika O. Bernardo and ending with Carole M. Y. Villamaria, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 11, 2019.

Air Force nominations beginning with Corey T. Beals and ending with Christopher R. Williams, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 11, 2019.

Air Force nomination of Daniel W. Schlieder, to be Major.

Air Force nominations beginning with Deborah J. Angeles and ending with Keri L. Young, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 11, 2019.

Air Force nomination of Douglas P. Wickert, to be Colonel.

Air Force nomination of Richard T. Cooney, Jr., to be Colonel.

Air Force nominations beginning with Tammie A. Canada and ending with Douglas N. Schneekloth, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 29, 2019.

Air Force nominations beginning with Alexander A. Adeleye and ending with Desbah R. Yazzie, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 29, 2019.

Air Force nominations beginning with Leo J. Burkardt and ending with David M. Maurer, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 29, 2019.

Air Force nominations beginning with Michael R. Cabral and ending with Ray A. Zuniga, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 29, 2019.

Air Force nomination of Tann S. Jones, to be Major.

Army nomination of Theodore W. Kleisner, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Robert W. Hughes, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Larry R. Jordan, Jr., to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Kontrina S. Park, to be Major.

Army nomination of Marcus L. Jordan, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nominations beginning with Robert M. Hudson and ending with James D. Sizemore, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 4, 2019.

Army nominations beginning with John E. Callihan II and ending with Jeffrey F. Ryan, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 4, 2019.

Army nomination of Boguslaw A. Augustyn, to be Colonel.

Army nominations beginning with James R. Achenbach and ending with Keith B. Weber, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 4, 2019.

Army nominations beginning with Keith A. Archibald and ending with Frank L. Witsberger, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 4, 2019.

Army nominations beginning with Timothy B. Alexander and ending with Wing Y. Yu, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 4, 2019.

Army nomination of Christopher L. Metzger, to be Major.

Army nomination of Jonathan W. Anderson, to be Major.

Army nomination of Brian J. Reed, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Thomas J. Wargo, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Terrence Sommers, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of David M. Rozelle, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Tony L. Dedmond, Jr., to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Ray G. McCulloch II, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nomination of Cory J. Cousins, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nomination of Damon L. Augustine, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nomination of Paul J. Stambaugh, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nomination of Brenton D. Griffith, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nomination of Andrew E. Radbill, to be Major.

Army nominations beginning with Richard Elias and ending with William A. Watts, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 29, 2019.

Army nominations beginning with Marlon G. Burns and ending with Michael F. Wood, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 29, 2019.

Army nominations beginning with Paul R. Barbo and ending with Mark A. Wurth, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 29, 2019.

Army nominations beginning with Frederick W. Alf III and ending with Michael D. Lewis, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 29, 2019.

Army nominations beginning with Timothy S. Adams and ending with Dennis R. Turner, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 30, 2019.

Army nominations beginning with Carol A. Anderson and ending with Abdul R. Willis, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 30, 2019.

Army nominations beginning with Thomas A. Bryant and ending with Arthur F. Yeager, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 30, 2019.

Army nominations beginning with Jeremy J. Bearss and ending with Michelle Thompson, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 30, 2019.

Army nomination of Rebecca A. Brawner, to be Major.

Marine Corps nominations beginning with Leslie S. Albers and ending with Sean E. Zukowsky, which nominations were received

by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 11, 2019.

Navy nomination of Steven J. Debich, to be Commander.

Navy nomination of Neil Partain, to be Commander.

Navy nomination of Robert G. Graham, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nomination of Laura C. Gilstrap, to be Commander.

Navy nomination of Micheal K. Wagner, to be Captain.

Navy nomination of Jason T. Stepp, to be Captain.

Navy nomination of Stephen C. Plew, to be Captain.

Navy nomination of Michael D. Krisman, to be Captain.

Navy nomination of Michael J. Cirivello, to be Commander.

Navy nomination of Zachary J. Conley, to be Commander.

Navy nomination of Brentone E. Helbig, to be Commander.

Navy nomination of Patrick H. O'Mahoney, to be Captain.

Navy nominations beginning with Guy W. Jensen and ending with Venita M. Simpson, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 4, 2019.

Navy nomination of Marissa A. Mayor, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nomination of Adam C. Hancock, to be Captain.

Navy nomination of John J. Eastman, to be Commander.

Navy nomination of Terence B. McAdoo, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nomination of Donald A. Sinitiere, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nominations beginning with Robert H. Battle and ending with Keith E. Wilber, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 11, 2019.

Navy nomination of Riley A. Walls, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nomination of Benjamin D. Adams, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nomination of Jessica M. Miller, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nomination of Frank R. Bittner, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nomination of David M. Groves, to be Lieutenant Commander.

By Mr. JOHNSON for the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

*Ron A. Bloom, of New York, to be a Governor of the United States Postal Service for a term expiring December 8, 2020.

*Roman Martinez IV, of Florida, to be a Governor of the United States Postal Service for a term expiring December 8, 2024.

*James A. Crowell IV, of the District of Columbia, to be an Associate Judge of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia for the term of fifteen years.

*Jason Park, of the District of Columbia, to be an Associate Judge of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia for the term of fifteen years.

*Michael Eric Wooten, of Virginia, to be Administrator for Federal Procurement Policy.

*Dale Cabaniss, of Virginia, to be Director of the Office of Personnel Management for a term of four years.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

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. HEINRICH (for himself and Mr. PORTMAN):

S. 1471. A bill to require digital engineering as a core competency of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. SCHATZ, Ms. WARREN, Mr. BOOKER, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. BROWN, and Mr. BENNET):

S. 1472. A bill to amend the Help America Vote Act of 2002 to require paper ballots and risk limiting audits in all Federal elections, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mrs. GILLIBRAND (for herself and Mrs. CAPITO):

S. 1473. A bill to amend the Safe Drinking Water Act to require the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to set maximum contaminant levels for certain chemicals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. WICKER, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. REED, Mr. KAINE, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. 1474. A bill to amend the Afghan Allies Protection Act of 2009 to make 4,000 visas available for the Afghan Special Immigrant Visa program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THUNE (for himself, Mr. CASEY, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. ROBERTS):

S. 1475. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to extend and modify certain charitable tax provisions; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. GILLIBRAND (for herself and Mr. CASSIDY):

S. 1476. A bill to waive the 24-month waiting period for Medicare eligibility for individuals disabled by Huntington's disease; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. WARNER, Ms. WARREN, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Mr. CARDIN):

S. 1477. A bill to amend the Federal Power Act to establish an Office of Public Participation and Consumer Advocacy; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. CRUZ (for himself, Mr. COTTON, and Mr. TILLIS):

S. 1478. A bill to repeal the Office of Financial Research, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself and Ms. CORTEZ MASTO):

S. 1479. A bill to further development of Next Generation 9-1-1 to enhance and upgrade the 9-1-1 systems of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. PERDUE, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mrs. FISCHER, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. BLUNT, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, and Mr. DAINES):

S. 1480. A bill to protect law enforcement officers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWN (for himself, Ms. SMITH, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. TESTER, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. CASEY, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. PETERS, Mr. KING, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. LEAHY, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. JONES, and Mr. KAINE):

S. 1481. A bill to amend title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act to provide for a special enrollment period for pregnant women, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. CARPER, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 1482. A bill to establish an integrated national approach to respond to ongoing and expected effects of extreme weather and climate change by protecting, managing, and conserving the fish, wildlife, and plants of the United States, and to maximize Government efficiency and reduce costs, in cooperation with State, local, and Tribal governments and other entities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. KAINE (for himself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Ms. HIRONO):

S. 1483. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to require institutions of higher education to have an independent advocate for campus sexual assault prevention and response; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself and Mr. MURPHY):

S. 1484. A bill to provide disaster relief assistance to individuals for the purpose of clearing fallen debris, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. MANCHIN (for himself and Mr. GARDNER):

S. 1485. A bill to improve the collection and aggregation of fixed and mobile broadband internet access coverage data, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. MANCHIN:

S. 1486. A bill to amend title 11, United States Code, to include certain pension as administrative expenses in bankruptcy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. MERKLEY (for himself, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. SANDERS, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, and Mr. SCHATZ):

S. 1487. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to create a national zero-emission vehicle standard, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. UDALL (for himself and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 1488. A bill to improve the integrity and safety of interstate horseracing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. WARNER (for himself, Mr. RUBIO, and Mr. CORNYN):

S. 1489. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to authorize borrowers to separate joint consolidation loans; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. WARNER (for himself and Mr. ISAKSON):

S. 1490. A bill to amend the General Education Provisions Act to allow the release of education records to facilitate the award of a recognized postsecondary credential; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mrs. MURRAY (for herself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BROWN, Mr. CASEY, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. KING, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. REED, Mr. SANDERS, Mrs. SHAHEEN, and Ms. WARREN):

S. 1491. A bill to prohibit forced arbitration in work disputes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mrs. MURRAY (for herself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CASEY, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. HASSAN, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SCHATZ, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. SMITH, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 1492. A bill to prevent harassment at institutions of higher education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. JONES:

S. 1493. A bill to direct the Secretary of Defense to develop workforce development investment incentives and to consider a qualified training program of an offeror as part of the past performance rating of such offeror, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GRAHAM:

S. 1494. A bill to amend the William Wilberforce Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2008 to protect alien minors and to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to end abuse of the asylum system and establish refugee application and processing centers outside the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. MCSALLY (for herself, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. BLUNT, Ms. ERNST, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, and Mr. ROUNDS):

S. 1495. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to enhance the prevention of sexual assault and related offenses in the Armed Forces, to enhance protections of victims of such offenses, to improve the investigation and prosecution of such offenses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WARNER (for himself, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. KAINE, and Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina):

S. 1496. A bill to amend the loan counseling requirements under the Higher Education Act of 1965, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. WYDEN:

S. 1497. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve cost and quality transparency under the Medicare program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. WARREN (for herself, Mr. SCHATZ, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE):

S. 1498. A bill to require the Secretary of Defense to enhance the readiness of the Department of Defense to challenges relating to climate change and to improve the energy and resource efficiency of the Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. BOOZMAN (for himself and Mr. COTTON):

S. Res. 211. A resolution recognizing the Aviation Cadet Museum in Eureka Springs, Arkansas, as "America's National Aviation Cadet Museum"; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. MERKLEY (for himself, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. PAUL, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. BROWN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. CARDIN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. SMITH, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. Con. Res. 16. A concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) continues to make an invaluable contribution to United States and international security, and noting former Senator Richard G. Lugar's indispensable contributions to international security and reducing nuclear weapons-related risks; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

s. 116

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 116, a bill to address maternal mortality and morbidity.

s. 133

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 133, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the United States merchant mariners of World War II, in recognition of their dedicated and vital service during World War II.

s. 151

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the names of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) and the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 151, a bill to deter criminal robocall violations and improve enforcement of section 227(b) of the Communications Act of 1934, and for other purposes.

s. 178

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 178, a bill to condemn gross human rights violations of ethnic Turkic Muslims in Xinjiang, and calling for an end to arbitrary detention, torture, and harassment of these communities inside and outside China.

s. 286

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 286, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the coverage of marriage and family therapist services and mental health counselor services under part B of the Medicare program, and for other purposes.

s. 362

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 362, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reform taxation of alcoholic beverages.

S. 371

At the request of Mrs. FISCHER, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 371, a bill to provide regulatory relief to charitable organizations that provide housing assistance, and for other purposes.

S. 373

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 373, a bill to provide for the retention and service of transgender individuals in the Armed Forces.

S. 382

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 382, a bill to authorize a special resource study on the spread vectors of chronic wasting disease in Cervidae, and for other purposes.

S. 457

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 457, a bill to require that \$1 coins issued during 2019 honor President George H.W. Bush and to direct the Secretary of the Treasury to issue bullion coins during 2019 in honor of Barbara Bush.

S. 460

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the names of the Senator from Iowa (Ms. ERNST) and the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) were added as cosponsors of S. 460, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the exclusion for employer-provided education assistance to employer payments of student loans.

S. 466

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the names of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW), the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS) and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 466, a bill to provide that certain guidance related to waivers for State innovation under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act shall have no force or effect.

S. 500

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 500, a bill to amend title 54, United States Code, to establish, fund, and provide for the use of amounts in a National Park Service Legacy Restoration Fund to address the maintenance backlog of the National Park Service, and for other purposes.

S. 504

At the request of Ms. SINEMA, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 504, a bill to amend title 36, United States Code, to authorize The American Legion to determine the requirements for membership in The American Legion, and for other purposes.

S. 511

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the names of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) and the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 511, a bill to promote and protect from discrimination living organ donors.

S. 569

At the request of Mr. YOUNG, the name of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 569, a bill to direct the Secretary of Transportation to issue regulations relating to commercial motor vehicle drivers under the age of 21, and for other purposes.

S. 589

At the request of Mr. LANKFORD, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 589, a bill to provide for a period of continuing appropriations in the event of a lapse in appropriations under the normal appropriations process, and establish procedures and consequences in the event of a failure to complete regular appropriations.

S. 622

At the request of Mr. JONES, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 622, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to repeal the requirement for reduction of survivor annuities under the Survivor Benefit Plan by veterans' dependency and indemnity compensation, and for other purposes.

S. 636

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) and the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) were added as cosponsors of S. 636, 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.

S. 651

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the names of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 651, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the age requirement with respect to eligibility for qualified ABLE programs.

S. 684

At the request of Mr. HEINRICH, the names of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) and the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) were added as cosponsors of S. 684, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the excise tax on high-cost employer-sponsored health coverage.

S. 703

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 703, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to address health, safety, and environmental hazards at private military housing units, to pro-

hibit the payment by members of the Armed Forces of deposits or other fees relating to such housing units, and for other purposes.

S. 754

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 754, a bill to encourage partnerships among public agencies and other interested parties to promote fish conservation, and for other purposes.

S. 756

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 756, a bill to modify the prohibition on recognition by United States courts of certain rights relating to certain marks, trade names, or commercial names.

S. 758

At the request of Ms. DUCKWORTH, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 758, a bill to ensure affordable abortion coverage and care for every woman, and for other purposes.

S. 802

At the request of Mr. DAINES, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 802, a bill to amend part A of title IV of the Social Security Act, and for other purposes.

S. 820

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 820, a bill to strengthen programs authorized under the Debbie Smith Act of 2004.

S. 839

At the request of Mr. KAINE, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 839, a bill to extend Federal Pell Grant eligibility of certain short-term programs.

S. 846

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 846, a bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to limit certain rolling stock procurements, and for other purposes.

S. 880

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the names of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN), the Senator from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA) and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) were added as cosponsors of S. 880, a bill to provide outreach and reporting on comprehensive Alzheimer's disease care planning services furnished under the Medicare program.

S. 901

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the names of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) were added as cosponsors of S. 901, a bill to amend the

Older Americans Act of 1965 to support individuals with younger onset Alzheimer's disease.

S. 944

At the request of Mr. SCHATZ, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 944, a bill to enhance the security operations of the Transportation Security Administration and the stability of the transportation security workforce by applying a unified personnel system under title 5, United States Code, to employees of the Transportation Security Administration who are responsible for screening passengers and property, and for other purposes.

S. 998

At the request of Mr. HAWLEY, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 998, a bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to expand support for police officer family services, stress reduction, and suicide prevention, and for other purposes.

S. 1012

At the request of Mr. MANCHIN, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1012, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to protect the confidentiality of substance use disorder patient records.

S. 1039

At the request of Mr. UDALL, the names of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1039, a bill to limit the use of funds for kinetic military operations in or against Iran.

S. 1060

At the request of Mr. VAN HOLLEN, the names of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) and the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 1060, a bill to deter foreign interference in United States elections, and for other purposes.

S. 1148

At the request of Mr. HOEVEN, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1148, a bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to require the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration to give preferential consideration to individuals who have successfully completed air traffic controller training and veterans when hiring air traffic control specialists.

S. 1162

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1162, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent the individual tax provisions of the tax reform law, and for other purposes.

S. 1168

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the names of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY), the Senator from Mis-

souri (Mr. HAWLEY), the Senator from Iowa (Ms. ERNST), the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER), the Senator from Mississippi (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) and the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) were added as cosponsors of S. 1168, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to ensure campus access at public institutions of higher education for religious groups.

S. 1195

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the names of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) and the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS) were added as cosponsors of S. 1195, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to clarify presumption relating to the exposure of certain veterans who served in the vicinity of the Republic of Vietnam, and for other purposes.

S. 1203

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1203, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 in order to improve the public service loan forgiveness program, and for other purposes.

S. 1209

At the request of Mr. CASSIDY, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1209, a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to approval of abbreviated new drug applications.

S. 1210

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1210, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase and make permanent the exclusion for benefits provided to volunteer firefighters and emergency medical responders.

S. 1218

At the request of Mr. VAN HOLLEN, the names of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD) and the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) were added as cosponsors of S. 1218, a bill to require the review of the service of certain members of the Armed Forces during World War I to determine if such members should be awarded the Medal of Honor, to authorize the award of the Medal of Honor based on the results of the review, and for other purposes.

S. 1235

At the request of Mrs. BLACKBURN, the names of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. JONES), the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) were

added as cosponsors of S. 1235, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of ratification of the 19th Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, giving women in the United States the right to vote.

S. 1263

At the request of Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1263, a bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to establish an interagency task force on the use of public lands to provide medical treatment and therapy to veterans through outdoor recreation.

S. 1370

At the request of Mr. CASSIDY, the names of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN), the Senator from Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY) and the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER) were added as cosponsors of S. 1370, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to treat certain military survivor benefits as earned income for purposes of the kiddie tax.

S. 1374

At the request of Ms. MCSALLY, the names of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) were added as cosponsors of S. 1374, a bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the waiting periods for disability insurance benefits and Medicare coverage for individuals with metastatic breast cancer, and for other purposes.

S. 1388

At the request of Mr. PETERS, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1388, a bill to manage supply chain risk through counterintelligence training, and for other purposes.

S. 1394

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1394, a bill to provide collective bargaining rights for public safety officers employed by States or their political subdivisions.

S. 1416

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1416, a bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act to prohibit anticompetitive behaviors by drug product manufacturers, and for other purposes.

S. 1421

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1421, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the 23d Headquarters Special Troops and the 3133d Signal Service Company in recognition of their unique and distinguished service

as a “Ghost Army” that conducted deception operations in Europe during World War II.

S. 1422

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1422, a bill to transfer revenues from the net investment income tax to the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund.

S. 1438

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1438, a bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to extend the authority of the United States Postal Service to issue a semipostal to raise funds for breast cancer research.

S. 1448

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1448, a bill to require certain practitioners authorized to prescribe controlled substances to complete continuing education.

S. 1459

At the request of Mr. HAWLEY, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1459, a bill to control the export to the People’s Republic of China of certain technology and intellectual property important to the national interest of the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 1462

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the names of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN), the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) and the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1462, a bill to prevent a person who has been convicted of a misdemeanor hate crime, or received an enhanced sentence for a misdemeanor because of hate or bias in the commission, from obtaining a firearm.

S.J. RES. 11

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 11, a joint resolution to prohibit the unauthorized use of United States Armed Forces in hostilities with respect to Venezuela.

S. CON. RES. 10

At the request of Mr. GARDNER, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 10, a concurrent resolution recognizing that Chinese telecommunications companies such as Huawei and ZTE pose serious threats to the national security of the United States and its allies.

S. RES. 188

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 188, a resolution encouraging a swift transfer of power by the military

to a civilian-led political authority in the Republic of the Sudan, and for other purposes.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. THUNE (for himself, Mr. CASEY, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. ROBERTS):

S. 1475. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to extend and modify certain charitable tax provisions; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1475

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 “Charities Helping Americans Regularly Throughout the Year Act of 2019”.

SEC. 2. DETERMINATION OF STANDARD MILEAGE RATE FOR CHARITABLE CONTRIBUTIONS DEDUCTION.

(a) DETERMINATION OF STANDARD MILEAGE RATE FOR CHARITABLE CONTRIBUTIONS DEDUCTION.—Subsection (i) of section 170 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended to read as follows:

“(i) STANDARD MILEAGE RATE FOR USE OF PASSENGER AUTOMOBILE.—For purposes of computing the deduction under this section for use of a passenger automobile, the standard mileage rate shall be the rate determined by the Secretary, which rate shall not be less than the standard mileage rate used for purposes of section 213.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to miles traveled after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 3. MANDATORY E-FILE BY EXEMPT ORGANIZATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 6033 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by redesignating subsection (n) as subsection (o) and by inserting after subsection (m) the following new subsection:

“(n) MANDATORY ELECTRONIC FILING.—Any organization required to file a return under this section shall file such return in electronic form.”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Paragraph (7) of section 527(j) of such Code is amended by striking “if the organization has” and all that follows through “such calendar year”.

(c) INSPECTION OF ELECTRONICALLY FILED ANNUAL RETURNS.—Subsection (b) of section 6104 of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following: “Any annual return required to be filed electronically under section 6033(n) shall be made available by the Secretary to the public as soon as practicable in a machine readable format.”.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) TRANSITIONAL RELIEF.—

(A) SMALL ORGANIZATIONS.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—In the case of any small organizations, or any other organizations for which the Secretary of the Treasury or the Secretary’s delegate (hereafter referred to in this paragraph as the “Secretary”) deter-

mines the application of the amendments made by this section would cause undue burden without a delay, the Secretary may delay the application of such amendments, but such delay shall not apply to any taxable year beginning on or after the date 2 years after of the enactment of this Act.

(ii) SMALL ORGANIZATION.—For purposes of clause (i), the term “small organization” means any organization—

(I) the gross receipts of which for the taxable year are less than \$200,000; and

(II) the aggregate gross assets of which at the end of the taxable year are less than \$500,000.

(B) ORGANIZATIONS FILING FORM 990-T.—In the case of any organization described in section 511(a)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 which is subject to the tax imposed by section 511(a)(1) of such Code on its unrelated business taxable income, or any organization required to file a return under section 6033 of such Code and include information under subsection (e) thereof, the Secretary may delay the application of the amendments made by this section, but such delay shall not apply to any taxable year beginning on or after the date 2 years after of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 4. MODIFICATION OF RULES RELATING TO DONOR ADVISED FUNDS.

(a) ALLOWANCE OF TAX-FREE CHARITABLE DISTRIBUTIONS FROM INDIVIDUAL RETIREMENT ACCOUNTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Clause (i) of section 408(d)(8)(B) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking “or any fund or account described in section 4966(d)(2)”.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this subsection shall apply to distributions made in taxable years beginning after December 31, 2018.

(b) RETURN DISCLOSURES.—

(1) DISTRIBUTIONS.—Subsection (k) of section 6033 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(A) in paragraph (2), by striking “and” at the end;

(B) in paragraph (3), by striking the period at the end and inserting a comma; and

(C) by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

“(4) list the total number of such funds which were in existence for the 36-month period ending at the close of such taxable year,

“(5) list the total number of funds described in paragraph (4) which made at least 1 grant during the period described in such paragraph, and

“(6) set forth—

“(A) whether such organization has a publicly available policy with respect to funds which are inactive, dormant, or do not make distributions during the period described in paragraph (4),

“(B) a description of the organization’s policy for responding to funds described in subparagraph (A) or a statement that no such policy is in effect, and

“(C) whether such organization regularly and consistently monitors and enforces compliance with the policy described in subparagraph (A) with respect to such funds.”.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this subsection shall apply to returns for taxable years beginning after December 31, 2019.

SEC. 5. MODIFICATION OF THE TAX RATE FOR THE EXCISE TAX ON INVESTMENT INCOME OF PRIVATE FOUNDATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 4940(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking “2 percent” and inserting “1 percent”.

(b) ELIMINATION OF REDUCED TAX WHERE FOUNDATION MEETS CERTAIN DISTRIBUTION REQUIREMENTS.—Section 4940 of such Code is amended by striking subsection (e).

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. PERDUE, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mrs. FISCHER, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. BLUNT, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, and Mr. DAINES):

S. 1480. A bill to protect law enforcement officers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I come to the floor to talk about Police Week and some legislation we have introduced to honor and support our men and women in blue called, not surprisingly, the Back the Blue Act. With regard to the comments of my friend from Illinois, who was bemoaning the fact that there didn't seem to be bipartisan legislation that could come to the floor of the Senate, be debated, voted on, and passed with concurrence of the House of Representatives and the President's signature, I note that, actually, there is a lot we could be doing together.

I have been on the floor a number of times describing the humanitarian and security crisis at our southern border. That is something we could work together to address. I have introduced bipartisan and bicameral legislation with my friend and colleague HENRY CUELLAR at the House of Representatives that would address that humanitarian crisis and, I believe, take big steps toward stopping it. That is something we could do together.

I know the Democratic whip from Illinois doesn't particularly like the idea that President Trump is nominating highly qualified people for the judiciary and for executive branch nominations—the types of people we are voting on today and will vote on tomorrow. Obviously, that is not high on his agenda, but I submit that there are a lot of other things we could do besides fixing this humanitarian crisis.

We could work on roads and bridges together. I know that Chairman BARRASSO of the Environment and Public Works Committee is soliciting the views of a number of Senators and is going to come to the floor, hopefully, in the next couple of months with some ideas on what that infrastructure package should look like. I actually think that is the best way to handle that.

Again, these are nonpartisan issues. Infrastructure is not a partisan issue, but figuring out how to pay for it is the biggest challenge.

I note that Ms. PELOSI, Senator SCHUMER, the Democratic leader, and the President met and talked about a \$2 trillion pricetag. Well, it seems to me that is backward. We ought to be talking about what sort of plan makes sense and where we can get the votes to build consensus on that plan rather than saying that we want to spend this much money on a plan to come.

That is why I think the committee work that is being done in the Senate, in the Environment and Public Works Committee, and, hopefully, in the House is so important. Once the Environment and Public Works Committee makes a proposal and votes that out of the committee on a bipartisan basis, then, the Senate Finance Committee will be asked to come up with a way to pay for it. That is always the part that people want to talk about the least, but it is important.

It is important we not continue to spend money we don't have and increase our deficits and debt. Rather, we need to come up with a user-fee model, which is what the gas tax is designed to do, and find a way not to pay for that infrastructure and deal with the congestion and traffic by just borrowing from Peter to pay Paul, literally just increasing the money we borrow and giving that tab to our children and grandchildren to pay back. There are a lot of really good ideas out there and ones on which I think we ought to work together.

I don't share the dystopian views of the Senator from Illinois in terms of the Senate. The Senate is not broken. It is just a matter of political will to try to work together to get beyond the petty disagreements that seem to come up every day and to just do our work. Sometimes you don't necessarily appear on TV or have your name appear in lights when you are doing that sort of hard work, but it is essential to get the Senate's work done and, indeed, to get the work of the American people done. Those are some things we could work on together if there is a political will to do so.

Mr. President, this week, tens of thousands of Americans will make their way to Washington for National Police Week, our annual opportunity to honor the brave men and women in blue who have lost their lives while protecting our communities.

Of course, this includes many officers from Texas. I am particularly proud of the Fort Worth Police Pipes and Drums Band and the Texas Department of Public Safety Pipes and Drums Corps that performed on the National Mall yesterday.

Law enforcement is a calling answered by a select few. These brave men and women have chosen a difficult and sometimes dangerous life, dedicated to upholding the law, defending or civil liberties, and protecting our cities and our neighborhoods. They wake up each morning and put on a uniform, never knowing what the day may hold. It requires a lot of courage and sacrifice—both from the officers and their families—and I am grateful for those who selflessly serve our communities each day.

Each year for Police Week, we honor the law enforcement community to remember those who have made the ultimate sacrifice. One of the most emblematic reminders of that sacrifice is the National Law Enforcement Officers

Memorial, which is here in Washington, DC. It is a beautiful tribute to the Federal, State, and local law enforcement officials who have died in the line of duty and features marble walls filled with more than 21,000 names. Each of those names represents an American hero. Sadly, this year, we add the names of 13 Texans to that memorial. These officers gave their lives in service to their communities and to our country, and we thank them and their families for their sacrifices, and we remember and honor their names.

Each year for Police Week, we pay tribute to those who go to work and never come home. We honor the lives of those we have lost. We share in the grief of their families, and we promise never to forget the stories of heroism they left behind.

While we remember the fallen this week, I hope we will also take time to consider how we can do more to support and serve those who have taken the oath to defend us.

Throughout my career in public office, I have had the pleasure of interacting with law enforcement officials from across my State and, certainly, here at the Federal level, including our incredible Capitol Police officers. I am continually impressed and inspired by their professionalism, their conviction, and their unwavering commitment to enforcing the law, and I want to ensure that they have what they need when they put on that uniform with confidence every morning.

Last Congress we made a lot of progress, and two bills that I introduced then are now law. The first is the Justice Served Act, which I introduced with my colleague Senator KLOBUCHAR, another example of bipartisan legislation. This bill provides grants to State and local governments to prosecute cold cases by making sure the newly tested DNA evidence is used to investigate and prosecute unsolved cases. The Justice Served Act helps to ensure that violent criminals are taken off the streets and brought to justice.

We also passed legislation I introduced with Senator PETERS from Michigan to authorize the Project Safe Neighborhoods program at the Department of Justice. This is a nationwide partnership among Federal, State, and local law enforcement and prosecutors who use data-driven, evidence-based, and trauma-informed practices to reduce violent crime. It is inspired by a successful program that was initiated at the State level in Texas, when I was attorney general, but the truth is it started in the Eastern District. I believe it was in Virginia. Of course, it was designed to focus on reducing gun crime and gun violence by targeting those who repetitively used firearms in the commission of violent crimes.

We were glad to use the examples in Virginia and in Texas to bring the model to the Nation and to promote this proactive and collaborative approach to prevent violence in our neighborhoods.

I am appreciative of the fact that our colleagues have seen fit to work together to pass both of these bills and of President Trump for signing those, but I know there is a lot more that we can and should do.

Today I am introducing another piece of legislation called the Back the Blue Act, which I am introducing along with our colleagues Senator CRUZ from Texas and Senator TILLIS from North Carolina. This legislation sends a strong message to the more than 900,000 law enforcement officers serving in our country that we support them and that we will not tolerate any act of violence against them, period.

In recent years, we have seen brutal and inexcusable attacks on law enforcement officers across the United States, including one in Texas that rocked our entire State.

In 2016, a man killed five police officers and injured nine others in Dallas. It was a sobering reminder of the danger these officers face every day and a call for us to take action to do more to support them.

This bill makes clear our support for these public servants who dedicate their lives to protecting and serving us. The Back the Blue Act would add stiff mandatory penalties and make it a Federal crime to kill or attempt to kill a law enforcement officer, a Federal judge, or a federally funded public safety officer. It would also make it a Federal crime to assault a law enforcement officer.

There is zero justification for attacking a police officer—none. We need to show that we value their lives, and we need to make it absolutely clear that we will hold those who carry out crimes against them accountable. The Back the Blue Act sends that message loud and clear.

I think it is important to point out that this legislation would also help make our communities stronger by allowing grant funds to be used for efforts that help foster more trust between the police and the communities they protect. This bill would better serve the men and women who work tirelessly in our communities each day.

There is no doubt in my mind that our Nation is better and safer because of the hard work and dedication of our law enforcement officials. Here in the Senate we should do all we can to help them do their job as effectively and as safely as possible. The Back the Blue Act would be a great start.

I hope my colleagues will consider this legislation and decide to support it and, more importantly, show our law enforcement across the country that we stand shoulder to shoulder with them.

By Mr. KAINE (for himself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Ms. HIRONO):

S. 1483. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to require institutions of higher education to have an independent advocate for campus sex-

ual assault prevention and response; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President. Sexual assault is a major issue on our Nation's college campuses. In 2016, the Department of Justice found that one in four college women are sexually assaulted while in school. Alarming, the majority of these crimes will go unreported. The consequences of these crimes are often damaging to a student's mental, physical, and emotional well-being and the aftermath can drive many survivors to drop out of school.

Sexual assault survivors deserve access to a safe and supportive educational environment. I have met with students in Virginia, most recently at the University of Virginia and Virginia Tech, who have expressed the need for someone on campus to turn to for unbiased advice, guidance, and support following an assault. Given the prevalence of this issue, it is clear that our federal higher education policy must do more to prevent sexual assaults and ensure that survivors have access to and can navigate through a plethora of resources.

This is why I am pleased to reintroduce today the Survivor Outreach and Support Campus Act of 2019 or SOS Campus Act. The SOS Campus Act requires every institution of higher education that receives federal funding to designate an independent advocate for campus sexual assault prevention and response. The advocate will help students access all of the resources available to them, both on and off campus, in the wake of a sexual assault and will guide them through the process of reporting their assault if they choose to do so, acting always in the interests of the victim, not the university.

The SOS Campus Act requires that the confidential advocate is responsible for ensuring that survivors, regardless of whether they decide to report the crime, have access to emergency and follow-up medical care, guidance on reporting assaults to law enforcement, medical forensic or evidentiary exams, crisis intervention, and information on their legal rights. The advocate will also conduct a public information campaign on campus to inform students of their services, and train other university staff to provide information to students about the advocate.

I am proud to reintroduce this legislation with Senators BALDWIN, HIRONO and FEINSTEIN, which would ensure all college students across our country have access to a supportive advocate for sexual assault survivors. It is our responsibility as public servants to advocate relentlessly for reforms to prevent sexual assault and protections for survivors. I strongly encourage my colleagues in the Senate to consider this legislation when we consider reauthorization of the Higher Education Act.

By Mr. MANCHIN:

S. 1486. A bill to amend title 11, United States Code, to include certain

pension as administrative expenses in bankruptcy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. MANCHIN. Mr. President, today I am introducing the Prioritizing Our Workers Act, which will make changes to the current bankruptcy code, requiring companies going through bankruptcy proceedings to pay unpaid vested benefits, like workers' pensions, before they pay out other claims against them.

I firmly believe that no one should be denied their pension because their employer goes bankrupt. Hard-working men and women across the country go to work every day for years, paying into these pension plans each paycheck with the expectation that one day they can retire and provide for their families.

Companies offering pension plans made promises to their workers and need to live up to those promises, no matter what else happens to that company financially.

In West Virginia, we are far too familiar with coal and steel companies leaving their workers out to dry in this way. This is absolutely unacceptable. That is why I am introducing this bill, and I look forward to my fellow Senators joining me to support and protect pensions across this country.

By Mr. UDALL (for himself and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 1488. A bill to improve the integrity and safety of interstate horseracing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

Mr. UDALL. 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. 1488

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 "Racehorse Doping Ban Act of 2019".

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) INTERSTATE OFF-TRACK WAGER; HORSEMEN'S GROUP; HOST RACING ASSOCIATION; OFF-TRACK BETTING SYSTEM.—The terms "interstate off-track wager", "horsemen's group", "host racing association", and "off-track betting system" have the meanings given those terms in section 3 of the Interstate Horseracing Act of 1978 (15 U.S.C. 3002).

(2) VETERINARIAN-CLIENT-PATIENT RELATIONSHIP.—The term "veterinarian-client-patient relationship" has the meaning of that term as used in the Principles of Veterinary Medical Ethics of the American Veterinary Medical Association (as in effect on the date of the enactment of this Act).

SEC. 3. INDEPENDENT ANTI-DOPING ORGANIZATION FOR INTERSTATE HORSE-RACING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—There shall be an independent anti-doping organization with responsibility for ensuring the integrity and safety of horseraces that are the subject of interstate off-track wagers.

(b) DUTIES.—The duties of the independent anti-doping organization referred to in subsection (a) with respect to horseraces described in that subsection are the following:

(1) Developing, publishing, and maintaining rules with respect to—

(A) substances, methods, and treatments that may not be administered to a horse participating in such a horserace;

(B) substances, methods, and treatments that may be administered to a horse participating in such a horserace in the context of a veterinarian-client-patient relationship; and

(C) the use of substances, methods, and treatments permitted under subparagraph (B), including rules with respect to the period before a horserace (which may not be less than 24 hours before a horserace) during which a horse may no longer receive such substances, methods, and treatments.

(2) Implementing programs relating to anti-doping education, research, testing, and adjudication to prevent any horse participating in a horserace described in subsection (a) from racing under the effect of any substance, method, or treatment that could affect the performance of the horse (other than a substance, method, or treatment described in subparagraph (B) of paragraph (1) administered during a time period that is permitted under subparagraph (C) of that paragraph).

(3) Excluding from participating in any horserace described in subsection (a) any person that the independent anti-doping organization or a State racing commission determines—

(A) has violated a rule with respect to a substance, method, or treatment that may not be administered to a horse participating in such a horserace under subparagraph (A) of paragraph (1);

(B) has violated 3 or more times a rule with respect to a substance, method, or treatment permitted under subparagraphs (B) and (C) of that paragraph that has the ability to affect the performance of a horse; or

(C) is subject to a suspension from horse-racing activities by any State racing commission.

(c) DEADLINE.—The independent anti-doping organization referred to in subsection (a) shall publish the rules required by subsection (b) not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(d) SUSPENSION OF EXCLUSION PERIOD.—The independent anti-doping organization referred to in subsection (a) may—

(1) suspend a period of exclusion from participating in a horserace imposed on a person pursuant to subsection (b)(3) if the person provides substantial assistance to the organization or other persons that results in the discovery of—

(A) a violation of a rule published under subsection (b) by another person; or

(B) a violation of Federal or State law by another person; and

(2) reinstate all or part of a period of exclusion imposed on a person and suspended under paragraph (1) if the person fails to provide substantial assistance described in that paragraph.

(e) CONSULTATIONS.—In developing, publishing, and maintaining rules under subsection (b)(1), the independent anti-doping organization referred to in subsection (a) may consult with State racing commissions, host racing associations, horsemen's groups, and other interested persons.

(f) TRANSITION RULE WITH RESPECT TO FUROSEMIDE.—During the 2-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, the independent anti-doping organization referred to in subsection (a) shall permit the use of furosemide in a horse partici-

pating in a horserace described in subsection (a) if—

(1) the horse is 3 years old or older; and

(2) the use of furosemide—

(A) complies with the requirements of the document entitled "ARCI-011-020 Medications and Prohibited Substances" published by the Association of Racing Commissioners International, Inc.; and

(B) is within the context of a veterinarian-client-patient relationship.

(g) DESIGNATION OF ORGANIZATION.—The independent anti-doping organization designated pursuant to section 701 of the Office of National Drug Control Policy Reauthorization Act of 2006 (21 U.S.C. 2001) shall serve as the independent anti-doping organization referred to in subsection (a).

SEC. 4. CONSENT REQUIRED FOR ACCEPTANCE OF INTERSTATE OFF-TRACK WAGERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—On and after the date of the enactment of this Act, a host racing association may conduct a horserace that is the subject of an interstate off-track wager, and an interstate off-track wager may be accepted by an off-track betting system, only if consent is obtained from the independent anti-doping organization referred to in section 3(a).

(b) REQUIREMENT FOR AGREEMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—A host racing association shall obtain the consent required by subsection (a) of the independent anti-doping organization referred to in section 3(a) pursuant to an agreement entered into between the association and the organization that specifies the terms and conditions relating to such consent, including—

(A) compliance with the rules published under section 3(b); and

(B) payments to the organization to defray the costs of carrying out the duties of the organization under this Act.

(2) DEFRAYAL OF COSTS.—The independent anti-doping organization referred to in section 3(a) shall ensure that all of the costs incurred by the organization in carrying out the duties of the organization under this Act are defrayed pursuant to agreements entered into under paragraph (1).

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 211—RECOGNIZING THE AVIATION CADET MUSEUM IN EUREKA SPRINGS, ARKANSAS, AS "AMERICA'S NATIONAL AVIATION CADET MUSEUM"

Mr. BOOZMAN (for himself and Mr. COTTON) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources:

S. RES. 211

Whereas, in 1994, former Aviation Cadet and United States Air Force First Lieutenant Errol Severe founded the Aviation Cadet Museum;

Whereas the flying cadet and succeeding aviation cadet programs served as the primary production source of nearly 500,000 United States Air Force pilots, navigators, and bombardiers from 1917 to 1961;

Whereas the bravery, courage, dedication, and heroism of United States aviators from across the Air Corps and Army Air Forces were critical factors in defeating the enemies of the United States during World War I and World War II;

Whereas the Aviation Cadet Museum in Eureka Springs, Arkansas, exists to exclu-

sively preserve and promote an understanding of the role of aviation cadets in the 20th century; and

Whereas the Aviation Cadet Museum is dedicated to celebrating the spirit of the United States and recognizing the teamwork, collaboration, patriotism, and courage of the individuals who trained and fought and the individuals on the homefront who mobilized and supported the national aviation effort: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate recognizes the Aviation Cadet Museum in Eureka Springs, Arkansas, as "America's National Aviation Cadet Museum".

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 16—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF CONGRESS THAT THE TREATY ON THE NON-PROLIFERATION OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS (NPT) CONTINUES TO MAKE AN INVALUABLE CONTRIBUTION TO UNITED STATES AND INTERNATIONAL SECURITY, AND NOTING FORMER SENATOR RICHARD G. LUGAR'S INDISPENSABLE CONTRIBUTIONS TO INTERNATIONAL SECURITY AND REDUCING NUCLEAR WEAPONS-RELATED RISKS

Mr. MERKLEY (for himself, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. PAUL, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. BROWN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. CARDIN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. SMITH, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. CON. RES. 16

Whereas the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) opened for signature 50 years ago on July 1, 1968;

Whereas the United States and the former Soviet Union averted a catastrophic nuclear exchange during the October 1962 Cuban Missile Crisis, which led to a series of bilateral and multilateral agreements to lessen the chance of nuclear war, including the NPT;

Whereas President John F. Kennedy predicted in 1963 that as many as 25 countries would acquire nuclear weapons by 1970 absent a treaty to control nuclear weapons;

Whereas the United States Senate provided its advice and consent to the NPT on March 13, 1969, with a vote on ratification of 83 to 15;

Whereas the NPT has grown to include 191 State Parties, making an irreplaceable contribution to international security by preventing the spread of nuclear weapons;

Whereas former Senator Richard G. Lugar made indispensable contributions to reducing nuclear weapon risks, most notably through his leadership in standing up the Cooperative Threat Reduction Program (commonly referred to as the "Nunn-Lugar Program"), which eliminated 7,600 nuclear weapons in the former Soviet Union;

Whereas Senator Lugar successfully secured the advice and consent of the Senate to the Treaty between the United States of America and the Russian Federation on Measures for the Further Reduction and Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms, signed at Prague April 8, 2010, and entered into force February 5, 2011 (commonly known as the "New START Treaty");

Whereas Article III of the NPT obligates each nonnuclear weapon state to the NPT to conclude a Safeguards Agreement with the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) to verify treaty compliance, 174 of which are

Comprehensive Safeguards Agreements crafted to detect the diversion of nuclear materials from peaceful to non-peaceful uses;

Whereas the 2018 Department of Defense Nuclear Posture Review affirms, “The Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) is a cornerstone of the nuclear nonproliferation regime. It plays a positive role in building consensus for non-proliferation and enhances international efforts to impose costs on those that would pursue nuclear weapons outside the Treaty.”;

Whereas the success of the NPT has and will continue to depend upon the full implementation by all State Parties of the Treaty’s three mutually reinforcing pillars: non-proliferation, access to peaceful uses of nuclear energy, and disarmament;

Whereas, over the past half century, the United States has exhibited leadership in strengthening each of the NPT’s three pillars for the global good, including—

(1) reducing its nuclear weapons stockpile by more than 85 percent from its Cold War heights of 31,225 in parallel with equally massive reductions of the Russian Federation’s stockpile through bilateral coordination;

(2) cooperating with Kazakhstan, Ukraine, and Belarus to facilitate the surrender of nuclear weapons on their soil after the fall of the Soviet Union—leading to each country’s accession to the NPT as nonnuclear weapons states;

(3) providing voluntary contributions to the IAEA to promote peaceful nuclear activities exceeding \$378,000,000 since 2010, including activities that help in the treatment of cancer and other life-saving applications; and

(4) extending deterrence to United States allies in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), Japan, and the Republic of Korea—which is an unmistakable demonstration of the United States commitment to collective security;

Whereas heightened geopolitical tensions in recent years have made cooperation on nonproliferation and arms control issues with the Russian Federation more challenging;

Whereas a range of actions by the Government of the Russian Federation has led to a deterioration in bilateral relations with the United States, including Russia’s brazen interference in the 2016 United States presidential elections, its violation of the Treaty between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the Elimination of Their Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles (commonly known as the “INF Treaty”), signed at Washington, D.C., December 8, 1987, and entered into force June 1, 1988, its use of a chemical nerve agent in an assassination attempt against Sergei Skripal and his daughter Yulia in the United Kingdom in March 2018, its illegal annexation of Crimea, its invasion of Eastern Ukraine, and its destabilizing actions in Syria;

Whereas, within a difficult environment, preserving agreements that continue to contribute to United States and global security, particularly the New START Treaty, is important, and that to that end, the Department of State confirmed in February 2018 that Russia had met New START’s Central Treaty Limits and stated that “implementation of the New START Treaty enhances the safety and security of the United States”;

Whereas United States efforts to reduce dangers associated with nuclear arsenals through ambitious arms control agreements with both the Russian Federation and the People’s Republic of China would advance United States and global security, adding to

the benefits of stability and transparency provided by existing agreements.

Whereas, in a March 2018 speech, President Vladimir Putin of the Russian Federation unveiled details of new kinds of strategic nuclear weapons under development, including hypersonic nuclear weapons, nuclear-powered cruise missiles, and multi-megaton nuclear torpedoes shot from drone submarines that may be accountable under the New START Treaty;

Whereas the Russian Federation erroneously claimed that the United States may have not reached New START Treaty central limits by February 5, 2018, as is mandated by the Treaty;

Whereas the Bilateral Consultative Commission (BCC) is the appropriate forum for the Parties to engage constructively on any New START Treaty implementation issues that arise; and

Whereas the collapse of the INF Treaty and expiration of the New START Treaty would lead to the absence of any binding, bilateral treaty or agreement governing United States and Russian nuclear forces, which account for 90 percent of those currently in existence globally, for the first time since 1972: Now, therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the United States should continue to encourage all States Party to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) to comply fully with the Treaty;

(2) the United States should maintain support for the IAEA through its assessed and voluntary contributions and promote the universal adoption of the IAEA Additional Protocol;

(3) the United States should—

(A) consider extending the New START Treaty, within the context of wider enhancement of strategic stability between the United States and the Russian Federation and provided the Treaty continues to advance United States national security;

(B) assess whether Russia’s recently announced nuclear capabilities should be accountable under the New START Treaty, and raise the issue directly with the Russian Federation;

(C) conclude an interagency process to consider an extension of the New START Treaty and to engage with the Russian Federation on the full range of strategic stability issues and other arms control and nonproliferation issues;

(D) begin negotiations with the Russian Federation on an agreement to address the massive disparity between the nonstrategic nuclear weapons stockpiles of the Russian Federation and of the United States and to secure and reduce nonstrategic nuclear weapons in a verifiable manner; and

(E) consider the consequences of the New START Treaty’s expiration in 2021 in relation to the insights it provides into the location, movement, and disposition of current and future Russian strategic systems;

(4) the United States strongly condemns the Russian Federation’s violations of the INF Treaty and its noncompliance with its other arms control commitments and treaty obligations, and urges the Russian Federation to come back into full compliance;

(5) in responding to the Russian Federation’s deployment of INF-range systems, advocate for those defense and deterrence steps which preserve NATO alliance cohesion and are aimed at averting an arms race on the European continent;

(6) pursuit of a verifiable and comprehensive arms control agreement with the Russian Federation and the People’s Republic of China, which may capture strategic and non-strategic nuclear weapons capabilities,

would enhance United States and global security by building upon other treaties, agreements, and transparency measures that reduce nuclear risk; and

(7) the United States should continue to encourage opportunities for cooperation with other nuclear weapon possessing states to reduce the salience, number, and role of nuclear weapons in their national military strategies.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I have 10 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 BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 15, 2019, at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled “Oversight of financial regulators.”

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

The Committee on Environment and Public Works is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 15, 2019, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 15, 2019, at 10:15 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

The Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 15, 2019, at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing on pending legislation and the following nominations: James A. Crowell IV, and Jason Park, both to be an Associate Judge of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia, Ron A. Bloom, of New York, and Roman Martinez IV, of Florida, both to be a Governor of the United States Postal Service, Dale Cabaniss, of Virginia, to be Director of the Office of Personnel Management, and Michael Eric Wooten, of Virginia, to be Administrator for Federal Procurement Policy.

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Indian Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 15, 2019, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a business meeting.

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Indian Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 15, 2019, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing on pending legislation.

COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

The Committee on Rules and Administration is authorized to meet during

the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 15, 2019, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing entitled, "Oversight of the U.S. Election Assistance Commission."

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS AND
ENTREPRENEURSHIP

The Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 15, 2019, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, OCEANS,
FISHERIES, AND WEATHER

The Subcommittee on Science, Oceans, Fisheries, and Weather of the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 15, 2019, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON WATER AND POWER

The Subcommittee on Water and Power of the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources is to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 15, 2019, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I have a request for one committee to meet during today's session of the Senate. It has the approval of the Majority and Minority leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committee is authorized to meet during today's session of the Senate:

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

The Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 15, 2019, at 6 p.m., to conduct a hearing on pending military nominations.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Christian Braunlich, an Air Force defense fellow in Senator SULLIVAN's office, be granted floor privileges for the remainder of the Congress.

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

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my legislative fellow, Adam Bradlow, be granted floor privileges until the end of July of 2019.

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

APPOINTMENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. For the information of the Senate, the Chair makes the following announcement:

The President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, pursuant to the provisions of Section 201(a)(2) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, have appointed Dr. Phillip Swagel as Director of the Congressional Budget Office, effective June 3, 2019, for the term expiring January 3, 2023.

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, MAY 16,
2019

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m., Thursday, May 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, morning business be closed, and the Senate proceed to executive session and resume consideration of the Vitter nomination.

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

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M.
TOMORROW

Mr. GARDNER. If there is no business to come before the Senate, I ask that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 7:30 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, May 16, 2019, at 10 a.m.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate May 15, 2019:

THE JUDICIARY

KENNETH KIYUL LEE, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HONORING JAMES BOGART

HON. JIMMY PANETTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 15, 2019

Mr. PANETTA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mr. James Bogart for his decades of service to the central coast of California with the Grower-Shipper Association of Central California. Through his decades of serving agricultural producers on the Central Coast, Mr. Bogart leaves an indelible legacy in our community.

Mr. Bogart joined the Grower-Shipper Vegetable Association on November 3, 1980 as a Staff Attorney. In 1998, began his leadership role by serving as President and General Counsel for what would later be re-named the Grower-Shipper Association of Central California, where he has helped lead the Association and its members on many issues in the Monterey, Santa Cruz, San Benito and Santa Clara Counties. He is the longest serving president of the Grower-Shipper Association and is a highly respected advocate for agriculture.

Mr. Bogart has been a prominent leader in agriculture and his community all of his professional life. His community activities include service on several boards of directors, including but not limited to the Community Foundation of Monterey County, Salinas Valley Chamber of Commerce (Chairman of the Board), California Bar Association (Agriculture Committee), Monterey County Bar Association (Labor Committee), Ag Against Hunger (Founding Director), Monterey County Agricultural Education (Founding Director), Grower-Shipper Association Foundation (Co-Founder and Incorporator), "AgKnowledge" Executive Leadership and Education Program (Past President and Founding Director), Hartnell College Ag Steering Committee (Founder and Past Chairman), Spreckels Union School District Board of Trustees, Monterey County Legal Services (Founding Director), Community Homeless Solutions (Past Chairman and Member of the Board of Directors), and the Salinas Valley Chapter of the American Cancer Society (Past President).

Mr. Bogart takes pride in the growth of the Grower-Shipper Association in both membership and in their leadership. Through the AgKnowledge program, he has focused efforts to educating community stakeholders in the importance of the produce industry. Mr. Bogart has been tenacious in working on issues that impact the produce industry, including labor relations, water, food safety, and crop protection tools. He has led by example and worked to build relationships with individuals on all sides of an issue by emphasizing work to identify common ground. He is well known for entertaining all with his good sense of humor.

Mr. James Bogart exemplifies what it means to be a conscientious and engaged citizen of the Central Coast. In retirement, Mr. Bogart will be cheering on his beloved alma mater,

the University of Southern California, and enjoying life with his wife, Janis; two stepsons, David and Aaron; and his grandchildren. Madam Speaker, the agricultural community on the Central Coast will miss Mr. Bogart, and I ask my colleagues to join me in wishing him a long and fulfilling retirement.

HONORING DAVID BARTLETT

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 15, 2019

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Madam Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize David Bartlett. David is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 606, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

David has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years David has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, David has received the Paul Bunyon Award, and is a member of the Order of the Arrow. David has also contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project. David built a wooden dumpster enclosure at his church to aid in aesthetics and security.

Madam Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending David Bartlett for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

RECOGNIZING KYLER REESE

HON. BRYAN STEIL

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 15, 2019

Mr. STEIL. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize one of our hardworking D.C. office interns, Kyler Reese. Kyler was born and raised in Virginia and is working towards a concentration in Sports Management from George Mason University.

Our office was fortunate to have Kyler as part of the Gregg and Livingston Harper Congressional Internship Program for Individuals with Intellectual Disabilities. Kyler lit up the office with his smile and energy, and enjoyed learning from staff and helping with our mail program.

We'll miss having Kyler in the office and wish him all the best in the future. On behalf of Wisconsin's First Congressional District, we thank Kyler for his help.

CONGRATULATING MARK K. COLIP, OD ON HIS APPOINTMENT AS THE SIXTH PRESIDENT OF THE ILLINOIS COLLEGE OF OPTOMETRY

HON. BOBBY L. RUSH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 15, 2019

Mr. RUSH. Madam Speaker, I wish to acknowledge Mark K. Colip, OD on his appointment as the sixth president of the Illinois College of Optometry, the oldest and largest college of optometry in the country and the largest provider of eye and vision care in Illinois.

Dr. Colip has dedicated his career to improving optometric education and the profession of optometry and has served in increasing positions of responsibility at the Illinois College of Optometry for the past twenty years. He has led multiple projects and campaigns that have garnered unprecedented alumni and community support and devoted his life's work to studying, understanding, and influencing the national optometry applicant pool.

Because of his leadership, Madam Speaker, the Illinois College of Optometry had a 250 percent increase in fundraising revenues over the past nine years, demonstrating significant successes compared to any prior period in the college's history. Dr. Colip is dedicated to the sound financial management of the College, utilizing his business acumen and service prioritization to enhance essential fiscal strategies, and has served in volunteer positions within the American Optometric Association, the Association of Schools and Colleges of Optometry, and the Accreditation Council on Optometric Education throughout his stellar career.

He has earned the recognition of Distinguished Scholar and Fellow by the National Academies of Practice for his extensive involvement and dedication to furthering practice, scholarship, and policy in support of inter-professional care and his dedication to helping the underserved, participating in six international medical mission trips.

Needless to say, Dr. Colip has a deep-seated passion and commitment to the success of the College and its students, alumni, patients, employees, and community. So, Madam Speaker, I applaud Dr. Colip for his years of hard work and congratulate him on his appointment as president of the Illinois College of Optometry and wish him nothing but continued success.

RECOGNIZING TANJA FRANSEN OF GLASGOW

HON. GREG GIANFORTE

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 15, 2019

Mr. GIANFORTE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Tanja Fransen of Glasgow, an

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

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

award-winning meteorologist who is recognized nationally for her innovation and leadership.

Tanja is the Meteorologist in Charge at the Glasgow Weather Forecast Office in Montana. Starting as a meteorologist in Glasgow in 2001, she has been a supervisor since 2015. In fact, Tanja is one of only 8 percent of female supervisors for National Weather Service (NWS) field offices.

Tanja's research benefits Montana's ag producers. Tanja and colleague Bill Martin helped develop an innovative cold weather advisory tool that helps livestock producers take precautions during calving season, saving hundreds of thousands of dollars annually. Their work earned them the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's Administrator's Award in 2011.

In 2014, the American Meteorological Society (AMS) presented Tanja with the Kenneth C. Spengler Award for her collaborative approach to ensure weather forecasts result in timely and appropriate public responses. The NWS recognized her with the Isaac Cline Award for Outreach in 2011 and the Isaac Cline Award for Leadership in 2002.

Throughout her 25-year career, Tanja has served in many public and professional advisory positions, and she has a passion for mentoring others. She mentors junior colleagues through the AMS and the NWS. She often encourages young people to embrace STEM courses and enhance their education with communication, business, and leadership training.

Madam Speaker, for her accomplishments in the sciences, dedication to the public, and 18 years of service to Montanans, I recognize Tanja Fransen for her spirit of Montana.

HONORING AUSTYN SMELLEY

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 15, 2019

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Madam Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Austyn Smelley. Austyn is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 606, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Austyn has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Austyn has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Austyn has received the World Conservation Award, Paul Bunyon Award, and Ironman Award. Austyn has also contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project. Austyn built a series of games for the 6th Grade Center of the North Kansas City School District.

Madam Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Austyn Smelley for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

PURDUE MARCHING BAND'S 100TH PERFORMANCE AT THE INDY 500

HON. JAMES R. BAIRD

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 15, 2019

Mr. BAIRD. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 100th performance of Purdue University's "All-American" Marching Band at the Indy 500, along with Director of Bands Jay Gephart becoming president of the prestigious American Bandmasters Association.

This year marks the 100th anniversary of the band performing pop tunes, patriotic songs, and Indy 500 ceremonial music like "God Bless America" and "Back Home Again in Indiana." The band builds the sound, color and emotion leading to the start of the race, thrilling fans for the past century.

The All-American band has become part of the fabric of the "Greatest Spectacle in Racing." Nearly 300 members pay their own way each year to return to the Indy 500 from around the United States to perform on the track and under the Pagoda.

They also invite high school bands from across the Midwest to participate in the Parade of Bands that has marched around the course before the start of the race since 1922 and have appeared in every nationally televised IPL 500 Festival Parade since its debut in 1957.

Thanks to Director of Bands Jay Gephart, Purdue's participation in one of Indiana's most storied traditions has held strong at the "Racing Capitol of the World." I congratulate every band member—former and current—and Director Gephart on their remarkable achievements.

HONORING BOB DINGEMAN

HON. SCOTT H. PETERS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 15, 2019

Mr. PETERS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the late Colonel Robert "Bob" Dingeman, a decorated veteran and beloved community leader, who dedicated his entire life to service.

Bob's commitment to service began when he was just a teenager. Bob was living with his family in Hawaii and serving in the Reserve Officer Training Corps when the attack on Pearl Harbor occurred.

Bob helped to get the women and children to safety before joining the defense of the base. The events of that day led Bob to a life of military service.

He graduated from West Point in 1945 and went on to serve in World War II, the Korean War, and the Vietnam War. During his decades of service, Bob earned a Silver Star, Soldier's Medal, Bronze Star, and a Purple Heart.

After retiring from the Army, Bob earned multiple master's degrees and worked as a college professor at San Diego Miramar College, teaching math, history, and political science.

Bob also became a pillar of San Diego's Scripps Ranch community, where he, his wife Gaye, and their children made their home.

Bob helped create the town's council, the Scripps Ranch Civic Association; organized

many annual traditions, including the 4th of July Parade; and established the community newsletter.

The Robert E. Dingeman Elementary School opened in 1995, so named by the San Diego Unified School District to recognize Bob Dingeman's accomplishments in the community. The school celebrates Bob Dingeman Day every year on June 12, Bob's birthday.

Scripps Ranch and San Diego are better off for Bob's leadership and community involvement. His legacy of military and volunteer service will continue to be an example for us all.

Please join me in honoring Bob Dingeman for his dedication to Scripps Ranch and his service to our country.

RECOGNIZING THE RETIREMENT OF RICK JOHNSON

HON. MICHAEL K. SIMPSON

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 15, 2019

Mr. SIMPSON. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Rick Johnson upon his retirement as Executive Director of the Idaho Conservation League. His leadership will be greatly missed by myself and many others.

For the past three decades, Rick has been the seminal leader in Idaho protecting Idaho's outdoors and environment. Whenever I am asked who in the conservation community to speak to in Idaho, the answer is always Rick Johnson.

When I first met Rick in the 1990s, I would describe the environmental community as having a single mission of fighting and objecting to almost anything proposed by the resource industry.

Through the years, I am pleased to say that both Rick and I have evolved and recognized that there are other ways to accomplish conservation. Rick's willingness to recognize the needs and concerns of others and his willingness to look for options where all parties can win, have made him a leader in the nation in finding ways to reach consensus on difficult conservation issues.

Rick and I have been through many battles together. We started with a not so harmonious discussion of nuclear power at my first wild Idaho and one day we ended up in the Oval Office with the President signing the Boulder-White Clouds and Jerry Peak Wilderness bills.

You learn a lot about an individual when you work for 15 years together on a wilderness bill and go camping in the mountains you are both trying to protect.

They also learn a lot about you. Rick was able to recognize my sincerity and concern for Idaho's special areas and more importantly convey that to others.

Rick wasn't a partner in crime, he was a partner in conservation. We were both able to maximize "wins" for our respective sides that they could take to the bank. He conserved hundreds of thousands of acres of wilderness and I was able to create security and certainty for counties, ranchers and motorized users.

Working together we were able to find the proverbial "win-win" that everybody is looking for but always seems elusive. We found it, and Idaho is better off for it.

As future generations of Idahoans gaze over the beautiful vistas of the Cecil Andrus-White

Clouds, the Hemingway-Boulders, the McClure-Jerry Peaks, and the Owyhees, they should be thanking Rick Johnson for his work, his effort, and most importantly his ability to compromise with others.

I will miss Rick greatly as a leader and as my partner in conservation, but I know he is not leaving us forever. I will always have my friend I can call on.

I am wishing Rick and his wonderful wife Roberta, the best of luck in their future endeavors and retirement. I thank them for all that both of them have done for Idaho.

VERTAFORE, INC.

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 15, 2019

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Vertafore, Inc. for celebrating their 50th anniversary.

For more than fifty years, Vertafore has provided software services to the insurance industry worldwide. Founded in 1969, Vertafore was previously known as AMS Holding Group, Inc. In 2017, they relocated their headquarters to Denver, Colorado where they have created hundreds of jobs in the city and partnered with the thousands of agents across the state. The mission at Vertafore is to transform the way the industry operates by putting people at the heart of insurance technology. By focusing on their customers and delivering results you can see, they offer a level of trust and security that's at the heart of the insurance industry. It is that service and level of trust that has allowed the company to be successful for over fifty years.

To all the employees of Vertafore, congratulations on this remarkable accomplishment, and I thank them for their continued commitment to the insurance community and contribution to the state of Colorado.

HONORING THE MONCOVICH FAMILY AND THE ORIGINAL SPRING LAMB BARBECUE

HON. JIMMY PANETTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 15, 2019

Mr. PANETTA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Moncovich family for their commitment to philanthropy to empowering their community and bettering the lives of others through the Original Spring Lamb Barbecue. Mr. John Moncovich founded the Original Spring Lamb Barbecue in Watsonville, California 60 years ago, and his son, Mr. Bill Moncovich, has chaired the event since his father's passing in 1972. Since its inception, the Original Spring Lamb Barbecue has been a celebration of family, friends, and the fight against cancer on the central coast of California.

In May of 1959, John Moncovich held the very first Original Spring Lamb Barbecue. The Original Spring Lamb Barbecue started as a simple gathering among friends to collect donations for charity. Held annually, it has evolved into a beloved community event bene-

fitting the American Cancer Society. Volunteers from a local produce company, California Giant Berry Farms, and agriculture industry members from the Pajaro Valley commit their time and energy each year to make the event a memorable one. Live music, family friendly activities, and a horseshoe tournament make this a community event for culture and fun, all while benefitting families who have been affected by cancer.

The Original Spring Lamb Barbecue is the oldest consecutively held fundraiser for the American Cancer Society in the United States and has been recognized as such by the charity. Ten years ago, the organization congratulated the Original Spring Lamb Barbecue for raising over \$1 million worth of cumulative proceeds. This year, the event will celebrate its diamond anniversary for 60 years of outstanding community leadership and fundraising efforts for cancer research.

Madam Speaker, it is my honor to recognize the dedication and commitment to cancer prevention and community service that John and Bill Moncovich and the Original Spring Lamb Barbecue have provided to the Central Coast. We are fortunate to have such a longstanding tradition of community fundraising organized every year by the Moncovich family and California Giant Berry Farms. I ask my colleagues to join me in celebrating the Moncovich family and the Original Spring Lamb Barbecue.

U.S. TERRITORIES MID-DECADE CENSUS ACT

HON. GREGORIO KILILI CAMACHO SABLAN

OF THE NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 15, 2019

Mr. SABLAN. Madam Speaker, today I am introducing a bill that would require the United States Census Bureau to conduct a census every five years in the U.S. insular areas of the Northern Mariana Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the U.S. Virgin Islands. This legislation is necessary because the priority, availability, timeliness, and types of data collected by federal agencies in the insular areas remains deficient compared to data collection in the states. Without accurate and timely information on changes in the economy, employment, income levels, and other key indicators, insular governments are hindered in the establishment of appropriate policy. And without these data, governments and the public are less able to assess the effectiveness of policies that have been established.

Every decade, the Census Bureau conducts a census throughout the country to determine the number of people living in the country. In the insular areas, detailed demographic, housing, and socioeconomic data is also collected in the decennial census using a "long-form" questionnaire consisting of about 75 questions. The decennial census conducted in the states, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico only asks 10 questions because the vital information gathered in the decennial census is now acquired annually in the American Community Survey.

The American Community Survey does not include data from the insular areas. The Census Bureau has claimed that a lack of funding to collect the data and the absence of a prov-

en methodology tested in the territories leaves the Bureau unable to include our districts and the hundreds of thousands of Americans living there. As a result, the insular areas have to wait every 10 years for critical, up-to date information on education, income, housing, jobs, and insurance that surveys like the American Community Survey provide. This data is vital to sustain economic development and for prudent government and business decisions. The decennial census is inadequate to this need. The allocation of federal funding for numerous programs is also largely based on the most recent census data available. With no alternative, most current funding allocations to the insular areas are based on data from the previous decennial census. 2010 Census data will continue to be used for many federal program funding allocations until 2023—the earliest key 2020 Census demographic data for the insular areas will likely be available.

As an alternative to annual surveys, my bill would require the Census Bureau to conduct a mid-decade census in the insular areas. The bill starts the first mid-decade census in 2025 and in addition to the decennial census, a census will be conducted every five years. This will provide more current data in the insular areas, similar to that provided by five-year estimates produced by the American Community Survey. Having a mid-decade census will also enable insular governments and the Census Bureau to plan and conduct data collection efforts that are often logistically challenging in these diverse, remote regions. My bill also authorizes appropriations for the mid-decade census, based on costs estimates provided by the Census Bureau to conduct the 2020 decennial census in U.S. insular areas. I ask my colleagues for their support.

RECOGNIZING COLTON SCRUDDER

HON. BRYAN STEIL

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 15, 2019

Mr. STEIL. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize one of our hardworking D.C. office interns, Colton Scrudder. Colton is a native of Coppell, Texas and studies finance at Georgetown University. He has been with our office since January. Colton was a great help getting our office up and running.

From drafting letters and memos, to giving Capitol tours, Colton was always eager to assist. Colton is an intelligent, diligent young man who aspires to continue serving his community.

We'll miss having Colton in the office and wish him all the best in the future. On behalf of Wisconsin's First Congressional District, we thank Colton for his help.

HONORING GARRETT WINHEIM

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 15, 2019

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Madam Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Garrett Winheim. Garrett is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship

and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 247, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Garrett has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Garrett has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Garrett is a member of the Order of the Arrow and has received the Boy Scout World Conservation Award. Garrett has also contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project. Garrett built mobile shelving units to be used as storage space and visual barriers at the Kansas City Pet Project.

Madam Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Garrett Winheim for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

HONORING A GIANT OF PUTNAM COUNTY

HON. ALEXANDER X. MOONEY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 15, 2019

Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia. Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD, the following obituary for Mr. Bill O'Dell of Putnam County:

WILLIAM DOUGLAS O'DELL

William "Bill" Douglas O'Dell, 68, of Pocahontas, West Virginia, died on Monday, May 6, 2019.

Bill was a graduate of South Charleston High School and Marshall University. He worked at Regional Family Resource Network and was the Director of Putnam Wellness Coalition. He dedicated his life to drug and alcohol prevention. He was a mentor to many. His impact on the youth and the community cannot be measured. He touched many lives at Teen Institute, a leadership program that helps young people become leaders around prevention of alcohol, tobacco, drugs and other critical daily decisions.

He was a man of Christian faith, integrity, great humor, positive thinking, a role model to many, a devoted husband, father, grandfather and brother. He will be greatly missed. The family would like to thank his Church, friends, co-workers, the community, our extended family and the Putnam Wellness Coalition for their support, love and prayers.

Bill is preceded in death by his parents Dr. Richard Nolan O'Dell and Vera Waldorf O'Dell and father-in-law, Louis "Gene" Barnett. He is survived by his wife Judith O'Dell of Pocahontas, daughter Tina (Mike) Shoemaker and his pride and joy, his grandson, Caden of Ona, WV, son Joshua (Kristina) of Charleston, SC; mother-in-law Lorene Barnett, brother Larry (Beverly) O'Dell of Chesapeake, OH; sister Verajane (William) Fish of Savannah, GA, brother-in-law and sister-in-law Adrain and Cindy Jones of Winfield, WV; nieces Wendy (Stephen) Mann, Laura (David) Moir; nephews Keith (Jennifer) O'Dell, Joseph (Marie) Fish, David (Heather) Fish and Logan Jones.

A tribute to the life of William "Bill" O'Dell will be 2:00 PM Saturday, May 11, 2019 at Gatens-Harding chapel with Pastor Fred Elliott and Pastor Wayne Hooper officiating. Entombment will follow at Haven of Rest Memory Gardens, Red House, WV. Friends

may visit at the funeral home 3 hours prior to the service 11:00 AM-2:00 PM on Saturday.

In lieu of flowers, please make donations to Wilkinson United Methodist Church, PO Box 236, Hometown, WV 25109 or donate to the Bill O'Dell Teen Institute Fund, PO Box 3041, Charleston, WV 25331.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BILL HUIZENGA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 15, 2019

Mr. HUIZENGA. Madam Speaker, I rise today regarding missed votes. Had I been present for roll call vote number 201, on Motion to Recommit with Instructions of H.R. 2157, Making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes, I would have voted "yea." Had I been present for roll call vote number 202, on Passage of H.R. 2157, Making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes, I would have voted "nay."

IN HONOR OF ANDRIS "ANDY" JON SILINS OF WEST BARNSTABLE, MA

HON. STEPHEN F. LYNCH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 15, 2019

Mr. LYNCH. Madam Speaker, I rise today in honor of Andris "Andy" Jon Silins, in recognition of his outstanding contributions to working carpenters, their families and the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and to commend him for over fifty years of dedicated service to his community.

The son of Olga Silins and Rudolfs Silins, immigrants from Riga, Latvia, Andy was born on January 12, 1947, and immigrated with his parents and older sister to the United States and lived in Jamaica Plain.

Andy attended Roslindale High School and graduated in 1965. Subsequent to his graduation, Andy enlisted in the United States Marine Corps and served his country honorably in the Vietnam War. Ultimately, Andy graduated from the University of Massachusetts, Boston.

Upon completion of his distinguished service to our country, Andy joined Carpenters Local 67 in 1968. In 1979, he was elected General Agent and Executive Secretary of the Boston District Council of Carpenters, and President in 1989. In 1995, Andy was elected to the position of General Secretary—Treasurer of the United Brotherhood of Carpenters (UBC) and served in that position until his retirement on April 1, 2019. He continues to serve the Commonwealth of Massachusetts as a board member of the Massachusetts Housing Authority. He is also one of the founders of First Trade Union Savings Bank, in Boston, where he later served as Chairman of the Board.

Andy has had the good fortune to be married to his wife, Diane for 37 years. He is the proud father of his son, Jake, and the master of his beloved German Shepherd, Sami.

Madam Speaker, it is my distinct honor to thank Andris "Andy" Jon Silins for his remarkable service and dedication to the working carpenters and their families and all workers in

the Commonwealth and across the United States of America.

IN HONOR OF HARLEY LIPPMAN

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 15, 2019

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I rise to recognize Harley Lippman, who is being recognized today as part of Jewish American Heritage Month. Harley has been a generous philanthropist and humanitarian who has been dedicated to uncovering mass graves of Jews murdered by the Nazis in Poland. His persistence and dedication have meant that the Nazis' victims will never be forgotten.

Deeply concerned about the possibility that Jews murdered during the Holocaust would simply disappear from memory, Harley has made a unique contribution to the remembrance of the Jewish community that was destroyed by the Nazis. With singular purpose and dedication, Harley has searched for unknown gravesites and has paid for the restoration of historic Jewish graveyards.

At my urging, Harley was appointed by President Bill Clinton to the Commission for the Preservation of America's Heritage Abroad which is involved in restoring desecrated cemeteries in Eastern Europe. Created in 1993, the Commission is tasked with identifying and reporting on cemeteries, monuments, and historic buildings in Eastern and Central Europe that are associated with the heritage of U.S. citizens, particularly endangered properties. Congress recognized that, as a nation of immigrants, the United States has an interest in preserving sites related to the heritage of Americans, particularly Jewish gravesites since the Holocaust wiped out the communities that would ordinarily have cared for them. It is a credit to him, his enthusiasm and dedication, that he was reappointed by both Republican and Democratic Administrations.

Harley has been the sole funder of an effort to find mass graves in Poland—sites where Jews were slaughtered by the Nazis and then buried. So far, his team has found 52 sites. When he finds a site, he ensures that a memorial plaque is erected to honor the victims. He also arranges for a service with the Chief Rabbi of Poland, a Catholic priest and a Protestant minister and invites school children to help memorialize the dead. These ceremonies provide a meaningful opportunity to remind people of the Jews who perished, the tremendous loss in culture and humanity for Poland, the brutality of the Nazis and the success of the Jewish community that survived.

Harley has been a leader of a host of organizations from the Institute for the Study of Global Anti-Semitism and Policy, an organization founded by Eli Wiesel, which he currently serves as President, to the American-Israel Friendship League and American Jewish Congress.

With great generosity and compassion, Harley has also helped orphans in Cambodia. He is the sole funder of an orphanage, enabling children to find stability, get an education and go on to college. It truly has been life-changing for many of these kids.

Harley Lippman created Genesis 10, a company that currently employs over 2,000 people across the country. Genesis 10 helps companies solve technology problems and find talent to address their needs. Unquestionably, Genesis 10 succeeds because it has a great leader at the helm. USA Today ranked Harley among the top 30 CEOs in America of all large companies including the Fortune 500.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in celebrating Harley Lippman for his extraordinary contributions to America and the Jewish community.

IN RECOGNITION OF RUTH BROWN

HON. ROBERT J. WITTMAN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 15, 2019

Mr. WITTMAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Ruth Brown's life and her many accomplishments. We deeply thank her for all of her support and dedication to our military.

Ruth was born in Harryhogan, VA on February 28, 1925. She married George W. Brown Jr., Former Town Sergeant and Mayor of Warsaw, VA in 1946. Ruth went on to have three children, six grandchildren, and five great-grandchildren. She held her family at the center of her life.

Ruth was a charter member and secretary of the United Methodist Women and served on many committees within the Warsaw Methodist Church. She was a charter member of the Telephone Pioneers and retired from the Tidewater Telephone Company after 28 years of service. Ruth was also a charter member of the Veteran of Foreign Wars Ladies Auxiliary Post 7167 in Warsaw, VA. Finally, Ruth's heart belonged to our veterans. She spent her time fighting for them and taking care of them. She served our nation well during her long life.

Madam Speaker, I ask you to join me in recognizing the accomplishments, tenacity, and dedication of Ruth Brown. Words alone cannot express our gratitude. May God bless Ruth Brown and her family.

CONGRATULATING THE JAIL HILL INN FOR WINNING THE TRAVELERS' CHOICE AWARDS FOR TRIPADVISOR

HON. CHERI BUSTOS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 15, 2019

Mrs. BUSTOS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Jail Hill Inn for winning first place in the Travelers' Choice Award for TripAdvisor in the United States and for being named second place globally for the bed-and-breakfast/inn category.

The brick building where Jail Hill Inn operates today has been around for 140 years and originally served as a jail until 1977. The Jail Hill Inn was lovingly restored and revitalized by its owner, Matthew Carroll, and has been a hotel for the last 17 years. The hotel has six luxurious rooms complete with a fireplace, wet bar, king-size bed, high-end linens and a Bluetooth-connected sound system. Those

who stay in all six of the rooms are dubbed "repeat offenders" for their frequent visits to the inn. Galena's historic Main Street and downtown area are only a short walk away and provides guests with easy access to all Galena has to offer. I commend Matthew Carroll for creating an excellent stop for visitors hoping to catch a glimpse of some of the beauty our region has to offer and look forward to hearing about the Jail Hill Inn's future successes.

It is because of creative entrepreneurs like Matthew Carroll that I am especially proud to serve Illinois' 17th Congressional District. Madam Speaker, I would like to again formally congratulate the Jail Hill Inn for its rise to the top of TripAdvisor's Travelers' Choice Awards.

INTRODUCTION OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COURTS HOME RULE ACT

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 15, 2019

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, today, I introduce the District of Columbia Courts Home Rule Act. This bill would give the Council of the District of Columbia authority over the jurisdiction and organization of the local D.C. courts. The 1973 Home Rule Act (HRA) expressly prohibits D.C. from enacting any law with respect to any provision of the D.C. Code title that relates to the local D.C. courts. Congress can correct this injustice to the District's tax paying residents by amending the HRA, even before the District becomes the 51st state.

Forty-six years after passage of the HRA, matters involving the D.C. courts almost never come to Congress, so Congress knows virtually nothing about the District's courts—and could not care less. Notwithstanding the importance of D.C.'s courts to District residents, the D.C. Council, which is the repository of knowledge and experience for the District's criminal and civil justice systems and the body accountable to our residents, is irresponsibly left on the sidelines while Congress remains the sole entity to correct flaws in the District's courts.

Under the HRA, the D.C. Council has no authority to "enact any act, resolution, or rule with respect to any provision of title 11 of the District of Columbia Code (relating to organization and jurisdiction of the District of Columbia courts)." Matters in title 11 are limited primarily to rules of criminal and civil procedure, court administration, the number of authorized judges, the branches of the courts, the rules of jury service and admission to the bar. Our bill would strike this limitation on the D.C. Council's authority.

The District has never had authority over its local courts, even when it was responsible for paying for their operations. Under the National Capital Revitalization and Self-Government Improvement Act of 1997, the federal government assumed the costs for several state-level functions, including the courts because it alone has jurisdiction over these courts. This bill, an important first step, would not change the courts' funding. This bill also would not affect the authority of the President to nominate, or the Senate to confirm, local D.C. judges,

which has been within their purview since the creation of the modern local court system in 1970.

This bill is an important step to increase democratic self-government for the District. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

RECOGNIZING THE OFFICERS AT THE HAVERHILL, MASSACHUSETTS POLICE DEPARTMENT

HON. LORI TRAHAN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 15, 2019

Mrs. TRAHAN. Madam Speaker, I rise during National Law Enforcement Week 2019 to honor the valiant men and women who protect and serve the town of Haverhill, Massachusetts. The Haverhill Police Department consists of outstanding public servants who devote their lives to keeping the citizens of the city safe, while improving the lives of countless individuals.

Like most Americans each day, they get up, say goodbye to their loved ones, and head to work. But their work, and the work of police officers around the country, is like no other. From the moment they put on their uniform they have answered a call that at any moment may put their lives in harm's way.

I thank the Haverhill Police Department for their continued and unwavering service and wish them well in their careers and future endeavors to come.

Madam Speaker, it is with great honor that I recognize the Officers of the Haverhill, Massachusetts Police Department.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. GARRET GRAVES

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 15, 2019

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Madam Speaker, President Trump visited our home state and I missed two important votes.

Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 203; and YEA on Roll Call No. 204.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 2018 ALABAMA OUTSTANDING YOUNG FARM FAMILY

HON. MIKE ROGERS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 15, 2019

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Madam Speaker, I ask for the House's attention to recognize 2018 Alabama Outstanding Young Farm Family, the Upchurch family.

The Upchurch family are multi-generation farmers and received the honor at the Alabama Farmer's Federation's 46th Commodity Producers Conference in Montgomery. They also placed in the Top 10 at the American Farm Bureau Federation national contest in New Orleans.

The Upchurches—Chris, Jordyn and son Charlie—owns Rockin U farm in Clay County.

Their farm encompasses over 300 acres, 130 cows and three poultry houses. They're hard-working, forward-thinking stewards of the land whose recent diversification allows them to produce over 3,500 bales of haylage annually. They also partner on C&J Farm, a trucking and poultry house clean-out business.

Off the farm, they promote agriculture and rural living through Clay County Young Farmers, the county cattlemen's association and Lineville Baptist Church. Chris also serves as State Poultry Committee first vice chairman.

Madam Speaker, please join me in recognizing the 2018 Outstanding Young Farm Family: Chris and Jordyn Upchurch.

HONORING JOHN P. LARUE

HON. MICHAEL CLOUD

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 15, 2019

Mr. CLOUD. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor and recognize John LaRue, a resident of Corpus Christi, for his commitment to his community and to the Port of Corpus Christi.

Originally from Reading, Pennsylvania, John LaRue spent the first half of his career assisting the City of Philadelphia and its Port Authority. In 1994, Mr. LaRue relocated to Corpus Christi to become the Executive Director of the Port of Corpus Christi Authority. His responsibilities included organizing, planning, and administering the Port Authority's activities.

Thanks to Mr. LaRue's 25 years of leadership, the Port of Corpus Christi transformed from a Regional Port Authority to the "Energy Port of the Americas" and the fourth-largest port in the United States. The Port is a key contributor to America's global energy dominance and is continuing to expand. Mr. LaRue's widespread expertise on port policy is lauded both domestically and internationally.

In addition to providing leadership and guidance for the POCCA, Mr. LaRue also serves on multiple advisory boards and panels. He is Chairman of the State of Texas Department of Transportation Port Advisory Committee and serves as a member of the Port Industries of Corpus Christi, as well as on the Board of Directors of the American Association of Port Authorities.

On the occasion of his upcoming retirement, I would like to extend to John LaRue my thanks and appreciation for his valuable work at the Port of Corpus Christi Authority, and on the next exciting chapter of his life.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JIM COSTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 15, 2019

Mr. COSTA. Madam Speaker, regrettably, I was unable to attend the votes series for May 14, 2019. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA to Roll Call No. 203, H.R. 29 Blue Water Navy Vietnam Veterans Act of 2019, and YEA to Roll Call No. 204, H.R. 2379 To reauthorize the Bulletproof Vest Partnership Grant Program.

TRIBUTE TO RON WELLMAN

HON. VIRGINIA FOXX

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 15, 2019

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I rise to recognize Ron Wellman, Athletics Director at Wake Forest University, who is retiring in May 2019. He leaves as the longest-tenured athletics director in the country at the NCAA Division I level, having been named to the position at Wake Forest in 1992.

He has overseen the most successful period in athletics history at Wake Forest, which ranks first in the Directors Cup in the Atlantic Coast Conference (ACC), while achieving a student-athlete graduation rate of 94 percent.

Under Mr. Wellman, Wake Forest has thrived and has become a national powerhouse in men's tennis, men's soccer, and women's field hockey. The football program has seen the most successful stretch in school history recently as well.

Wake Forest's accomplishments under Wellman's leadership include five team and seven individual national titles, 22 ACC championships, 171 first team All-Americans and the renaissance of athletics facilities. During his tenure, Wake Forest has raised over \$400 million in philanthropic support for athletics.

Wellman has also played a significant role in shaping intercollegiate athletics on a regional and national level. He served on multiple committees, including the NCAA Division I Management Council and was chairman of the NCAA Division I Men's Basketball Championship Committee. Additionally, as former president of the Division I-A Athletic Directors' Association, Wellman served on the NCAA Diversity Leadership Strategic Planning Committee.

Wellman's efforts leading Wake Forest have not gone unnoticed. In 2007-08, he was honored by two organizations: Street & Smith's Sports Business Journal named him College Athletic Director of the Year and the National Association of Collegiate Directors of Athletics (NACDA) selected him as its AstroTurf AD of the Year for the Southeast Region—the second time in his career he received that honor.

Off the playing fields, Wellman helped enhance the overall development of the student-athlete. He stressed academics and instituted programs to assist and develop student-athletes in ways outside of competition. Most recently, Wake Forest athletics launched its Deacon Leader program, a comprehensive leadership development system designed to identify and develop student-athlete leaders from their arrival on campus through their senior year and beyond graduation.

Wellman earned his undergraduate degree from Bowling Green State University, where he was a pitcher on the baseball team. After receiving a master's from Bowling Green, he joined the faculty and coaching staff at Elmhurst (IL) College in 1971, serving as head baseball coach, assistant basketball and football coach and associate professor of health and physical education. Wellman was the athletics director during his last five years at Elmhurst.

I ask the House to join me in recognizing Mr. Ron Wellman, a leader of extraordinary conscience and character.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ERIC SWALWELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 15, 2019

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Madam Speaker, I missed votes on Tuesday, May 7, Thursday, May 9, and Friday, May 10. Had I been present, I would have voted as follows:

Roll Call Vote Number 185 (Passage of H. Res. 273): YES;

Roll Call Vote Number 186 (Passage of H.R. 1704, the Championing American Business Through Diplomacy Act): YES;

Roll Call Vote Number 189 (Ordering the Previous Question): YES;

Roll Call Vote Number 190 (Passage of H. Res. 357): YES;

Roll Call Vote Number 191 (Passage of H. AMDT. 199 to H.R. 986 offered by Rep. ANTHONY BROWN): YES;

Roll Call Vote Number 192 (Passage of H. AMDT. 203 to H.R. 986 offered by Rep. GEORGE HOLDING): NO;

Roll Call Vote Number 193 (Passage of H. AMDT. 207 to H.R. 986 offered by Rep. TOM MALINOWSKI): YES;

Roll Call Vote Number 194 (Passage of H. AMDT. 208 to H.R. 986 offered by Rep. SUSAN WILD): YES;

Roll Call Vote Number 195 (Adoption of Motion to Recommit to H.R. 986): NO;

Roll Call Vote Number 196 (Passage of H.R. 986, the Protecting Americans with Pre-existing Conditions Act): YES;

Roll Call Vote Number 197 (Passage of H. AMDT. 209 to H.R. 2157 offered by Rep. ED PERLMUTTER): YES;

Roll Call Vote Number 198 (Passage of H. AMDT. 210 to H.R. 2157 offered by Rep. GREGORIO KILILI CAMACHO SABLAN): YES;

Roll Call Vote Number 199 (Passage of H. AMDT. 214 to H.R. 2157 offered by Rep. JARED HUFFMAN): YES;

Roll Call Vote Number 200 (Passage of H. AMDT. 216 to H.R. 2157 offered by Rep. LIZZIE FLETCHER): YES;

Roll Call Vote Number 201 (Adoption of Motion to Recommit to H.R. 2157): NO; and

Roll Call Vote Number 202 (Passage of H.R. 2157, the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2019): YES.

COMMENDING THE ROANOKE VALLEY CHRISTIAN SCHOOL BOYS BASKETBALL TEAM

HON. H. MORGAN GRIFFITH

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 15, 2019

Mr. GRIFFITH. Madam Speaker, it is my pleasure to commend the Roanoke Valley Christian School boys basketball team, which captured the Virginia Association of Christian Athletics state title on February 23, 2019. The Eagles put on a commanding performance, handily defeating an exceptional team from Timberlake Christian School by a score of 66 to 42.

This victory carries particular meaning, as it is Roanoke Valley Christian's first boys basketball state championship in its history. Their championship caps a 27-4 season. I applaud

the hard work and dedication of all members of this year's Roanoke Valley Christian boys basketball team, and congratulate the administrators, teachers, coaches, parents, students, and fans. In particular, I would like to recognize the contributions of the team's seniors, and their head coach Todd Mann. Congratulations on a great end to the season.

IN HONOR OF ZORICA PANTIĆ,
OUTGOING PRESIDENT OF ONE
OF BOSTON'S TOP UNIVERSITIES—WENTWORTH INSTITUTE
OF TECHNOLOGY

HON. STEPHEN F. LYNCH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 15, 2019

Mr. LYNCH. Madam Speaker, I rise today in honor of Zorica Pantić, the first woman president of Wentworth Institute of Technology in Boston and first woman engineer to lead an institution of technology in higher education in the United States.

President Pantić is leaving her position at Wentworth at the end of May, following a 14-year-tenure that can only be described as transformative and historic in scope. Dr. Pantić's contributions to this 115-year-old institution have earned her respect far and wide. Just recently, while saluting Dr. Pantić during his keynote remarks at Wentworth's graduation on April 28, 2019, Charlie Baker, the esteemed Governor of Massachusetts, characterized President Pantić as, "a gift to Wentworth and blessing to Massachusetts."

Born in Serbia, Dr. Pantić first became interested in electrical engineering as a young girl, while watching her father work on repairing a radio. She went on to earn her B.S., M.S., and Ph.D. degrees in electrical engineering from the University of Niš, Serbia, and became the founding dean of the College of Engineering at the University of Texas at San Antonio; director of the School of Engineering at San Francisco State University; a Fulbright fellow at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign; and an associate professor at the University of Niš.

As Wentworth's President, she has been an important role model and tireless advocate for traditionally underrepresented students, particularly young women wishing to pursue a college education and career in the STEM arenas. Under her leadership, Wentworth has introduced its first seven graduate programs, becoming a master's degree-granting institution and achieving "university" status in 2017. Dr. Pantić has overseen the introduction of 10 new undergraduate programs (seven in engineering), a \$300 million investment in state-of-the-art facilities, and a 20 percent enrollment increase on the school's campus.

During her presidency, Wentworth has enhanced its experiential-learning educational model by implementing EPIC Learning (Externally-collaborative, Project-based, Interdisciplinary Culture for Learning), and is focusing on innovation and entrepreneurship. The Institute continues to earn annual recognition in the top national and regional college rankings.

Applauding her "energetic, entrepreneurial, and ambitious leadership style," the Council

for the Advancement and Support of Education, District 1, in 2017 honored Dr. Pantić with its Chief Executive Leadership Award. That same year, Dr. Pantić was inducted into the National Academy of Construction. In January 2018, Governor Baker appointed her to serve on the Massachusetts Cybersecurity Strategy Council. And more recently, the Greater Boston Chamber of Commerce honored her as one of its Pinnacle Award winners for 2019.

President Pantić has served on various boards and professional organizations, including the board of directors for the World Association for Cooperative Education, the American Association for Presidents of Independent Universities and Colleges, the New England Association for Schools and Colleges, the Massachusetts Workforce Investment Board, and the Presidents Council for the NCAA Division III.

Madam Speaker, Zorica is known for her love of students and for helping to guide and serve thousands of young women and men who have attended Wentworth since she became president in 2005. She is the proud mother of one son, Daniel Tanner, who graduated from Wentworth and is busy building his own career.

Madam Speaker, it is my distinct honor to thank Zorica Pantić for her incredible leadership over these past 14 years at one of Boston's oldest and most venerable educational institutions, and to salute her for her many contributions to higher education in the United States.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 100TH
BIRTHDAY OF WORLD WAR II
VETERAN RAYMOND BURRELL

HON. ROBERT J. WITTMAN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 15, 2019

Mr. WITTMAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the 100th birthday of World War II Veteran, Mr. Raymond Burrell.

In the winter of 1944–45, Raymond Burrell was a member of the famous 761st Tank Battalion, the Black Panthers. The 761st Tank Battalion was the first to consist of African-Americans and saw extensive action at the Battle of the Bulge. Raymond Burrell demonstrated bravery and a cunning military mind on multiple occasions. Despite experiencing seemingly hopeless situations, Raymond persevered along with the other members of the 761st Tank Battalion and held their vital positions on the battlefield. Our nation is lucky to have had someone like him risk his life to protect us all.

Madam Speaker, I ask you to join me in recognizing the accomplishments, bravery, and dedication of Raymond Burrell. Words alone cannot express our gratitude. May God bless Raymond Burrell, and I look forward to seeing his excellence in the future.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE SERVICE
OF THE HONORABLE SERGIO
AMARAL, AMBASSADOR OF
BRAZIL TO THE UNITED STATES
OF AMERICA

HON. GREGORY W. MEEKS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 15, 2019

Mr. MEEKS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the Brazilian Ambassador to the United States, Sergio Silva do Amaral, whose invaluable commitment to the bonds of friendship between Brazil and the American people has left an indelible mark on our bilateral and hemispheric relations. As Co-Chair of the Congressional Caucus on Brazil, I have worked on numerous occasions with Ambassador Amaral to deepen our bilateral relations, and build upon the great history of partnership between Brazil and America.

In September 2016, Sergio Amaral was appointed Ambassador of Brazil to the United States in Washington, D.C. Since then, Ambassador Amaral has worked tirelessly to promote a closer U.S.-Brazil friendship, as well as to promote the expansion of our economic, political, defense, and cultural relations, bringing a message of friendliness and cooperation during his travels through our country in furtherance of his mission to spread Brazil's message of peace and prosperity for all people. On June 1, when he retires from his Ambassadorial role in the U.S., he will conclude nearly 45 years of service to Brazil. His time as Brazil's Ambassador is thus an appropriate capstone to his long and distinguished career.

Born in São Paulo, Brazil, and as a graduate of the University of São Paulo and the University of Paris, France, Ambassador Amaral has served in a number of senior official posts in the Brazilian public service over five decades. Prior to his appointment as Ambassador to the U.S., he served as Ambassador to London and Ambassador to Paris, as well as Minister of Development, Trade and Industry, and Chief-Minister for Social Communication of Brazil's Presidency. His other notable positions include Vice Minister of Environment and the Amazon, Secretary for International Affairs of the Ministry of Economy, President of the Council of Brazil's Chamber of Foreign Trade, and President of the Brazil-China Business Council.

Ambassador Sergio Amaral has continuously reminded us of the great potential that lies ahead of Brazil and the United States as two of the largest democracies and economies in the Western Hemisphere. We must build upon the common beliefs that have historically connected the peoples of Brazil and America: our commitment to democracy, our commitment to the rule of law, and our commitment to the dignity of all people in our own countries and around the world. Today, I thank Ambassador Sergio Amaral for his service to these ideals, and wish him a long and happy retirement.

RECOGNITION OF SHEIDA
SAHANDY

HON. DENNY HECK

OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 15, 2019

Mr. HECK. Madam Speaker, today I recognize Sheida Sahandy for her extraordinary and unwavering dedication to the people of Washington state and efforts to restore Puget Sound. For over five years, Sheida served as the Executive Director of the Puget Sound Partnership, the state agency leading the coordination of Puget Sound recovery.

Sheida received her bachelor's degree from the University of California, Berkeley, and then went on to study law at Columbia University. After working as an attorney for several years, Sheida returned to the classroom and earned her master's degree in Climate, Energy, and Environmental Policy from Harvard University's Kennedy School of Government. Back in Washington state, Sheida used her notable background and legal expertise to spearhead programs and initiatives as Assistant to the City Manager for the City of Bellevue, where she created the City's first citywide environmental stewardship initiative.

In January 2014, Governor Jay Inslee appointed Sheida to serve as Executive Director of the Puget Sound Partnership, where for years she demonstrated her commitment to sustainability and conservancy issues in Washington state. The Puget Sound Partnership works with hundreds of partners and stakeholders to coalesce around a common goal: accelerating the collective effort to recover and sustain the Puget Sound. On federal-level issues, Sheida worked with the Congressional Puget Sound Recovery Caucus—which I co-chair along with my friend and colleague, DEREK KILMER—to convene key decision-makers here at the Capitol for the annual Puget Sound Day on the Hill. This event brings people from across the political spectrum to Washington, D.C. to advocate for increased federal attention to Puget Sound. Sheida also worked tirelessly with the Congressional Puget Sound Recovery Caucus to successfully craft and garner support for the PUGET SOS Act, which would increase federal and state coordination on recovery efforts.

Whether it's leading efforts at the state level to revitalize the salmon and orca populations, or working with legislators in Washington, D.C. to enact critical legislation, Sheida has always been an effective leader and the driving force behind the Puget Sound Partnership's success.

Madam Speaker, it is my honor to recognize the selfless service of Sheida Sahandy, and I wish her and her family happiness as Sheida proceeds to the next chapter in her remarkable career.

COMMEMORATING THE 213TH ANNI-
VERSARY OF THE CANEY FORK
BAPTIST CHURCH

HON. JOHN W. ROSE

OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 15, 2019

Mr. JOHN W. ROSE of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Caney

Fork Baptist Church in honor of their 213th anniversary.

A longstanding pillar in the Cookeville community, the Caney Fork Baptist Church, originally referred to as "Brown's Mill Church," is Putnam County's oldest Baptist Church. Joshua Bartlett and his wife, Winnie Williams Bartlett, founded the church after relocating to Tennessee from Boonesborough, Kentucky, in 1806. They constructed a fort, and within it was the cabin first used to host worship gatherings for the Caney Fork Baptist Church. The congregation relocated in 1931 to Highway 70 East in Cookeville, which is where they remain today.

In the early days of Tennessee's statehood, churches far outnumbered preachers. As was common then, the Caney Fork Baptist Church hosted traveling "revival preachers" for their services.

Throughout its history, the congregation affiliated with the general tenets of the Baptist denomination. From 1865 to 1897, the congregation embraced the Independent Baptist Christian denominational beliefs; they affiliated with the Free Will Baptist congregation from 1897 to 1918; and in 1918, the congregation joined with the larger Baptist denomination. Today, the Caney Fork Baptist Church is affiliated with the Stone Baptist Association, the Tennessee Baptist Mission Board, and the Southern Baptist Convention.

I hope my House colleagues will join me in recognizing the Caney Fork Baptist Church for their longstanding service to the community, commitment to strengthening family values, and unwavering faith.

RECOGNIZING TOM MORRISON

HON. ERIC SWALWELL

OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 15, 2019

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Madam Speaker, I rise to recognize the life's work of Thomas Roger Morrison, who served as a trusted local reporter and staple on televisions in my district since 1982.

Tom was born in Oakland, California on January 7, 1936 to proud parents, Lozetta and John Morrison. Shortly after his graduation from Oakland High School in 1954, Tom joined the Army and deployed to Korea. He patrolled the newly established Korean Demilitarized Zone in 1956 and 1957.

Tom took on the role of a volunteer reporter for local Channel TV 30 in 1982. After reporting on local stories for a time, Tom joined the TV 30 staff and became the anchor of the 580/680 News. He served in this role for 10 years and received two prestigious Bay Area Television Association awards for his work during that time.

After budgets no longer allowed the 580/680 News program to continue, Tom kept our community informed on local news and developments through his bi-weekly "Mayor's Report." With this platform, he would meet with local mayors and county supervisors to ensure that local residents had access to information about upcoming events and what was happening in their local government.

Tom's connection to the community was deep. His voice became synonymous with the

annual Saint Patrick's Day parade in my hometown of Dublin, as he served as the announcer for so many years. Whether he was reporting from the tarmac at the Livermore Airshow, hosting an election special, or a segment of the Slice of Life show, Tom was a trusted and revered source of news in my district.

Tom's work on behalf of our community continued until just two months ago, very shortly before his passing. His passion and commitment were recently memorialized when the studio at TV 30 adopted the honorary title, "Tom Morrison Studio."

After a long and valiant battle with cancer, Tom Morrison passed away peacefully on April 18, 2019. He is survived by a large and loving family, including Kathy, his wife of 23 years, his two sons, Kevin and Michael, his step-children, Stacey, Kristin, Amy, and Bradley, his sister Jenean, and the eight grandchildren he absolutely adored.

REMEMBERING THE LIFE OF JOHN
K. VADAS

HON. TIM RYAN

OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 15, 2019

Mr. RYAN. Madam Speaker, I was saddened to learn of the passing of Mr. John K. Vadas, age 69, who passed away peacefully on Tuesday, May 7, 2019.

John's son Matt is one of my longest serving staff members. I very much depend on him to help me fulfill my duties and I am very proud of his service.

John was born on January 19, 1950, in Warren, Ohio to John and Margaret. He was a 1968 graduate of John F. Kennedy High School in Warren. I too am a graduate of JFK.

He proudly served his country in the U.S. Navy from 1969 to 1972, where he was the radar operator on the USS *Wasp*. Upon his honorable discharge, John took a position working for Packard Electric. He retired from Delphi in 2001.

On April 11, 1970, John married the former Sandra Allen.

John loved the outdoors and found peace in the woods by carving out time to go hunting and camping. He was an avid fan of the Cleveland Indians and NASCAR, cheering on driver Kevin Harvick. He stayed in touch with his shipmates as a member of the USS *Wasp* Association. Most importantly, John was a patriot who loved his family and was a devoted husband and father.

After 49 years of marriage, John is survived by his wife Sandra, and also survived by his sons, (Jon) Kristopher, Jason and Matthew Vadas; his brother, Michael (Judy) Vadas; as well as many other relatives and friends.

He was preceded in death by his son, Kevin Vadas; his parents; and his brother, William Poppal.

I extend my deepest sympathies to Matt and all the family and friends whose lives were blessed by John Vadas.

HONORING CHIEF JEFFREY
WALCOTT, SCHUYLKILL HAVEN
POLICE DEPARTMENT

HON. DANIEL MEUSER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 15, 2019

Mr. MEUSER. Madam Speaker, it is with great respect and admiration that I rise today to honor Schuylkill Haven Police Chief Jeffrey Walcott for his 25 years of service. Chief Walcott has been a remarkable leader of the Schuylkill Haven Police Department. Through promoting public safety and community he has become a fixture of Schuylkill Haven Elementary Center's "Salute to Blue Program."

A veteran of the United States Air Force, Chief Walcott has been a model officer and public servant for citizens of all ages. He is a skilled officer, certified in firearms instruction, active shooter response, and teaches G.R.A.P.L.E for Law Enforcement and Military Personnel. He has certainly earned the respect of the community he protects and the officers he serves alongside.

After 25 years leading the "Salute to Blue" Program, I invite my colleagues to join me in saluting Chief Jeffrey Walcott for his dedicated service and dedication to the Greater Schuylkill Haven Community. On behalf of the United States House of Representatives and the citizens of Pennsylvania's Ninth Congressional District, I extend my sincerest appreciation and respect for Chief Walcott's lifetime of service.

COMMEMORATING NATIONAL
POLICE WEEK

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 15, 2019

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, as a member of the Law Enforcement Caucus and a senior member of the Committees on Judiciary and Homeland Security, I rise to commemorate National Police Week, which runs from May 12 through May 18, 2019.

It is altogether fitting and proper that we do this.

The National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial is the nation's monument to law enforcement officers who have died in the line of duty.

Dedicated on October 15, 1991, the Memorial honors federal, state and local law enforcement officers who have made the ultimate sacrifice for the safety and protection of our nation and its people.

Carved on its walls are the names of 21,910 officers who have been killed in the line of duty throughout U.S. history, dating back to the first known death in 1791.

Added to the Wall this year will be the names of the 158 police officers killed in the line of duty in 2018.

Madam Speaker, enshrined on the Memorial Wall of Honor also are the names of 1,751 fallen peace officers from the state of Texas, the most of any state, including 115 members of the Houston Police Department who gave their lives to keep their city safe.

Madam Speaker, today there are more than 900,000 law enforcement personnel serving

the people of our country, the highest amount ever.

About 12 percent of them are female.

These brave men and women risk their lives to keep the peace and keep us safe, but they are too often taken by the violence they are working to prevent.

Every year, a law enforcement officer is killed somewhere in the United States every 55 hours, and there are also 60,211 assaults against our law officers each year, resulting in 17,476 injuries.

Madam Speaker, I am proud to represent the people of the 18th Congressional District of Texas in paying tribute to the 158 fallen heroes who will be joining the 21,910 gallant men and women who gave the last full measure of devotion to the communities they took an oath to protect and serve.

Madam Speaker, I ask for a moment of silence in memory of the 158 officers who died in the line of duty in 2018 and an additional 213 officers who died in previous years but whose story had been lost to history, the names of all of whom will be added to the National Peace Officers Memorial Wall of Honor.

HOUSTON LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS
MEMORIALIZED ON THE WALL OF HONOR

1. Timothy Scott Abernethy; End of Watch: December 7, 2008; Houston, Texas, P.D.
2. Charles H. Baker; End of Watch: August 16, 1979; Houston, Texas, P.D.
3. Johnny Terrell Bamsch; End of Watch: January 30, 1975; Houston, Texas, P.D.
4. Claude R. Beck; End of Watch: December 10, 1971; Houston, Texas, P.D.
5. Jack B. Beets; End of Watch: March 30, 1955; Houston, Texas, P.D.
6. TROY A. BLAND; End of Watch: May 19, 1999; Houston, Texas, P.D.
7. James Charles Boswell; End of Watch: December 9, 1989; Houston, Texas, P.D.
8. C.E. Branon; End of Watch: March 20, 1959; Houston, Texas, P.D.
9. John M. Cain; End of Watch: August 3, 1911; Houston, Texas, P.D.
10. Richard H. Calhoun; End of Watch: October 10, 1975; Houston Texas Police Department.
11. Dionicio M. Camacho; End of Watch: October 23, 2009; Harris County, Texas, S.O.
12. Henry Canales; End of Watch: June 23, 2009; Houston, Texas, P.D.
13. Frank Manuel Cantu, Jr.; End of Watch: March 25, 2004; Houston, Texas, P.D.
14. E.C. Chavez; End of Watch: September 17, 1925; Houston, Texas, P.D.
15. Charles Roy Clark; End of Watch: April 3, 2003; Houston, Texas, P.D.
16. Charles Robert Coates II; End of Watch: February 23, 1983; Houston, Texas, P.D.
17. Pete Corrales; End of Watch: January 25, 1925; Houston, Texas, P.D.
18. Rufus E. Daniels; End of Watch: August 23, 1917; Houston, Texas, P.D.
19. Johnnie Davidson; End of Watch: February 19, 1921; Houston, Texas, P.D.
20. Worth Davis; End of Watch: June 17, 1928; Houston, Texas, P.D.
21. Keith Alan Dees; End of Watch: March 7, 2002; Houston, Texas, P.D.
22. Reuben Becerra DeLeon; End of Watch: October 26, 2005; Houston, Texas, P.D.
23. William Edwin DeLeon; End of Watch: March 29, 1982; Houston, Texas, P.D.
24. Floyd T. Deloach, Jr.; End of Watch: June 30, 1965; Houston, Texas, P.D.
25. George D. Edwards; End of Watch: June 30, 1939; Houston, Texas, P.D.
26. Dawn Suzanne Erickson; End of Watch: December 24, 1995; Houston, Texas, P.D.
27. J.C. Etheridge; End of Watch: August 23, 1924; Houston, Texas, P.D.

28. James E. Fenn; End of Watch: March 14, 1891; Houston, Texas, P.D.

29. E.D. Fitzgerald; End of Watch: September 30, 1930; Houston, Texas, P.D.

30. C. Edward Foley; End of Watch: March 10, 1860; Houston, Texas, P.D.

31. Joseph Robert Free; End of Watch: October 18, 1912; Houston, Texas, P.D.

32. Guy P. Gaddis; End of Watch: January 31, 1994; Houston, Texas, P.D.

33. James T. Gambill; End of Watch: December 1, 1936; Houston, Texas, P.D.

34. Florentino M. Garcia, Jr.; End of Watch: November 10, 1989; Houston, Texas, P.D.

35. Ben Eddie Gerhart; End of Watch: June 26, 1968; Houston, Texas, P.D.

36. G.Q. Gonzalez; End of Watch: February 28, 1960; Houston, Texas, P.D.

37. Charles R. Gougenheim; End of Watch: April 30, 1955; Houston, Texas, P.D.

38. Carl Greene; End of Watch: March 14, 1928; Houston, Texas, P.D.

39. Leon Griggs; End of Watch: January 31, 1970; Houston, Texas, P.D.

40. Maria Michelle Groves; End of Watch: April 10, 1987; Houston, Texas, P.D.

41. Gary Allen Gryder; End of Watch: June 29, 2008; Houston, Texas, P.D.

42. Antonio Guzman, Jr.; End of Watch: January 9, 1973; Houston, Texas, P.D.

43. Howard B. Hammond; End of Watch: August 18, 1946; Houston, Texas, P.D.

44. James Donald Harris; End of Watch: July 13, 1982; Houston, Texas, P.D.

45. David Michael Healy; End of Watch: November 12, 1994; Houston, Texas, P.D.

46. Timothy A. Hearn; End of Watch: June 8, 1978; Houston, Texas, P.D.

47. Oscar Hope; End of Watch: June 22, 1929; Houston, Texas, P.D.

48. Elston M. Howard; End of Watch: July 20, 1988; Houston, Texas, P.D.

49. David Huerta; End of Watch: September 19, 1973; Houston, Texas, P.D.

50. James Bruce Irby; End of Watch: June 27, 1990; Houston, Texas, P.D.

51. Bobby L. James; End of Watch: June 26, 1968; Houston, Texas, P.D.

52. John C. James; End of Watch: December 12, 1901; Houston, Texas, P.D.

53. Rodney Joseph Johnson; End of Watch: September 21, 2006; Houston, Texas, P.D.

54. Ed Jones; End of Watch: September 13, 1929; Houston, Texas, P.D.

55. P.P. Jones; End of Watch: January 30, 1927; Houston, Texas, P.D.

56. Frank L. Kellogg; End of Watch: November 30, 1955; Houston, Texas, P.D.

57. S.A. Buster Kent; End of Watch: January 12, 1954; Houston, Texas, P.D.

58. James F. Kilty; End of Watch: April 8, 1976; Houston, Texas, P.D.

59. Kent Dean Kincaid; End of Watch: May 23, 1998; Houston, Texas, P.D.

60. Louis R. Kuba; End of Watch: May 17, 1967; Houston, Texas, P.D.

61. J.D. Landry; End of Watch: December 3, 1930; Houston, Texas, P.D.

62. Robert Wayne Lee; End of Watch: January 31, 1971; Houston, Texas, P.D.

63. Fred Maddox, Jr.; End of Watch: February 24, 1954; Houston, Texas, P.D.

64. Eydulmen Mani; End of Watch: May 19, 2010; Houston, Texas, P.D.

65. A.P. Marshall; End of Watch: November 8, 1937; Houston, Texas, P.D.

66. Charles R. McDaniel; End of Watch: August 4, 1963; Houston, Texas, P.D.

67. E.G. Meinke; End of Watch: August 23, 1917; Houston, Texas, P.D.

68. Harry Mereness; End of Watch: October 18, 1933; Houston, Texas, P.D.

69. Noel R. Miller; End of Watch: June 6, 1958; Houston, Texas, P.D.

70. Kenneth L. Moody; End of Watch: November 26, 1969; Houston, Texas, P.D.

71. Horace Moody; End of Watch: August 23, 1917; Houston, Texas, P.D.

72. William Moss; End of Watch: September 12, 1983; Houston Airport Police, Texas

73. Dave Murdock; End of Watch: June 27, 1921; Houston, Texas, P.D.

74. William E. Murphy; End of Watch: April 1, 1910; Houston, Texas, P.D.

75. David Franklin Noel; End of Watch: June 17, 1972; Houston, Texas, P.D.

76. M.E. Palmer; End of Watch: March 24, 1938; Houston, Texas, P.D.

77. Isaac Parson; End of Watch: May 24, 1914; Houston, Texas, P.D.

78. Ross Patton; End of Watch: August 23, 1917; Houston, Texas, P.D.

79. Stephen Albert Perez; End of Watch: August 27, 2017; Houston, Texas, P.D.

80. W.B. Phares; End of Watch: September 30, 1930; Houston, Texas, P.D.

81. Herbert N. Planer; End of Watch: February 18, 1965; Houston, Texas, P.D.

82. Ira Raney; End of Watch: August 23, 1917; Houston, Texas, P.D.

83. Winston J. Rawlings; End of Watch: March 29, 1982; Houston, Texas, P.D.

84. Jerry Lawrence Riley; End of Watch: June 18, 1974; Houston, Texas, P.D.

85. John Charles Risley; End of Watch: October 23, 2000; Harris County, Texas, S.O.

86. Sandra Ann Robbins; End of Watch: March 17, 1991; South Houston, Texas, P.D.

87. George G. Rojas; End of Watch: January 28, 1976; Houston, Texas, P.D.

88. Michael P. Roman; End of Watch: January 6, 1994; Houston, Texas, P.D.

89. John Anthony Salvaggio; End of Watch: November 25, 1990; Houston, Texas, P.D.

90. Louis L. Sander; End of Watch: January 21, 1967; Houston, Texas, P.D.

91. Jeffery Scott Sanford; End of Watch: September 14, 1991; Harris County, Texas, S.O.

92. Kathleen C. Schaefer; End of Watch: August 18, 1982; Houston, Texas, P.D.

93. Robert Schultea; End of Watch: August 25, 1956; Houston, Texas, P.D.

94. Daryl Wayne Shirley; End of Watch: April 28, 1982; Houston, Texas, P.D.

95. Richard Snow; End of Watch: March 17, 1882; Houston, Texas, P.D.

96. Bruno David Soboleski; End of Watch: April 12, 1991; Houston, Texas, P.D.

97. Jerry Leon Spruill; End of Watch: October 27, 1972; Houston, Texas, P.D.

98. R.H. Sullivan; End of Watch: March 9, 1935; Houston, Texas, P.D.

99. John W. Suttle; End of Watch: August 3, 1959; Houston, Texas, P.D.

100. Cuong Huy Trinh; End of Watch: April 6, 1997; Houston, Texas, P.D.

101. Alberto Vasquez; End of Watch: May 22, 2001; Houston, Texas, P.D.

102. James T. Walker; End of Watch: March 8, 1963; Houston, Texas, P.D.

103. Victor R. Wells III; End of Watch: October 2, 1980; Houston, Texas, P.D.

104. R.O. Wells; End of Watch: July 30, 1927; Houston, Texas, P.D.

105. Albert Charles Wilkins; End of Watch: January 6, 1978; Harris County, Texas, C.O.

106. Kevin Scott Will; End of Watch: May 29, 2011; Houston, Texas, P.D.

107. Henry Williams; End of Watch: February 8, 1886; Houston, Texas, P.D.

108. William C. Williams Jr; End of Watch: April 16, 1930; Harris County, Texas, S.O.

109. Edd Williams; End of Watch: January 12, 1974; Harris County, Texas, S.O.

110. James Franklin Willis; End of Watch: July 1, 1964; Houston, Texas, P.D.

111. Marvin Alton Winter; End of Watch: December 4, 1937; Harris County, Texas, C.O., Pct. 4

112. Andrew Winzer; End of Watch: February 18, 1988; Houston, Texas, P.D.

113. Jeter Young; End of Watch: June 19, 1921; Houston, Texas, P.D.

114. Herman Youngst; End of Watch: December 12, 1901; Houston, Texas, P.D.

115. Joe A. Zamarron; End of Watch: April 18, 1981; Houston, Texas, P.D.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, May 16, 2019 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

MAY 20

4 p.m.

Committee on Armed Services
Subcommittee on Readiness and Management Support
Closed business meeting to markup those provisions which fall under the subcommittee's jurisdiction of the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2020.

SR-232A

5 p.m.

Committee on Armed Services
Subcommittee on Airland
Closed business meeting to markup those provisions which fall under the subcommittee's jurisdiction of the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2020.

SR-232A

Committee on Foreign Relations
To receive a closed briefing on the prospects for Afghan peace.

SVC-217

5:30 p.m.

Committee on Armed Services
Subcommittee on Strategic Forces
Closed business meeting to markup those provisions which fall under the subcommittee's jurisdiction of the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2020.

SR-232A

MAY 21

9:30 a.m.

Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
To hold hearings to examine climate change and the agriculture sector.

SR-328A

Committee on Armed Services
Subcommittee on Cybersecurity
Closed business meeting to markup those provisions which fall under the subcommittee's jurisdiction of the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2020.

SR-232A

10 a.m.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

To hold hearings to examine combating illicit financing by anonymous shell companies through the collection of beneficial ownership information.

SD-538

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources

To hold hearings to examine opportunities to advance renewable energy and energy efficiency efforts in the United States.

SD-366

Committee on the Judiciary

To hold hearings to examine the digital advertising ecosystem and the impact of data privacy and competition policy.

SD-226

11 a.m.

Committee on Armed Services

Subcommittee on SeaPower

Closed business meeting to markup those provisions which fall under the subcommittee's jurisdiction of the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2020.

SR-232A

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Armed Services

Subcommittee on Personnel

Business meeting to markup those provisions which fall under the subcommittee's jurisdiction of the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2020.

SD-G50

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation

Subcommittee on Communications, Technology, Innovation, and the Internet

To hold hearings to examine the use of persuasive technology on internet platforms, focusing on optimizing for engagement.

SD-106

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

Subcommittee on Federal Spending Oversight and Emergency Management

To hold hearings to examine the Government Accountability Office's annual duplication report.

SD-342

3:30 p.m.

Committee on Armed Services

Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities

Closed business meeting to markup those provisions which fall under the subcommittee's jurisdiction of the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2020.

SR-232A

MAY 22

9 a.m.

Committee on Armed Services

Closed business meeting to markup the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2020.

SR-222

9:30 a.m.

Committee on Appropriations

Subcommittee on Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies

To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2020 for the Department of the Interior.

SD-124

Special Committee on Aging

To hold hearings to examine aging and disability in the 21st century, focusing on how technology can help maintain health and quality of life.

SD-562

10 a.m.

Committee on Appropriations

Subcommittee on Department of Defense

To hold closed hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2020 for the Missile Defense Agency.

SVC-217

Committee on Environment and Public Works

To hold hearings to examine legislation to address the risks associated with per-and polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS).

SD-406

Committee on the Judiciary

To hold hearings to examine pending nominations.

SD-226

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship

To hold hearings to examine reauthorization of the Small Business Administration Office of Advocacy.

SD-106

Committee on Veterans' Affairs

To hold hearings to examine S. 123, 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, S. 221, to amend title 38, United States Code, to require the Under Secretary of Health to report major adverse personnel actions involving certain health care employees to the National Practitioner Data Bank and to applicable State licensing boards, S. 318, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to furnish medically necessary transportation for newborn children of certain women veterans, S. 450, to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to carry out a pilot program to expedite the onboarding process for new medical providers of the Department of Veterans Affairs, to reduce the duration of the hiring process for such medical providers, S. 514, to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the benefits and services provided by the Department of Veterans Affairs to women veterans, S. 524, to establish the Department of Veterans Affairs Advisory Committee on Tribal and Indian Affairs, S. 711, to amend title 38, United States Code, to expand eligibility for mental health services from the Department of Veterans Affairs to include members of the reserve components of the Armed Forces, S. 746, to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to conduct a study on the accessibility of websites of the Department of Veterans Affairs to individuals with disabilities, S. 785, to improve mental health care provided by the Department of Veterans Affairs, S. 805, to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the processing of veterans benefits by the Department of Veterans Affairs, to limit the authority of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to recover overpayments made by the Department and other amounts owed by veterans to the United States, to improve the due process accorded veterans with respect to such recovery, S. 850, to extend the au-

thorization of appropriations to the Department of Veterans Affairs for purposes of awarding grants to veterans service organizations for the transportation of highly rural veterans, S. 857, to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase the amount of special pension for Medal of Honor recipients, S. 980, to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the provision of services for homeless veterans, S. 1101, to ensure that only licensed health care providers furnish disability examinations under a certain Department of Veterans Affairs pilot program for use of contract physicians for disability examinations, S. 1154, to amend title 38, United States Code, to establish an advisory committee on the implementation by the Department of Veterans Affairs of an electronic health record, an original bill entitled, "Janey Ensminger Act of 2019", and an original bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend the authority of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to continue to pay educational assistance or subsistence allowances to eligible persons when educational institutions are temporarily closed.

SR-418

MAY 23

9 a.m.

Committee on Armed Services

Closed business meeting to markup the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2020.

SR-222

9:30 a.m.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

To hold hearings to examine resources needed to protect and secure the homeland.

SD-342

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S2845–2892

Measures Introduced: Twenty-eight bills and two resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 1471–1498, S. Res. 211, and S. Con. Res. 16.

Pages S2883–84

Measures Reported:

H.R. 540, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 770 Ayrault Road in Fairport, New York, as the “Louise and Bob Slaughter Post Office”.

H.R. 828, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 25 Route 111 in Smithtown, New York, as the “Congressman Bill Carney Post Office”.

H.R. 829, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1450 Montauk Highway in Mastic, New York, as the “Army Specialist Thomas J. Wilwerth Post Office Building”.

S. 347, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 40 Fulton Street in Middletown, New York, as the “Benjamin A. Gilman Post Office Building”.

S. 1196, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1715 Linnerud Drive in Sun Prairie, Wisconsin, as the “Fire Captain Cory Barr Post Office Building”.

Page S2882

Measures Passed:

National Sexual Assault Awareness and Prevention Month: Committee on the Judiciary was discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 178, recognizing and supporting the goals and ideals of National Sexual Assault Awareness and Prevention Month, and the resolution was then agreed to.

Pages S2877–78

Appointments:

Congressional Budget Office: The Chair made the following announcement: The President Pro Tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, pursuant to the provisions of Section 201(a)(2) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, have appointed Dr. Phillip Swagel as Director of the

Congressional Budget Office, effective June 3, 2019, for the term expiring January 3, 2023. **Page S2892**

Message from the President: Senate received the following message from the President of the United States:

Transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the issuance of an Executive Order declaring a national emergency to deal with the threat posed by the unrestricted acquisition or use in the United States of information and communications technology or services designed, developed, manufactured, or supplied by persons owned by, controlled by, or subject to the jurisdiction or direction of foreign adversaries; which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs. (PM–17)

Pages S2880–81

Vitter Nomination—Agreement: By 51 yeas to 45 nays (Vote No. EX. 111), Senate agreed to the motion to close further debate on the nomination of Wendy Vitter, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Louisiana.

Page S2878

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that Senate resume consideration of the nomination, post-cloture, at approximately 10 a.m., on Thursday, May 16, 2019.

Page S2892

Bulatao Nomination—Cloture: By 90 yeas to 5 nays (Vote No. EX. 112), Senate agreed to the motion to close further debate on the nomination of Brian J. Bulatao, of Texas, to be an Under Secretary of State (Management).

Pages S2878–79

Rosen Nomination—Cloture: Senate resumed consideration of the nomination of Jeffrey A. Rosen, of Virginia, to be Deputy Attorney General, Department of Justice.

Page S2879

During consideration of this nomination today, Senate also took the following action:

By 52 yeas to 44 nays (Vote No. EX. 113), Senate agreed to the motion to close further debate on the nomination.

Page S2879

Vitter, Bulatao, and Rosen Nominations—Agreement: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that notwithstanding Rule XXII, the votes on confirmation of the nominations of Wendy Vitter, to be United States District Judge for the

Eastern District of Louisiana, and Brian J. Bulatao, of Texas, to be an Under Secretary of State (Management), occur at 12 noon, on Thursday, May 16, 2019, and the vote on confirmation of the nomination of Jeffrey A. Rosen, of Virginia, to be Deputy Attorney General, Department of Justice, occur at 1:45 p.m., on Thursday, May 16, 2019. **Page S2856**

Nomination Confirmed: Senate confirmed the following nomination:

By 52 yeas to 45 nays (Vote No. EX. 110), Kenneth Kiyul Lee, of California, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit.

Pages S2845–77, S2878, S2892

Messages from the House: **Page S2881**

Measures Referred: **Page S2881**

Measures Placed on the Calendar:
Pages S2877, S2881

Executive Communications: **Pages S2881–82**

Executive Reports of Committees: **Pages S2882–83**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S2884–87**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions:
Pages S2887–91

Additional Statements: **Page S2880**

Authorities for Committees to Meet:
Pages S2891–82

Privileges of the Floor: **Page S2892**

Record Votes: Four record votes were taken today. (Total—113) **Pages S2878–79**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 7:30 p.m., until 10 a.m. on Thursday, May 16, 2019. (For Senate’s program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today’s Record on page S2892.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

APPROPRIATIONS: FOREST SERVICE

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies concluded a hearing to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2020 for the Department of Agriculture Forest Service, after receiving testimony from Vicki Christiansen, Chief, and John Rapp, Director for Strategic Planning, Budget and Accountability, both of the Forest Service, Department of Agriculture.

INTELLIGENCE PROGRAM UPDATE

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Department of Defense concluded a closed hearing to exam-

ine an intelligence program update and global threat assessment, after receiving testimony from Susan M. Gordon, Principal Deputy Director of National Intelligence; Gina C. Haspel, Director, Central Intelligence Agency; and General Paul M. Nakasone, Director, National Security Agency and Commander, Cyber Command, Department of Defense.

APPROPRIATIONS: DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Financial Services and General Government concluded a hearing to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2020 for the Department of the Treasury, after receiving testimony from Steven T. Mnuchin, Secretary, and Charles P. Rettig, Commissioner, Internal Revenue Service, both of the Department of the Treasury.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Armed Services: Committee ordered favorably reported 920 nominations in the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps.

FINANCIAL REGULATORS OVERSIGHT

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: Committee concluded an oversight hearing to examine financial regulators, after receiving testimony from Joseph M. Otting, Comptroller of the Currency; Randal K. Quarles, Vice Chair for Supervision, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System; Jelena McWilliams, Chairman, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation; and Rodney E. Hood, Chairman, National Credit Union Administration.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:

S. 737, to direct the National Science Foundation to support STEM education research focused on early childhood;

S. 1228, to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to provide for enhanced penalties for pirate radio;

S. 1289, to require the Secretary of Commerce to conduct an assessment and analysis of the effects of broadband deployment and adoption on the economy of the United States;

S. 1294, to require Federal agencies with jurisdiction over broadband deployment to enter into an interagency agreement related to certain types of funding for broadband deployment, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute; and

S. 1439, to reauthorize activities of the Maritime Administration, with amendments.

NOMINATION

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nomination of Stephen M. Dickson, of Georgia, to be Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, after the nominee testified and answered questions in his own behalf.

POWER MARKETING ADMINISTRATIONS

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Water and Power concluded a hearing to examine issues and challenges at the Power Marketing Administrations, after receiving testimony from Mark A. Gabriel, Administrator, Western Area Power Administration, Daniel M. James, Deputy Administrator, Bonneville Power Administration, Kenneth E. Legg, Administrator, Southeastern Power Administration, and Mike Wech, Administrator, Southwestern Power Administration, all of the Department of Energy; and Nicki Fuller, Southwestern Power Resources Association, Tulsa, Oklahoma.

COUNCIL ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY OVERSIGHT

Committee on Environment and Public Works: Committee concluded an oversight hearing to examine the Council on Environmental Quality, after receiving testimony from Mary B. Neumayr, Chairman, Council on Environmental Quality.

THE FUTURE OF ARMS CONTROL POST-INF TREATY

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the future of arms control post-Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces Treaty, after receiving testimony from Andrea L. Thompson, Under Secretary of State for Arms Control and International Security; and David J. Trachtenberg, Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Policy.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:

S. 1378, to repeal the multi-State plan program, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 1388, to manage supply chain risk through counterintelligence training;

S. 1434, to prohibit the use of reverse auctions for design and construction services procurements;

S. 1430, to amend title 5, United States Code, to prevent fraud by representative payees, with an amendment;

S. 1333, to amend the Improper Payments Elimination and Recovery Improvement Act of 2012, including making changes to the Do Not Pay Initia-

tive, for improved detection, prevention, and recovery of improper payments to deceased individuals;

S. 411, to establish a Counterterrorism Advisory Board, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 1275, to require the collection of voluntary feedback on services provided by agencies;

S. 1420, to amend title 5, United States Code, to improve the effectiveness of major rules in accomplishing their regulatory objectives by promoting retrospective review;

S. 580, to amend the Act of August 25, 1958, commonly known as the “Former Presidents Act of 1958”, with respect to the monetary allowance payable to a former President, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. Con. Res. 15, expressing support for the designation of October 28, 2019, as “Honoring the Nation’s First Responders Day”;

H.R. 1079, to require the Director of the Office of Management and Budget to issue guidance on electronic consent forms;

H.R. 1654, to amend title 44, United States Code, to modernize the Federal Register;

H.R. 1590, to require an exercise related to terrorist and foreign fighter travel;

S. 347, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 40 Fulton Street in Middletown, New York, as the “Benjamin A. Gilman Post Office Building”;

S. 1196, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1715 Linnerud Drive in Sun Prairie, Wisconsin, as the “Fire Captain Cory Barr Post Office Building”;

H.R. 540, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 770 Ayrault Road in Fairport, New York, as the “Louise and Bob Slaughter Post Office”;

H.R. 828, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 25 Route 111 in Smithtown, New York, as the “Congressman Bill Carney Post Office”;

H.R. 829, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1450 Montauk Highway in Mastic, New York, as the “Army Specialist Thomas J. Wilwerth Post Office Building”; and

The nominations of James A. Crowell IV, and Jason Park, both to be an Associate Judge of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia, Ron A. Bloom, of New York, and Roman Martinez IV, of Florida, both to be a Governor of the United States Postal Service, Dale Cabaniss, of Virginia, to be Director of the Office of Personnel Management, and Michael Eric Wooten, of Virginia, to be Administrator for Federal Procurement Policy.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Indian Affairs: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:

S. 279, to allow tribal grant schools to participate in the Federal Employee Health Benefits Program;

S. 832, to nullify the Supplemental Treaty Between the United States of America and the Confederated Tribes and Bands of Indians of Middle Oregon, concluded on November 15, 1865; and

S. 1207, to approve the settlement of the water rights claims of the Navajo Nation in Utah.

INDIAN PROGRAMS BUDGET OVERSIGHT

Committee on Indian Affairs: Committee concluded an oversight hearing to examine the President's fiscal year 2020 budget request for Indian Programs, and S. 1211, to provide for improvements to Tribal transportation facilities and Tribal transportation safety, after receiving testimony from Matt M. Dummermuth, Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Office of Justice Programs, Department of Justice; John Tahsuda, Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary—Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior; and Jamie Azure, Turtle Mountain Band of Chippewa Indians, Belcourt, North Dakota.

ELECTION ASSISTANCE COMMISSION

Committee on Rules and Administration: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the Election Assistance Commission, after receiving testimony from Christy McCormick, Chairwoman, Ben Hovland, Vice Chair, and Thomas Hicks, and Donald Palmer, both a Commissioner, all of the Election Assistance Commission.

SBA INNOVATION PROGRAMS

Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship: Committee concluded a hearing to examine reauthorization of the Small Business Administration's innovation programs, including S. 118, to require the Director of the National Science Foundation to develop an I-Corps course to support commercialization-ready innovation companies, after receiving testimony from Joseph Shepard, Associate Administrator, Office of Investment and Innovation, and John Williams, Director of Innovation and Technology, both of the Small Business Administration; Stephen J. Ezell, Information Technology and Innovation Foundation, Washington, D.C.; Jere W. Glover, Small Business Technology Council, Annapolis, Maryland; Sridhar Kota, FlexSys Inc., Ann Arbor, Michigan; and Stephen L. Hoffman, Sanaria Inc., Rockville, Maryland.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 38 public bills, H.R. 2739, 2741–2744, 2746–2778; and 4 resolutions, H.J. Res. 58; H. Con. Res. 39; and H. Res. 383–384 were introduced. **Pages H3840–42**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H3843–44**

Reports Filed: Reports were filed today as follows:

H.R. 2740, making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health, and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 116–62); and

H.R. 2745, making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 116–63). **Page H3840**

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein she appointed Representative Shalala to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H3795**

Recess: The House recessed at 10:31 a.m. and reconvened at 12 noon. **Page H3798**

Guest Chaplain: The prayer was offered by the Guest Chaplain, Dr. Benny Tate, Rock Springs Church, Milner, Georgia. **Pages H3798–99**

Mashpee Wampanoag Tribe Reservation Reaffirmation Act: The House passed H.R. 312, to reaffirm the Mashpee Wampanoag Tribe reservation, by a yea-and-nay vote of 275 yeas to 146 nays, Roll No. 207. **Pages H3816–24**

Pursuant to the Rule, the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Natural Resources now printed in the bill shall be considered as adopted. **Pages H3816–17**

H. Res. 377, the rule providing for consideration of the bills (H.R. 5), (H.R. 312), and (H.R. 987) was agreed to by a yea-and-nay vote of 229 yeas to 188 nays, Roll No. 206, after the previous question was ordered by a yea-and-nay vote of 228 yeas to 189 nays with one answering “present”, Roll No. 205. **Pages H3801–13**

Suspensions: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measure:

Amending the Act of June 18, 1934, to reaffirm the authority of the Secretary of the Interior to take land into trust for Indian Tribes: H.R. 375, to amend the Act of June 18, 1934, to reaffirm the authority of the Secretary of the Interior to take land into trust for Indian Tribes, by a $\frac{2}{3}$ ye-and-nay vote of 323 yeas to 96 nays, Roll No. 208.

Pages H3813–16, H3824–25

Suspension—Proceedings Resumed: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measure. Consideration began Tuesday, May 14th.

Quadrennial Homeland Security Review Technical Corrections Act of 2019: H.R. 1892, to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to make technical corrections to the requirement that the Secretary of Homeland Security submit quadrennial homeland security reviews, by a $\frac{2}{3}$ ye-and-nay vote of 415 yeas with none voting “nay”, Roll No. 209.

Pages H3825–26

Director of the Congressional Budget Office—Appointment: The Chair announced the joint appointment by the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President Pro Tempore of the Senate of Dr. Phillip Swagel as Director of the Congressional Budget Office for the term expiring January 3, 2023.

Page H3835

Discharge Petition: Representative Mast presented to the clerk a motion to discharge the Committee on Rules from the consideration of H. Res. 348, providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 336) 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 (Discharge Petition No. 3).

Presidential Message: Read a message from the President wherein he notified Congress that he had issued an Executive Order declaring a national emergency with respect to significant malicious cyber-enabled activities—referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed (H. Doc. 116–35).

Pages H3835–36

Senate Referrals: S. 1231 was held at the desk. S. 1436 was held at the desk.

Page H3801

Senate Message: Message received from the Senate by the Clerk and subsequently presented to the House today appears on page H3801.

Quorum Calls—Votes: Five ye-and-nay votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear

on pages H3812, H3812–13, H3824, H3824–25, and H3825–26. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 6:35 p.m.

Committee Meetings

TO REVIEW USDA FARM BILL CONSERVATION PROGRAMS

Committee on Agriculture: Subcommittee on Conservation and Forestry held a hearing entitled “To Review USDA Farm Bill Conservation Programs”. Testimony was heard from Matthew Lohr, Chief, Natural Resources Conservation Service, Department of Agriculture; and Richard Fordyce, Administrator, Farm Service Agency, Department of Agriculture.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURE

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Defense held a markup on the Defense Appropriations Bill, FY 2020. The Defense Appropriations Bill, FY 2020 was forwarded to the full Committee, without amendment. This hearing was closed.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURE

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development, and Related Agencies held a markup on the Energy and Water Development, and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill, FY 2020. The Energy and Water Development, and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill, FY 2020 was forwarded to the full Committee, without amendment.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURE

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies held a markup on the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill, FY 2020. The Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill, FY 2020 was forwarded to the full Committee, without amendment.

KEEPING OUR PROMISE TO AMERICA’S SENIORS: RETIREMENT SECURITY IN THE 21ST CENTURY

Committee on the Budget: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “Keeping Our Promise to America’s Seniors: Retirement Security in the 21st Century”. Testimony was heard from Representative Larson, and public witnesses.

EXAMINING THE OLDER AMERICANS ACT: PROMOTING INDEPENDENCE AND DIGNITY FOR OLDER AMERICANS

Committee on Education and Labor: Subcommittee on Civil Rights and Human Services held a hearing entitled “Examining the Older Americans Act: Promoting Independence and Dignity for Older Americans”. Testimony was heard from Lee Girard, Director, Aging, Disability and Veterans Services Division, Department of County Human Services, Multnomah County, Oregon; Patricia Ducayet, Long-Term Care Ombudsman, Office of the State Long-Term Care Ombudsman, Texas Health and Human Services, Texas; and public witnesses.

ACCOUNTABILITY AND OVERSIGHT OF THE FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Communications and Technology held a hearing entitled “Accountability and Oversight of the Federal Communications Commission”. Testimony was heard from the following Federal Communications Commission officials: Ajit Pai, Chairman; Michael O’Rielly, Commissioner; Brendan Carr, Commissioner; Jessica Rosenworcel, Commissioner; and Geoffrey Starks, Commissioner.

PROTECTING AMERICANS AT RISK OF PFAS CONTAMINATION AND EXPOSURE

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Environment and Climate Change held a hearing entitled “Protecting Americans at Risk of PFAS Contamination and Exposure”. Testimony was heard from Brian Steglitz, Manager, Water Treatment Services, City of Ann Arbor, Michigan; and public witnesses.

PROMOTING ECONOMIC GROWTH: A REVIEW OF PROPOSALS TO STRENGTHEN THE RIGHTS AND PROTECTIONS FOR WORKERS

Committee on Financial Services: Subcommittee on Investor Protection, Entrepreneurship, and Capital Markets held a hearing entitled “Promoting Economic Growth: A Review of Proposals to Strengthen the Rights and Protections for Workers”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

ASSESSING THE USE OF SANCTIONS IN ADDRESSING NATIONAL SECURITY AND FOREIGN POLICY CHALLENGES

Committee on Financial Services: Subcommittee on National Security, International Development, and Monetary Policy held a hearing entitled “Assessing the Use of Sanctions in Addressing National Security

and Foreign Policy Challenges”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

THE CONFLICT IN LIBYA

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on the Middle East, North Africa, and International Terrorism held a hearing entitled “The Conflict in Libya”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Homeland Security: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 542, the “Supporting Research and Development for First Responders Act”; H.R. 1158, the “DHS Cyber Incident Response Team Act”; H.R. 2083, the “Homeland Procurement Reform Act”; H.R. 2383, the “Secure Communities and Safe Schools Act”; H.R. 2476, the “Securing American Non-Profit Organizations Against Terrorism Act”; H.R. 2539, the “Strengthening Local Transportation Security Capabilities Act of 2019”; H.R. 2589, the “Unifying DHS Intelligence Enterprise Act”; H.R. 2590, the “DHS Overseas Personnel Enhancement Act of 2019”; H.R. 2609, the “DHS Acquisition Review Board Act of 2019”; and H.R. 2621, the “Homeland Security Assessment of Terrorists’ Use of Ghost Guns Act”. H.R. 542, H.R. 1158, H.R. 2383, H.R. 2476, H.R. 2539, H.R. 2609, and H.R. 2621 were ordered reported, without amendment. H.R. 2083, H.R. 2589, and H.R. 2590 were ordered reported, as amended.

EXECUTIVE PRIVILEGE AND CONGRESSIONAL OVERSIGHT

Committee on the Judiciary: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “Executive Privilege and Congressional Oversight”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR BUDGET AND POLICY PRIORITIES FOR FY 2020

Committee on Natural Resources: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “U.S. Department of the Interior Budget and Policy Priorities for FY 2020”. Testimony was heard from David Bernhardt, Secretary, Department of the Interior.

EXAMINING THE IMPACTS OF CLIMATE CHANGE ON PUBLIC LANDS RECREATION

Committee on Natural Resources: Subcommittee on National Parks, Forests, and Public Lands held a hearing entitled “Examining the Impacts of Climate Change on Public Lands Recreation”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

LEGISLATIVE MEASURE

Committee on Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Water, Oceans, and Wildlife held a hearing on H.R.

2532, the “Tribal Heritage and Grizzly Bear Protection Act”. Testimony was heard from Brian Nesvik, Director, Wyoming Game and Fish Department; and public witnesses.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE INSPECTOR GENERAL REPORT ON EXCESS PROFITS BY TRANSDIGM GROUP, INC.

Committee on Oversight and Reform: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “DOD Inspector General Report on Excess Profits by TransDigm Group, Inc.”. Testimony was heard from the following Department of Defense officials: Kevin Fahey, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Acquisition; Glenn Fine, Acting Inspector General; Theresa Hull, Assistant Inspector General for Acquisition, Office of Inspector General; and public witnesses.

CONFRONTING WHITE SUPREMACY (PART I): THE CONSEQUENCES OF INACTION

Committee on Oversight and Reform: Subcommittee on Civil Rights and Civil Liberties held a hearing entitled “Confronting White Supremacy (Part I): The Consequences of Inaction”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

ADVANCING THE NEXT GENERATION OF SOLAR AND WIND ENERGY TECHNOLOGIES

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology: Subcommittee on Energy held a hearing entitled “Advancing the Next Generation of Solar and Wind Energy Technologies”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

MEMBER DAY HEARING: COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Committee on Small Business: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “Member Day Hearing: Committee on Small Business”. Testimony was heard from Representatives Case and Cárdenas.

STATUS OF THE BOEING 737 MAX

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Subcommittee on Aviation held a hearing entitled “Status of the Boeing 737 MAX”. Testimony was heard from Daniel K. Elwell III, Acting Administrator, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation; and Robert L. Sumwalt, Chair, National Transportation Safety Board.

THE ECONOMIC AND HEALTH CONSEQUENCES OF CLIMATE CHANGE

Committee on Ways and Means: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “The Economic and Health Consequences of Climate Change”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR THURSDAY, MAY 16, 2019

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Subcommittee on Science, Oceans, Fisheries, and Weather, to hold hearings to examine atmospheric science research and forecasting innovation, 10 a.m., SD-562.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: to hold hearings to examine the Department of Energy’s carbon capture, utilization, and storage programs, including S. 1201, to amend the fossil energy research and development provisions of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 to enhance fossil fuel technology, 10 a.m., SD-366.

Committee on Foreign Relations: to hold hearings to examine the nominations of Bridget A. Brink, of Michigan, to be Ambassador to the Slovak Republic, Kenneth A. Howery, of Texas, to be Ambassador to the Kingdom of Sweden, Matthew S. Klimow, of New York, to be Ambassador to Turkmenistan, and John Jefferson Daigle, of Louisiana, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Cabo Verde, all of the Department of State, 2 p.m., SD-419.

Committee on the Judiciary: business meeting to consider S. 1328, to designate foreign persons who improperly interfere in United States elections as inadmissible aliens, S. 1321, to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit interference with voting systems under the Computer Fraud and Abuse Act, and the nominations of Ada E. Brown, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Texas, Steven D. Grimberg, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Georgia, David John Novak, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Virginia, and Matthew H. Solomson, of Maryland, to be a Judge of the United States Court of Federal Claims, 10 a.m., SD-226.

Committee on Veterans’ Affairs: to hold hearings to examine the nomination of James Byrne, of Virginia, to be Deputy Secretary of Veterans Affairs, 10 a.m., SR-418.

Select Committee on Intelligence: to hold closed hearings to examine certain intelligence matters, 2 p.m., SH-219.

House

Committee on Appropriations, Full Committee, markup on the Report on the Revised Suballocation of Budget Allocations for FY 2020; and the State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs Appropriations Bill, FY 2020, 10:30 a.m., 2359 Rayburn.

Committee on Armed Services, Full Committee, hearing entitled “The Department of Defense’s Financial Improvement and Audit Remediation Plan: The Path Forward”, 10 a.m., 2118 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Military Personnel, hearing entitled “Military Personnel Management—How Are the Military Services Adapting to Recruit, Retain, and Manage High

Quality Talent to Meet the Needs of a Modern Military?"; 2:30 p.m., 2212 Rayburn.

Committee on Energy and Commerce, Subcommittee on Energy, markup on H.R. 2088, a bill to amend the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 to reauthorize the Energy Efficiency and Conservation Block Grant Program, and for other purposes; H.R. 2041, the "Weatherization Enhancement and Local Energy Efficiency Investment and Accountability Act"; H.R. 2119, a bill to amend the Energy Policy Act of 2005 to reauthorize grants for improving the energy efficiency of public buildings, and for other purposes; H.R. 1315, the "Blue Collar to Green Collar Jobs Development Act of 2019"; H.R. 2665, the "Smart Energy and Water Efficiency Act of 2019"; H.R. 2044, the "Smart Building Acceleration Act"; H.R. 359, the "Enhancing Grid Security through Public-Private Partnerships Act"; H.R. 360, the "Cyber Sense Act of 2019"; H.R. 362, the "Energy Emergency Leadership Act"; and H.R. 370, the "Pipeline and LNG Facility Cybersecurity Preparedness Act", 10 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Committee on Education and Labor, Full Committee, markup on H.R. 2574, the "Equity and Inclusion Enforcement Act"; and H.R. 2639, the "Strength in Diversity Act of 2019", 10:15 a.m., 2175 Rayburn.

Committee on Financial Services, Full Committee, hearing entitled "Oversight of Prudential Regulators: Ensuring the Safety, Soundness and Accountability of Megabanks and Other Depository Institutions", 10 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Committee on Foreign Affairs, Full Committee, hearing entitled "Democracy, Development, and Defense: Rebalancing U.S.-Africa Policy", 10 a.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, Global Human Rights, and International Organizations, hearing entitled "The Dangers of Reporting on Human Rights", 2 p.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Committee on Homeland Security, Subcommittee on Oversight, Management, and Accountability, hearing entitled "Federal Law Enforcement Training Centers: Preparing America's Law Enforcement to Protect the Homeland", 10 a.m., 310 Cannon.

Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on Antitrust, Commercial, and Administrative Law, hearing entitled

"Justice Denied: Forced Arbitration and the Erosion of our Legal System", 10 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Committee on Natural Resources, Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources, hearing entitled "Oil and Gas Development: Impacts of Water Pollution Above and Below Ground", 10 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

Subcommittee on Water, Oceans, and Wildlife, hearing entitled "Examining the President's Fiscal Year 2020 Budget Proposal for the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation and U.S. Geological Survey", 2 p.m., 1324 Longworth.

Subcommittee for Indigenous Peoples of the United States, hearing entitled "Investigating the Health and Safety Risks of Native Children at BIE Boarding Schools", 2 p.m., 1334 Longworth.

Committee on Oversight and Reform, Full Committee, hearing entitled "HIV Prevention Drug: Billions in Corporate Profits after Millions in Taxpayer Investments", 10 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Economic and Consumer Policy, hearing entitled "CFPB's Role in Empowering Predatory Lenders: Examining the Proposed Repeal of the Payday Lending Rule", 2 p.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, Full Committee, hearing entitled "Event Horizon Telescope: The Black Hole Seen Round the World", 10 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Environment, hearing entitled "The Future of Forecasting: Building a Stronger U.S. Weather Enterprise", 2 p.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Committee on Small Business, Subcommittee on Contracting and Infrastructure, hearing entitled "Oversight of the SBA's Women-Owned Small Business Federal Contract Program", 10 a.m., 2360 Rayburn.

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Full Committee, hearing entitled "The Impacts of State-Owned Enterprises on Public Transit and Freight Rail Sectors", 10 a.m., 2167 Rayburn.

Committee on Ways and Means, Full Committee, hearing entitled "Overcoming Racial Disparities and Social Determinants in the Maternal Mortality Crisis", 10 a.m., 1100 Longworth.

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, Full Committee, hearing entitled "China's Digital Authoritarianism: Surveillance, Influence, and Political Control", 9 a.m., 210 Cannon.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

10 a.m., Thursday, May 16

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

10 a.m., Thursday, May 16

Senate Chamber

Program for Thursday: Senate will continue consideration of the nomination of Wendy Vitter, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Louisiana. At 12 noon, Senate will vote on confirmation of the nominations of Wendy Vitter, and of Brian J. Bulatao, of Texas, to be an Under Secretary of State (Management). At 1:45 p.m., Senate will vote on confirmation of the nomination of Jeffrey A. Rosen, of Virginia, to be Deputy Attorney General, Department of Justice.

House Chamber

Program for Thursday: Consideration of H.R. 987—Strengthening Health Care and Lowering Prescription Drug Costs Act.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Baird, James R., Ind., E596
Bustos, Cheri, Ill., E599
Cloud, Michael, Tex., E600
Costa, Jim, Calif., E600
Fox, Virginia, N.C., E600
Gianforte, Greg, Mont., E595
Graves, Garret, La., E599
Graves, Sam, Mo., E595, E596, E597
Griffith, H. Morgan, Va., E600
Heck, Denny, Wash., E602

Huizenga, Bill, Mich., E598
Jackson Lee, Sheila, Tex., E603
Lynch, Stephen F., Mass., E598, E601
Maloney, Carolyn B., N.Y., E598
Meeks, Gregory W., N.Y., E601
Meuser, Daniel, Pa., E603
Mooney, Alexander X., W.Va., E598
Norton, Eleanor Holmes, The District of Columbia, E599
Panetta, Jimmy, Calif., E595, E597
Perlmutter, Ed, Colo., E597
Peters, Scott H., Calif., E596

Rogers, Mike, Ala., E599
Rose, John W., Tenn., E602
Rush, Bobby L., Ill., E595
Ryan, Tim, Ohio, E602
Sablan, Gregorio Kilili Camacho, Northern Mariana Islands, E597
Simpson, Michael K., Idaho, E596
Steil, Bryan, Wisc., E595, E597
Swalwell, Eric, Calif., E600, E602
Trahan, Lori, Mass., E599
Wittman, Robert J., Va., E599, E601



Congressional Record

printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through the U.S. Government Publishing Office, at www.govinfo.gov, free of charge to the user. The information is updated online each day the *Congressional Record* is published. For more information, contact the GPO Customer Contact Center, U.S. Government Publishing Office. Phone 202-512-1800, or 866-512-1800 (toll-free). E-Mail, contactcenter@gpo.gov. ¶To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 979050, St. Louis, MO 63197-9000, or phone orders to 866-512-1800 (toll-free), 202-512-1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202-512-2104. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Publishing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.