



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 165

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JULY 9, 2019

No. 114

House of Representatives

The House met at 2 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CLAY).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,

July 9, 2019.

I hereby appoint the Honorable WM. LACY CLAY to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

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

As the Members of this assembly return from days away celebrating our Nation's birth, may they return rested and ready to assume the difficult work which must be done.

We pray for the needs of the Nation, the world, and all of creation. Bless those who seek to honor You and serve each other and all Americans in this House through their public service.

May the words and deeds of this place reflect an earnest desire for justice, and may men and women in government build on the tradition of equity and truth that represents the noblest heritage of our people.

May Your blessing, O God, be with us this day and every day to come, and may all we do be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania 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.

GROWING OUR ECONOMY

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

Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, Congress has exactly 3 weeks to pass the USMCA before we break for our August work period, and we owe it to our constituents to get the job done.

The USMCA will benefit every district in America, as it will lead to 176,000 new jobs and grow the U.S. economy by an additional \$68 billion.

This agreement will also be a huge benefit to my constituents. Pennsylvania's 13th District is made up of so many hardworking dairy farmers who have struggled in recent years. This deal will unleash new markets and bring our industry back to life.

Instead of hauling Robert Mueller before a committee to rehash a case that is already closed, Congress should be putting all of our efforts into making the USMCA agreement law.

During July, my focus will be on passing the USMCA and growing our economy for years to come. I urge all of my colleagues to join me in this mission.

PREVENTING LYME DISEASE

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3073, the TICK Act, which would help combat the rise of tickborne and bloodborne illnesses across the country. These diseases are rapidly becoming a serious and growing threat to public health with more than 300,000 estimated cases annually.

In my home State of Pennsylvania alone, ticks are a common threat to those who explore our vast network of trails and public lands in Pennsylvania.

While ticks carry a variety of harmful diseases, Lyme disease is one of the most prevalent. Currently, there are no uniformly accepted treatment options for patients with chronic symptoms of Lyme disease.

The TICK Act would develop a national strategy to prevent and treat Lyme and other diseases, including those spread by mosquitos and fleas. It would also authorize the Centers for Disease Control to award grants to State health departments to support early detection and diagnosis, improve treatment, and raise public awareness.

I am proud to cosponsor H.R. 3073, and I urge my colleagues to cosponsor this legislation to prevent and treat Lyme and other vector-borne diseases.

COMMUNICATION FROM CHAIR OF HOUSE REPUBLICAN CONFERENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Chair of the House Republican Conference:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, July 8, 2019.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to clause 5(b)(1) of Rule X, I am writing to inform you

□ 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.

H5273

that Rep. Justin Amash has resigned as a member of the House Republican Conference.
Sincerely,

LIZ CHENEY,
Chair, House Republican Conference.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE SPEAKER

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

SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE,
July 9, 2019.

Hon. ELIJAH CUMMINGS,
*Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, DC.*

DEAR CHAIRMAN CUMMINGS: This letter is to advise you that Representative JUSTIN AMASH's election to the Committee on Oversight and Reform has been automatically vacated pursuant to clause 5(b) of rule X effective today.

Best regards,

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 4:30 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 6 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1631

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CUELLAR) at 4 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m.

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.

PROTECTING AFFORDABLE MORTGAGES FOR VETERANS ACT OF 2019

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1988) to clarify seasoning requirements for certain refinanced mortgage loans, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1988

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 "Protecting Affordable Mortgages for Veterans Act of 2019".

SEC. 2. SEASONING REQUIREMENTS FOR CERTAIN REFINANCED MORTGAGE LOANS.

(a) GINNIE MAE.—Paragraph (1) of section 306(g) of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C.

1721(g)(1)) is amended by striking the second sentence (as added by section 309(b) of Public Law 115-174).

(b) VETERANS LOANS.—Section 3709 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking subsection (c) and inserting the following:

"(c) LOAN SEASONING.—Except as provided in subsection (d) and notwithstanding section 3703 of this title or any other provision of law, a loan to a veteran for a purpose specified in section 3710 of this title that is a refinancing may not be guaranteed or insured under this chapter until the date that is the later of—

"(1) the date on which the borrower has made at least six consecutive monthly payments on the loan being refinanced; and

"(2) the date that is 210 days after the first payment due date of the loan being refinanced."

(c) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this Act may be construed to restrict or otherwise modify the authorities of the Government National Mortgage Association.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, last year, when Congress passed S. 2155, it included as section 309 a bill sponsored by Senators TILLIS and WARREN titled Protecting Veterans from Predatory Lending Act of 2018.

That provision put new requirements in place to protect veteran borrowers from the aggressive and deceptive marketing practices of lenders pushing mortgage refinance deals.

However, the drafting of this provision caused some unintended consequences; specifically, an estimated 2,500 loans that were in full compliance with all requirements at the time were later denied Ginnie securitization simply because they were in the process of being refinanced or securitized when the law became effective.

Senators WARREN and TILLIS weighed in with Ginnie Mae, stating that it was not their intention to orphan those loans and have urged Ginnie Mae to address the issue.

However, Ginnie believes legislation is needed to grandfather these orphaned loans and address other administrative issues that have resulted from the slight differences between the new requirements in S. 2155 and Ginnie's prior requirements.

That is why we are here today with the bill from the gentleman from Georgia, H.R. 1988, which is a reasonable

step to address what were clearly unintended consequences of the previous legislation. I am pleased to support this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. SCOTT and Mr. ZELDIN for introducing this bill, urge Members to vote "yes," and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1988, the Protecting Affordable Mortgages for Veterans Act, introduced by my friend, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DAVID SCOTT).

This bill is an important continuation of work that our colleague LEE ZELDIN from Long Island, who is a lieutenant colonel in the Army Reserve, started last Congress to better protect our Nation's veterans from financial fraud.

This Congress, I was pleased to join Congressmen SCOTT and ZELDIN as an original cosponsor of this legislation, along with my colleague on the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, Congressman LEVIN, to assist with advancing this bill through both this committee, the Financial Services Committee, and the House Veterans' Affairs Committee.

Last year, Congress enacted S. 2155, the most pro-growth banking bill in a generation. Section 309 of that legislation included a provision to impose a new seasoning requirement for the securitization of loans insured by the VA.

This provision addresses the questionable practice of churning; that is, the refinancing of a home loan over and over again just to generate fees and profits for lenders with a slight short-term benefit for the borrower but at an increased life-of-the-loan cost.

Unfortunately, that provision created a technical issue for a group of VA loans that fell into no-man's land, if you will, between the date on which the mortgage was issued and the technical requirements of the new law, increasing the risk to lenders and making the loans less attractive to investors.

Congressmen ZELDIN and SCOTT took quick action to correct this unintended consequence, but Congress ran out of time last year and it did not become law.

The bill we are considering today, H.R. 1988, is a continuation of their efforts to address this unintended problem and ensure that these VA loans receive the equitable treatment they deserve.

To some, this bill today might seem to be just a technical fix, but it is an important one. Our Nation's veterans should not be subject to suspect practices like churning.

I am pleased that this bill, along with the ongoing efforts of the VA loan securitizer Ginnie Mae, will stamp out churning and better protect veterans.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1988 and, once again, commend my colleague from Georgia (Mr.

DAVID SCOTT), and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DAVID SCOTT), a senior member of the Committee on Financial Services and sponsor of H.R. 1988.

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairwoman WATERS for her support and encouragement to us to continue this.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make this opening statement because it is very important for us to realize the importance of this bill because, today, according to the latest data from the Veterans Administration, we are losing 20 of our military veterans every single day to suicide.

This is a clarion call from our veterans for help, and what we are doing today is one small step. But, as I will explain as I go on, we are doing much, much more because we need to bring this suicide rate to a stop.

So much of it is caused by disappointment, discouragement, and giving up. But, after today, with this vote, we will send a powerful message to this Nation and especially to our precious veterans that help is indeed on the way.

Now, I first of all want to thank my bipartisan friends Mr. ANDY BARR, Mr. ZELDIN, all of them, for this is truly a bipartisan effort, and I thank them for their support as we move forward with this.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to take my time and I want to go through this, and I want folks to really understand why this is so important. Mr. BARR touched on it.

Last year, when Congress passed S. 2155, which was called the Economic Growth, Regulatory Relief, and Consumer Protection Act, it included a set of bipartisan reforms to refinancing requirements for loans to protect our veterans from the predatory act of loan churning.

Mr. Speaker, this shows you the deviousness of it, that here you have these predatory lenders who are out here targeting our veterans and charging them over and over for the same payment on these refinancings.

How devious—how evil—can you be to do this to our veterans over and over again? And they do this to generate these fees and profits for these predatory lenders, while offering little to no benefit for our veteran homeowners—just using them.

So, in order to prevent this, S. 2155 codified new refinancing requirements, requiring lenders to demonstrate a material benefit to consumers when financing their mortgages and allowing for the initial loan to mature for at least 210 days before a borrower can refinance.

Now, these reforms were necessary to ensure that our veterans are adequately protected from these bad actors, these predatory lenders, so that our veterans can have access to the

safe and affordable homeownership opportunities that they have earned and deserve.

Upon implementation of S. 2155, however, as Mr. BARR mentioned, a technical error in the language of S. 2155 caused a deviation in how this 210-day seasoning period was calculated, between what was written in the text and the requirement in place at Ginnie Mae.

For those who may not know, Ginnie Mae is the Government National Mortgage Association.

Now, this, combined with the lack of clarity around time lines to implement these new requirements, has caused 2,500 refinanced veteran loans that met Federal requirements at the time of closing and were guaranteed by the VA to be barred from this Government National Mortgage Association, Ginnie Mae's securitization, which resulted in making these veteran loans orphan loans.

They are there but no longer eligible for the secondary investment market opportunities that they deserve, despite meeting all Federal requirements, as well as backing from the VA, and it is clear that it was not the intent of Congress to orphan these veteran loans.

But, rather, our intent when we passed the Senate bill was to ensure that there were strong and enduring protections in place to prevent future loan churning.

Can you imagine somebody sending you a bill and you paying for the same thing over and over? How evil is that?

This bill that we have today will put a stop to that predatory type lending and the abuse that it has caused our veterans.

And this is also necessary, Mr. Speaker, because it preserves liquidity while maintaining strong refinancing requirements to keep these bad actors out and ensuring that our veterans, our men and women of the military who have served our country through their outstanding bravery, their courage, their great sacrifice for us, have access now to safe and affordable home ownership opportunities.

□ 1645

Mr. Speaker, without this needed legislative fix, VA lenders may need to sell or refinance these mortgages at a loss, causing damage to the VA home loan market and potentially hindering their ability to originate similar loans in the future or raising borrowing costs and rates for other qualified veterans who will be suffering the same abuse.

Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned before, I am especially proud to have worked with my colleagues on this: Mr. LEE ZELDIN on the Financial Services Committee; Ms. WATERS, our chairwoman; and Mr. ANDY BARR, who sits on this committee. I also want to mention Mr. MIKE LEVIN, who sits on the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

We provided bipartisan common sense to fix this for our beloved vet-

erans. Through this bipartisan work of my colleagues on these two committees, we have been able to move this bill through the House, ensuring that the dream of homeownership continues to be preserved for our Nation's precious veterans, to whom we owe the deepest debt of gratitude.

Mr. Speaker, I mentioned in my remarks about this great tragedy, and I want to take this opportunity to let veterans who may be hearing this discussion this afternoon know that this Congress stands with and around them, and there are Members of Congress that have many bills and many different programs to get financial resources.

Dr. BUCSHON, my Republican colleague, and I, for example, have a process going where we are addressing the shortage of psychiatrists. We are working with the American Psychiatric Association and the American Medical Association to pay those doctors' student tuitions and give them scholarships so that they can come into the VA to work.

For the project I am working on with my good friend, Senator JOHNNY ISAKSON over in the Senate, we are trying to get more resources to open up more health clinics for our VA. And there are other things going.

I want people to know that down in my home State of Georgia, in my district, in the next month, on August 10, the doctors, nurses, and hospitals all over Atlanta, Georgia, are coming together, giving their time, along with the top administrators from the VA. They will be there in Jonesboro at Mundy's Mill High School.

We can cut down this suicide rate. It is a shame. It is a disgrace for this country. We are doing something about it in this Congress. Members on both sides of the aisle understand that this isn't a Democratic problem or a Republican problem. It is America's problem, and our veterans deserve our help.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, again, I thank my friend, the gentleman from Georgia, for his bipartisanship and his willingness to fight for veterans. I appreciate that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ZELDIN), my Republican colleague on the House Financial Services Committee, a veteran himself and a servicemember who has been a champion on legislating this fix.

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Ranking Member BARR for his leadership, not just for yielding time. This is something that he has been working on himself, putting a lot of heart, passion, and thought into.

I thank Congressman DAVID SCOTT for his incredible leadership on this important bipartisan effort. He laid it out so eloquently just now, the many aspects of not just this issue but the need to fight for veterans.

There are many people who are here in the gallery, millions of people at home watching C-SPAN, shocked at

what they are seeing, as Republicans and Democrats in the House and the Senate work together to get a bill through committee, through the Chambers, and to the President's desk to become law. The beneficiaries will be our Nation's veterans.

I rise today to urge passage of H.R. 1988, the Protecting Affordable Mortgages for Veterans Act. It provides more than a technical fix. It is important for recently issued loans refinanced by the Department of Veterans Affairs to remain eligible for the secondary market.

This fix is essential to prevent a liquidity crisis in the veterans home loan market and ensure that the brave men and women who have served our Nation in uniform have access to affordable mortgages.

Through passage of this bill, we can ensure that VA home loans are not adversely impacted by issues in the veterans mortgage market created by the unintended consequences of S. 2155.

The Economic Growth, Regulatory Relief, and Consumer Protection Act, S. 2155, became law in May 2018 and contained some very important bipartisan reforms to protect veterans from predatory lending and deceptive marketing. These provisions are essential to protect the VA home loan market, but unclear timelines laid out in the legislation, and the way that Ginnie Mae chose to implement the requirements of the new law, have left an estimated 2,500 or more VA home loans boxed out of the secondary market.

These mortgages are now considered orphan loans because they are no longer eligible for Ginnie Mae securitization, even though they met all Federal requirements and are backed by the VA.

This bill would prevent a government-triggered liquidity crisis in the VA mortgage market by fixing this problem and restoring eligibility for these orphaned loans.

Addressing this issue ensures that veteran homeowners or prospective home buyers who have earned access to the VA home loan program through their military service aren't hurt by a fluke in S. 2155.

Without this bill, potential damage to the overall VA home loan market is likely because VA lenders may have to sell or finance these orphaned mortgages at a loss. This would have a negative impact on the brave men and women who have served our country and deserve a path to homeownership in order to achieve the American Dream.

If lenders aren't able to securitize VA home loans through Ginnie Mae, closing costs and borrowing costs could go up, and opportunities to borrow or refinance could go down.

Mr. Speaker, veterans have some of the lowest default and foreclosure rates in the Nation. They have earned access to VA home loans through their selfless service to our country.

Even one VA home loan negatively impacted by a minor mistake is one

too many when it comes to giving our veterans access to homeownership. That is why we must pass this bipartisan bill and send it to the President's desk to become law as soon as possible.

Again, I thank my lead bipartisan cosponsors, Congressmen DAVID SCOTT and ANDY BARR, and MIKE LEVIN. I thank Chairwoman WATERS for her efforts and Ranking Member MCHENRY. This was a truly bipartisan effort from the committee. Everyone came together and worked together to get to this important point, a huge bipartisan, bicameral win coming for our Nation's veterans.

I urge adoption of this important bipartisan bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to avoid references to occupants of the gallery.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I would inquire, through the Chair, if my colleague has any remaining speakers on his side.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I am prepared to close.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Once again, I thank the sponsor of this legislation, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DAVID SCOTT).

I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. ZELDIN) for his continued leadership on this legislation.

I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. LEVIN), whom I have the privilege of serving with on the Veterans Affairs' Committee as well, for his leadership in getting this bipartisan legislation to the House floor and to this point.

I thank the chairwoman of our full committee, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS), for her leadership in helping navigate this legislation forward.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, this is an important piece of legislation. It is bipartisan recognition of a problem created unintentionally by a law passed last year, and it is about providing two basic protections for veterans: protecting veterans who are seeking the dream of homeownership from predatory practices and from this practice of churning, and preserving liquidity in the secondary market for VA loans, which, in a nutshell, means that our veterans will have access to more affordable housing.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my friends on the other side of the aisle, and I thank Mr. ZELDIN for his leadership.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

H.R. 1988 will address some unintended administrative complications that resulted from implementing laws that were put in place to help protect veterans from unscrupulous lenders.

I thank Mr. SCOTT and Mr. ZELDIN for working in a bipartisan manner to

bring H.R. 1988 before the House. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1988, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WHISTLEBLOWER PROTECTION REFORM ACT OF 2019

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2515) to amend the Securities and Exchange Act of 1934 to amend the definition of whistleblower, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2515

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 "Whistleblower Protection Reform Act of 2019".

SEC. 2. WHISTLEBLOWER.

Section 21F of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78u-6) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(6)—

(A) by striking "(6) WHISTLEBLOWER.—The term" and inserting the following:

"(6) WHISTLEBLOWER.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—The term"; and

(B) by adding the following new subparagraph at the end:

"(B) SPECIAL RULE.—Solely for the purposes of subsection (h)(1), the term 'whistleblower' shall also include any individual who takes an action described in subsection (h)(1)(A), or 2 or more individuals acting jointly who take an action described in subsection (h)(1)(A)."; and

(2) in subsection (h)(1)(A)—

(A) in clause (ii), by striking "or" at the end;

(B) in clause (iii), by striking the period at the end and inserting "; or"; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

"(iv) in providing information regarding any conduct that the whistleblower reasonably believes constitutes a violation of any law, rule, or regulation subject to the jurisdiction of the Commission to—

"(I) a person with supervisory authority over the whistleblower at the whistleblower's employer, where such employer is an entity registered with or required to be registered with the Commission, a self-regulatory organization, or a State securities commission or office performing like functions; or

"(II) such other person working for the employer described under subclause (I) who has the authority to investigate, discover, or terminate misconduct.".

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

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

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

I thank Representative GREEN, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, for working with the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA) to craft this timely piece of legislation to ensure that all whistleblowers reporting suspected securities law violations are protected from retaliation by their employers.

In the Dodd-Frank Act, Congress provided the Securities and Exchange Commission the authority to reward whistleblowers who voluntarily provide the SEC with original information that leads to a successful enforcement action with monetary sanctions exceeding \$1 million.

□ 1700

Realizing that these whistleblowers may be deterred by their employers, Congress also required the SEC to issue regulations to protect them from retaliatory efforts, such as firing or demotion; but in 2018, the Supreme Court held that whistleblowers who report alleged misconduct internally but not to the SEC are not protected by the antiretaliation provisions of Dodd-Frank. This is not what Congress intended. Indeed, requiring whistleblowers to race to the SEC in order to be protected discourages them from reporting their suspicions to their superiors.

The U.S. Chamber of Commerce highlighted the importance of internal reporting in its 2010 letter to the SEC, stating: “The experience of the many companies with robust internal reporting programs, as well as the empirical evidence, demonstrate that all stakeholders benefit when those with knowledge of potential securities law violations report internally, thus enabling management to promptly investigate and take remedial action.”

By clarifying that whistleblowers who only report alleged misconduct to the employers are also protected by the antiretaliation provisions in the Dodd-Frank Act, this bill would encourage employees to communicate potential securities law violations to their employers without fear of being fired before they are able to report to the SEC.

Again, I thank Chairman GREEN and Mr. HUIZENGA for pushing this important bill, and I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting it.

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

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

I rise in support of H.R. 2515, the Whistleblower Protection Reform Act of 2019.

I would like to thank my colleagues, Congressman GREEN and Congressman HUIZENGA, for their work on this commonsense, bipartisan legislation.

Mr. Speaker, whistleblowers play a very important role in rooting out bad behavior that harms the market as well as mom-and-pop investors. Additionally, businesses have a self-interest

in detecting and eliminating illegal activity as swiftly as possible within their organizations. To that end, clarifying the concept of encouraging employees to report alleged securities fraud activities to their employers without fear of retaliation just makes simple common sense.

Businesses typically strive to comply with the law, and they have incentives to do so from market pressures, but it is also because unlawful activity hurts the company itself and it hurts its investors, driving down the company's value, tarnishing the company's reputation, repelling business partners and customers, and damaging the overall marketplace. That is why, frankly, the vast majority of actors in the private sector do the right thing.

For these reasons, many companies have implemented strong internal reporting measures to detect and mitigate potential wrongdoing before harm spreads. But if internal whistleblowers who report potential securities law violations internally are not protected from retaliation, what good are these internal reporting systems that these companies have voluntarily established?

That notion might seem counterintuitive, but last year, in the Digital Realty Trust case, the Supreme Court held that the whistleblower antiretaliation protections of the Dodd-Frank Act do not extend to internal whistleblowers; only those who report to the SEC are protected from retaliation.

Now, this is not an error in the Supreme Court's judgment; it is simply a faithful interpretation of the flawed drafting of the Dodd-Frank law. This bill solves this problem by amending section 922 of Dodd-Frank to clarify that whistleblowers who report alleged misconduct internally with their employers but not to the SEC are protected by Dodd-Frank's antiretaliation provisions.

By clarifying that Dodd-Frank's antiretaliation protections also apply to internal whistleblowers, this bill addresses the Supreme Court's interpretation and aligns Dodd-Frank's whistleblower protections with other major whistleblower laws.

Again, I want to thank Congressman GREEN and Congressman HUIZENGA for this important bipartisan legislation, which I proudly support. I urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 2515.

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

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations and the sponsor of H.R. 2515.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to present this legislation, but I am more honored to acknowledge something that is exceedingly important.

The chairwoman of the committee, the Honorable MAXINE WATERS, has,

under her leadership in this Congress, produced many pieces of bipartisan legislation. This is but a continuation of her legislative record. I want to commend her for her efforts, and I would also like to salute Mr. McHENRY and the persons who are across the aisle for their efforts, as well, in producing bipartisan legislation.

I thank Mr. BARR for his assistance and his help. He is the Oversight ranking member, and he and I will be working together on many pieces of legislation.

I am honored today to say that this piece of legislation was born as a result of honorable intentions metamorphosing into unintended consequences, honorable intentions.

When we passed Dodd-Frank in 2010, we sought to add additional protections for whistleblowers above and beyond what was accorded in Sarbanes-Oxley. In so doing, with the best of intentions, we found that this legislation was taken before the Supreme Court of the United States of America, and the Supreme Court concluded—and I don't quarrel with their conclusion, but the Supreme Court concluded that the legislation would apply only if the person who was a whistleblower took the concern to the SEC first.

I don't quarrel with what the Supreme Court ruled. This is why we have this piece of legislation to correct the best of intentions that metamorphosed into unintended consequences.

Let's talk for just a moment about whistleblowers.

It is exceedingly important to do this because I want people to know that whistleblowers are extraordinary people in the sense only of they do extraordinary things. They are really ordinary people, but they do extraordinary things.

These are the people who are willing to put their livelihoods on the line. These are the people who are willing to take that step that many of us would not take because, when you take that step as a whistleblower, you will sometimes stand alone. But they understand that it is better to stand alone than never to stand at all, and in so doing, they are protecting us: consumers, members of the public.

So I commend the whistleblowers of the world who take these extraordinary steps.

But we also want to do more than commend them. We want to protect them. This legislation will protect those who are willing to step forward, those who will see something and say something, something that we encourage people to do.

You can't encourage people to see something and say something and then allow them to do this without the protections that we should properly accord them and that we intended to accord them under Dodd-Frank. So I am honored today to have this piece of legislation that will give whistleblowers the protection that we intended and will also send a message that the companies that they work for can have the

opportunity to take corrective action before the SEC is informed.

Many of these companies want to do the right thing, and if given the opportunity, they will—not all, many. I think we ought to give them an opportunity to do the right thing; and to do so, we would want whistleblowers to report internally before they take this to an external source such as the SEC.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is bipartisan. I am honored to tell you that, among the persons who are the cosponsors, we have the Honorable CAROLYN MALONEY; the Honorable Representative GERALD CONNOLLY; the Honorable GREGORY MEEKS; the Honorable JOYCE BEATTY, who is here in this room with us currently; and the Honorable VICENTE GONZALEZ, all of whom support it, along with the Honorable EMANUEL CLEAVER.

I would also add, it is endorsed by the National Whistleblower Center, endorsed by the North American Securities Administrators Association, endorsed by Public Citizen, endorsed by the Government Accountability Project, endorsed by the Project On Government Oversight, and endorsed by the Securities Industry and Financial Markets Association.

It is another example of how, under the leadership of the Honorable MAXINE WATERS, we continue to produce bipartisan legislation. I am honored, Mr. Speaker, to have this honorable chairwoman presiding today.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time, and I am prepared to close.

Mr. Speaker, again, I would thank Congressman GREEN and Congressman HUIZENGA for their leadership on this extending of whistleblower protections, and I yield back the balance of my time.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, this is a very important measure that will increase corporate accountability and help those companies committed to ferreting out wrongdoing to take action without government involvement and protects those workers who help them to do so.

I commend the gentleman from Texas and the gentleman from Michigan for working in a bipartisan manner to bring this bill before the House.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this important piece of legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2919, the Whistleblower Protection Reform Act of 2019.

Whistleblowers are an effective means of rooting out bad behavior that harms the market as well as investors.

In fact, Section 922 of Dodd-Frank amended the Securities and Exchange Act of 1934 to afford whistleblowers protection from retaliation by their employers for reporting suspected misconduct.

Additionally, Section 922 allows for the SEC to provide monetary awards to whistleblowers who provide “original information” resulting in monetary sanctions over \$1 million.

However, in February 2018, the Supreme Court held in *Digital Realty v. Somers* that whistleblowers who report alleged misconduct internally to their employer, as opposed to the SEC, are not protected by Dodd-Frank’s anti-retaliation provisions.

A whistleblower who reports directly to their employee about alleged misconduct shouldn’t risk being retaliated against. That’s why this bipartisan bill has been carefully crafted to clarify the application of the anti-retaliation provisions to whistleblowers provided within the Dodd-Frank Act.

By further clarifying the anti-retaliation provisions of section 922 apply to those whistleblowers who report internally will encourage employees to report potential misconduct instead of automatically escalating the issue to the SEC.

Internal reporting may be more efficient and practical in some cases as employers have a chance to correct, self-report, or take other action.

Moreover, by clarifying the application of Dodd-Frank anti-retaliation protections to internal whistleblowers, the bill aligns with similar protections for internal whistleblowers within the Whistleblower Protection Act and Sarbanes-Oxley.

I’d like to thank my colleague, Mr. GREEN for working with me on the Whistleblower Protection Reform Act and I urge my colleagues to vote yes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2515, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

Ms. WATERS. 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.

HOUSING FINANCIAL LITERACY ACT OF 2019

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2162) to require the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to discount FHA single-family mortgage insurance premium payments for first-time homebuyers who complete a financial literacy housing counseling program, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2162

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 “Housing Financial Literacy Act of 2019”.

SEC. 2. DISCOUNT ON MORTGAGE INSURANCE PREMIUM PAYMENTS FOR FIRST-TIME HOMEBUYERS WHO COMPLETE FINANCIAL LITERACY HOUSING COUNSELING PROGRAMS.

The second sentence of subparagraph (A) of section 203(c)(2) of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1709(c)(2)(A)) is amended—

(1) by inserting before the comma the following: “and such program is completed before the mortgagor has signed an application for a mortgage to be insured under this title or a sales agreement”; and

(2) by striking “not exceed 2.75 percent of the amount of the original insured principal obligation of the mortgage” and inserting “be 25 basis points lower than the premium payment amount established by the Secretary under the first sentence of this subparagraph”.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise to support H.R. 2162, the Housing Financial Literacy Act, a bipartisan bill authored by Representative BEATTY, the chairwoman of the Subcommittee on Diversity and Inclusion, and cosponsored by Representative STIVERS. This bill will make homeownership more affordable for FHA borrowers who complete a housing counseling program from a HUD-approved housing counseling agency.

While HUD currently has the authority to provide premium discounts to incentivize housing counseling, HUD is not taking advantage of this opportunity to help borrowers and strengthen the FHA. Research has consistently demonstrated that loans made to borrowers who have received prepurchase counseling perform better than loans made to comparable borrowers who did not receive prepurchase counseling.

And when borrowers avoid delinquencies, lenders save money, too. A 2013 study by Freddie Mac found that, when 90-day delinquencies were lowered by 29 percent, lenders saved an average of \$1,000 per loan.

□ 1715

So this bill would not only benefit consumers; it would also help increase the financial health of FHA.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative BEATTY and Representative STIVERS for their work on this commonsense, data-driven bill, and I urge my colleagues to vote “yes” on H.R. 2162.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. BEATTY) for her leadership and her work on H.R. 2162, the Housing Financial Literacy Act of 2019.

The Federal Housing Administration currently provides government-backed mortgage insurance to more than \$1.3 trillion in loans. FHA insurance allows a wide array of borrowers to qualify for mortgages, including many low- and moderate-income families who might not otherwise have access to credit through traditional underwriting.

In fiscal year 2018, the FHA endorsed over 1 million forward mortgages, including over 775,000 purchase loans, nearly 83 percent of which were to first-time home buyers.

Given the large population of first-time home buyers using the FHA, it makes sense to encourage those individuals to seek out ways to strengthen their financial knowledge and better prepare themselves for the challenges of homeownership.

Right now, current law states that FHA has the ability to provide first-time homeowners with a discount on their FHA upfront premiums if they complete an approved homeownership financial counseling course—makes a lot of sense. However, the statute is drafted in such a way that the provision only applies in particular circumstances when FHA upfront premiums exceed 2.75 percent.

Since FHA upfront premiums are currently set at 1.75 percent, a rate that has not been exceeded in a decade, FHA does not currently provide an upfront premium discount to first-time homeowners who complete a financial counseling course.

This bill, H.R. 2162, would amend current law to require FHA to provide a 0.25 percent upfront premium discount from the prevailing rate in effect at the time for other borrowers to first-time home borrowers. This equates to a \$625 savings off the current premium structure on a \$250,000 mortgage.

The hope is, by making such a discount mandatory, more first-time homeowners will seek out financial literacy counseling and produce better outcomes for a traditionally at-risk group of homeowners.

The bottom line is that FHA is a valuable tool to help expand the universe of mortgage credit in our housing system, and we ought to be doing all that we can to make sure that we are using our limited public resources to encourage all borrowers to be well-prepared for the commitment of homeownership through financial counseling or any other effective means of creating more stable and reliable borrowers.

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

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. BEATTY),

the chair of the Subcommittee on Diversity and Inclusion and the sponsor of H.R. 2162.

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, first I would like to thank Chairwoman WATERS for all of her leadership and her support.

Mr. Speaker, for a majority of American families, buying a home will be the biggest financial purchase in their lifetime. That is why this bill we are considering today is so important.

My bill, the Housing Financial Literacy Act, H.R. 2162, would provide a 25-basis point discount on an FHA upfront mortgage insurance premium to first-time home buyers who complete a HUD-approved housing counseling program.

One of the main barriers to homeownership is saving up for the downpayment. This bill would reduce that barrier by roughly \$500.

The FHA has been utilized by everyday American families to achieve the American Dream of homeownership. Eighty-two percent of all FHA-insured mortgages are used by first-time home buyers, likely since consumers only need to put down 3.5 percent as a downpayment. The downpayment is the number one barrier to homeownership for many first-time home buyers.

This bipartisan bill would incentivize those prospective first-time home buyers to take ahold of their financial futures by taking a financial literacy class, while making it easier and a little cheaper for them to purchase that first home.

These classes are already available across the country, from Homeport and Homes on the Hill in Columbus, Ohio, to Kentucky's Housing Corporation, to the Kenosha Housing Authority in Wisconsin, and the list goes on. These classes are available to first-time home buyers to purchase a home in urban, suburban, and rural areas.

Not only is this bill a good deal for first-time home buyers, but it is also a good deal for the American taxpayer. There have been several studies over the past few years that prove not only does prepurchase housing counseling lead to improved mortgage literacy, greater appreciation for communications with lenders, and improved underwriting qualifications, such as higher credit scores, but there are also studies that show, as we have heard, that first-time home buyers who have received housing counseling are nearly one-third, Mr. Speaker, less likely to face delinquencies or foreclosures.

When you consider the average cost to the taxpayer for default within FHA's portfolio is greater than \$65,000, this bill could actually save the taxpayers money. That is something that both my Republican and Democratic colleagues were interested in during the debate on this bill in committee, and both sides of the aisle will be happy to know that, according to the Congressional Budget Office's initial analysis, this bill would not have a cost to the U.S. taxpayer.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to close by thanking my colleague and friend from Ohio, Congressman STEVE STIVERS, for cosponsoring this important bill. STEVE and I have served as the co-chairs of the Financial and Economic Literacy Caucus for the past two Congresses. This is an issue that we care about deeply.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to thank the organizations that came out in support of this bill. I think it is very important for people to know that the National Association of REALTORS, the National Housing Resource Center, the National Association of Real Estate Brokers, the Leadership Conference for Civil and Human Rights, the League of United Latin American Citizens, Credit Unions National Association, National Association of Federally-Insured Credit Unions, Public Citizen, and National Association of Hispanic Real Estate Professionals all support this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I think you get my point. People want this bill. It is the right thing to do.

Mr. Speaker, I want to also thank Congressman BARR for his support.

I urge my colleagues to join us in support of this bill, H.R. 2162, to allow more Americans to reach for that dream of homeownership in a financially responsible way. Please support this bill.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STIVERS), my Republican colleague, who is the co-chairman of the Financial Literacy Caucus in Congress and someone who has worked in a bipartisan way very productively with Congresswoman BEATTY on this important initiative.

Mr. STIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to begin by congratulating my good friend and colleague, Congresswoman JOYCE BEATTY, for advancing the Housing Financial Literacy Act, H.R. 2162. It is an effort she has championed for years. As co-chair of the Financial Literacy Caucus, I am proud to cosponsor this legislation with her.

Mr. Speaker, for many folks across this country, owning a home is quintessential to the American Dream. While not everyone will always be able to afford a single-family home, we should work to encourage the American Dream of homeownership and make sure that we help people along the way. It is good for individuals, and it is good for communities. Not only does it help individuals build equity over time, but reducing the disparities in homeownership by race has the potential to reduce the racial wealth gap in this country.

However, we must work to ensure consumers are informed and encourage responsible homeownership, and the Housing Financial Literacy Act does just that. By providing a discount of 25 basis points on the upfront FHA insurance premiums for borrowers who complete HUD-approved prepurchase financial counseling, what we are doing is

making those homes more affordable; we are empowering those people with knowledge; and we are helping build the dream of homeownership.

This financial counseling is so important for first-time buyers. It helps them understand the costs associated with homeownership, like taxes, insurance, and maintenance costs. It also helps them factor in household budgeting and recognize high-risk financial products to make sure they can make informed decisions.

For people across this country, including in my district, having a place to raise their family is the American Dream, and I encourage my colleagues to support this bill to help make homeownership a reality for more people.

Mr. Speaker, again, I want to acknowledge my colleague, Congresswoman JOYCE BEATTY, for her incredible leadership on H.R. 2162, the Housing Financial Literacy Act. I encourage all of my colleagues to support the bill.

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

Mr. Speaker, again, I would like to commend and applaud my friend, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. BEATTY), for her leadership on this. What an outstanding list of endorsements of this legislation. It goes to show how much work she has put into this and that Congressman STIVERS and others have put into this bipartisan legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairwoman of the full committee, Congresswoman WATERS, for bringing this forward.

In conclusion, as we look at this legislation, it is really a win-win-win:

It is a win because first-time home buyers are now going to be able to have a more affordable downpayment.

It is a win, in addition, because those first-time homeowners, as the gentlewoman from Ohio and the gentleman from Ohio pointed out, will be more prepared for the responsibility of homeownership, which is what is typically the most significant investment anyone makes in their entire lifetime.

And, finally—and I think this is a point that we do need to underscore as well—when you are talking about federally insured, federally backed, taxpayer-insured, taxpayer-supported mortgages, it is good for the American taxpayer that we make sure that homeowners are prepared for that very important responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues—for homeowners, for taxpayers—to support this legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman and gentleman from Ohio for pushing this bill forward. This bill incentivizes financial literacy that will help avoid delinquencies and may have an impact well beyond the housing area.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting this important piece of legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2162, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EMPHASIZING IMPORTANCE OF GRASSROOTS INVESTOR PROTECTION AND INVESTOR EDUCATION MISSIONS OF STATE AND FEDERAL SECURITIES REGULATORS

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 456) emphasizing the importance of grassroots investor protection and the investor education missions of State and Federal securities regulators, calling on the Securities and Exchange Commission to collaborate with State securities regulators in the protection of investors, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 456

Whereas State securities regulators are the original pioneers of regulating the United States capital markets and have protected investors during times of boom and bust, from ticker tape to the block-chain;

Whereas State securities regulators founded the North American Securities Administrators Association (NASAA) as a voluntary association in 1919, 8 years after the first securities laws were enacted in Kansas in 1911;

Whereas NASAA's membership in 2019 includes securities administrators in the 50 States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, the U.S. Virgin Islands, Canada, and Mexico;

Whereas the fundamental mission of the State securities regulators is protecting investors who transact in securities and receive investment advice, and their jurisdiction extends to a wide variety of issuers and intermediaries who offer and sell securities to the public;

Whereas State securities regulators are leaders in civil and administrative enforcement actions, as well as criminal prosecutions of securities violators;

Whereas State securities regulators have led efforts resulting in landmark settlements to stop unfair practices in the securities industry, the return of billions of dollars to harmed investors, and thousands of bad actors sitting in jail as the result of their work in investigating and uncovering fraud;

Whereas State securities regulators independently and within the framework of NASAA have also devised innovative ways for small companies to raise investment capital;

Whereas State securities regulators independently and within the framework of NASAA conduct investor education programs throughout the United States, providing important information to main street Americans on investing for a secure future and avoiding scams; and

Whereas State securities regulators are known for their accessibility and accountability to the investing public and have been

willing to push the envelope when it comes to protecting investors: Now, therefore, be it Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) emphasizes the longstanding role of State securities regulators in maintaining investor protection and vibrant capital markets in the United States;

(2) supports the efforts of State securities regulators to educate investors throughout the United States;

(3) supports the efforts of State securities regulators to promote responsible and efficient capital formation for the benefit of small businesses and investors throughout the United States;

(4) urges State securities regulators to continue working independently and within the voluntary framework of NASAA to protect and educate investors and promote capital formation; and

(5) urges the Securities and Exchange Commission to maintain and expand voluntary collaboration with State securities regulators in the interest of the investing public.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

□ 1730

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Representative PRESSLEY and Representative HUIZENGA for bringing H. Res. 456 to the floor, a bipartisan resolution that highlights the importance of our State securities regulators to protecting investors. This year commemorates the 100th anniversary of the North American Securities Administrators Association, the oldest international investor protection organization with a membership consisting of 67 State, provincial, and territorial securities regulators in the 50 States, the District of Columbia, the U.S. Virgin Islands, Puerto Rico, Canada, and Mexico.

The primary mission of both State securities regulators and NASAA is to protect and advocate for the protection of investors, especially the most vulnerable investors, like our Nation's seniors, who may lack the expertise, experience, and resources to protect their own interests.

These grassroots regulators are often the first line of defense against investment fraud and often respond to emerging frauds and investment scams before they are detected at the Federal level.

In 2017 alone, State securities regulators conducted nearly 4,790 investigations, leading to more than 2,100 enforcement actions, including 255 criminal prosecutions. These actions have

resulted in approximately \$486 million in restitution for harmed investors, nearly \$79 million in fines and/or penalties, and 1,985 years in incarceration or probation being ordered.

In addition, in 2017, NASAA's U.S. member jurisdictions reported bringing formal enforcement actions involving more than 1,100 senior victims, illustrating their unwavering commitment to protecting senior investors.

NASAA also engages and collaborates with Congress to promote Federal laws to improve protections for senior investors. For example, in 2018, we worked with NASAA to pass the Senior Safe Act, which was inspired by a training program developed by NASAA in partnership with the Maine Council for Elder Abuse Prevention. The Senior Safe Act addresses barriers that financial professionals face in reporting suspected senior financial exploitation or abuse to authorities.

NASAA also collaborated with us on the Senior Security Act, which passed the House with broad, bipartisan support in April. That bill would, among other things, require the SEC to work across divisions and with the State securities regulators to ensure that seniors are not subject to financial exploitation.

I strongly support our State securities regulators, and I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this resolution.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I, too, rise in support of H. Res. 456.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues, Congresswoman PRESSLEY and Congressman HUIZENGA, for their work on this bipartisan resolution.

More often than not, discussions in the Financial Services Committee are about the Securities and Exchange Commission, as it is the primary Federal regulatory agency for the U.S. securities markets.

However, State securities regulators also play an important and complementary role in grassroots investor protection, investor education, and facilitating capital formation.

H. Res. 456 highlights the important investor protection missions of State and Federal securities regulators. The resolution also encourages the continued collaboration between the SEC and State securities regulators.

American capital markets provide an avenue for mom-and-pop investors and retail investors to achieve the American Dream and grow their nest egg for retirement, for their child's college tuition, or to buy a home. Protecting investors, ensuring the integrity of our capital markets, and promoting capital formation are goals that we all can stand behind.

This resolution recognizes the important role State securities regulators play on each of these fronts.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H. Res. 456, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. PRESSLEY), the sponsor of H. Res. 456.

Ms. PRESSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairwoman WATERS for her vigilance and her steadfast leadership in continuing to bring people together across the aisle on issues of consequence to the American people and always putting consumer protection at the center of that. I also thank my colleague, Representative HUIZENGA, for his partnership.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of my resolution, which highlights the important role that State securities regulators play in strengthening the financial services industry.

The 2008 economic crisis devastated American families everywhere. But, as we watched the unemployment skyrocket, home values plummet, and credit disappear, it became clear that the impact of the crisis hit harder for some. Black families that had only just begun to build wealth through homeownership watched everything they had worked for disappear.

And although the recovery has been similarly unequal, it is critical to recognize those on the front lines protecting the investments of working families and small businesses alike.

The North American Securities Administrators Association, NASAA, comprised of securities administrators from all 50 States, are champions for stronger investor protections and diligent oversight.

My home State of Massachusetts was the first to require the registration of some securities, helping to lay the groundwork for other State models that would serve as the foundation for future Federal securities law.

As the world's oldest international investor protection organization, NASAA has remained vigilant in its policing of securities trading, securing over \$486 million in restitution to victims of investment fraud in 2017 alone.

NASAA's work with AARP helps protect seniors from the troubling upward trends in elder financial abuse. Additionally, they continue to work with medical professionals on ways to identify seniors at risk of financial abuse.

NASAA's efforts to spread retirement best practices can help empower families with the knowledge to invest wisely for generations to come.

My resolution recognizes 100 years of excellence in investor protection and encourages continued cooperation between local, State, and Federal regulators to ensure 100 more.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to support my resolution.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, once again, I appreciate the work of Ms. PRESSLEY, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, this important resolution demonstrates that our Federal form of government serves us well.

Both Federal and State authorities have important roles to play, and this is certainly true in the securities arena.

I congratulate my colleagues from Massachusetts and Michigan for bringing this bipartisan bill before the House.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this important piece of legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 456 that recognizes the importance of grassroots investor protection and the investor education missions of State and Federal securities regulators. Additionally, this important resolution calls on the Securities and Exchange Commission to collaborate and work with State securities regulators to protect investors.

Over a century ago, a group of state securities regulators had the idea to form a network of colleagues to work together for the protection of investors throughout North America. Shortly thereafter, the North American Securities Administrators Association ("NASAA") was formed in 1919. This year, 2019, marks their 100th anniversary.

The primary mission of both state securities regulators and NASAA is to protect and advocate for the protection of investors, especially the most vulnerable who lack the expertise, experience, and resources to protect their own interests.

NASAA members accomplish their mission through the vigorous enforcement of their respective civil and criminal securities laws. While the securities markets are global, securities are sold locally. NASAA members are often the first line of defense against investment fraud in their jurisdictions. Moreover, because states are "grass roots" regulators, they often respond to emerging frauds and investment scams before they are detected at the federal level.

NASAA also plays an important role in investor education, which is one of the best measures in preventing investment fraud. NASAA members have developed a wide array of specialized community outreach programs to educate investors in their jurisdictions.

Most state securities regulators have established investor education departments or divisions within their agencies. The result is an effective network of dedicated professionals delivering unbiased, relevant, and free investor education programs in local communities throughout North America. These professionals can be found educating investors in the classroom, at the workplace, and at senior centers. NASAA members work hard to reach out to people who otherwise would not be able to readily access such information.

For the past 15 years, NASAA has compiled and released an annual list of top 10 investment scams, schemes, and scandals to alert investors to increasingly complex and confusing investment fraud.

Another important part of NASAA's mission is to help with capital formation. To that end, state securities regulators often work with and assist local businesses that seek capital investment. Small businesses are the lifeblood of our economy. NASAA members help facilitate a healthy small business economy that increases growth, investment, and job creation.

In my home state of Michigan, NASAA members have worked tirelessly to become a leading voice for improving investment education, protected investors by utilizing securities enforcement, and helped build stronger communities by assisting in capital formation projects.

Today, NASAA is the oldest international investor protection organization with a membership consisting of 67 state, provincial, and territorial securities regulators in the 50 states, the District of Columbia, the U.S. Virgin Islands, Puerto Rico, Canada, and Mexico.

I want to congratulate NASAA on their first 100 years and look forward to their work continuing for many years ahead. I urge passage of this resolution acknowledging the superb work of this outstanding organization.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 456.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

IMPROVING INVESTMENT RESEARCH FOR SMALL AND EMERGING ISSUERS ACT

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2919) to require the Securities and Exchange Commission to carry out a study to evaluate the issues affecting the provision of and reliance upon investment research into small issuers.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2919

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Improving Investment Research for Small and Emerging Issuers Act”.

SEC. 2. RESEARCH STUDY.

(a) **STUDY REQUIRED.**—The Securities and Exchange Commission shall conduct a study to evaluate the issues affecting the provision of and reliance upon investment research into small issuers, including emerging growth companies and companies considering initial public offerings.

(b) **CONTENTS OF STUDY.**—The study required under subsection (a) shall consider—

(1) factors related to the demand for such research by institutional and retail investors;

(2) the availability of such research, including—

(A) the number and types of firms who provide such research;

(B) the volume of such research over time; and

(C) competition in the research market;

(3) conflicts of interest relating to the production and distribution of investment research;

(4) the costs of such research;

(5) the impacts of different payment mechanisms for investment research into small issuers, including whether such research is paid for by—

(A) hard-dollar payments from research clients;

(B) payments directed from the client’s commission income (i.e., “soft dollars”); or

(C) payments from the issuer that is the subject of such research;

(6) any unique challenges faced by minority-owned, women-owned, and veteran-owned small issuers in obtaining research coverage; and

(7) the impact on the availability of research coverage for small issuers due to—

(A) investment adviser concentration and consolidation, including any potential impacts of fund-size on demand for investment research of small issuers;

(B) broker and dealer concentration and consolidation, including any relationships between the size of the firm and allocation of resources for investment research into small issuers;

(C) Securities and Exchange Commission rules;

(D) registered national securities association rules;

(E) State and Federal liability concerns;

(F) the settlement agreements referenced in Securities and Exchange Commission Litigation Release No. 18438 (i.e., the “Global Research Analyst Settlement”); and

(G) Directive 2014/65/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 15 May 2014 on markets in financial instruments and amending Directive 2002/92/EC and Directive 2011/61/EU, as implemented by the European Union (“EU”) member states (“MiFID II”).

(c) **REPORT REQUIRED.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Securities and Exchange Commission shall submit to Congress a report that includes—

(1) the results of the study required by subsection (a); and

(2) recommendations to increase the demand for, volume of, and quality of investment research into small issuers, including emerging growth companies and companies considering initial public offerings.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member of our Investor Protection, Entrepreneurship, and Capital Markets Subcommittee, Representative HUIZENGA, and Representative MCADAMS, for working across the aisle on this bipartisan bill to improve investment research coverage for small issuers.

Investment research helps to raise investor awareness, understanding, and interest about a company, which in turn can promote informed investment and overall trading in a company’s securities.

However, reports indicate significant declines in analyst research on small

public companies. In fact, it appears that most exchange-listed companies with less than \$100 million in market capitalization have no research coverage at all.

To address this concerning trend, H.R. 2919 would direct the SEC to conduct a study on the issues that are affecting the availability of research coverage for small issuers, including emerging growth companies, companies considering an initial public offering, and minority-, women-, and veteran-owned businesses. It also directs the SEC to report back recommendations to improve the quality and availability of investment research for small issuers.

I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan bill to enable us to identify some of the barriers small businesses face when attempting to get their story out to investors in our public capital markets.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2919, the Improving Investment Research for Small and Emerging Issuers Act. I thank my colleagues, Congressman HUIZENGA and Congressman MCADAMS, for their efforts on this bipartisan legislation that will help small companies and our capital markets.

The U.S. capital markets have, and continue to be, a vibrant ecosystem, fueling America’s economic growth and generating millions of private sector jobs. These markets provide financing and needed resources to the smallest startups and the largest international companies.

However, a company’s size often impacts how easily it can access capital. For example, larger companies have generally found capital markets easier to access than smaller ones.

While the number of IPOs in the U.S. has rebounded from its post-crisis glut—thanks in large part to the success of the bipartisan JOBS Act of 2012—smaller companies still face significant regulatory and market impediments that disincentivize them from accessing capital via the public markets.

There are differing perspectives as to why fewer companies, particularly small companies, have gone public over the past few decades. The data suggest that in fulfilling its capital formation mandate, the Securities and Exchange Commission needs to tailor its approach to account for the varying nature and size of companies.

□ 1745

An important piece to this approach is recognizing insufficient research coverage of microcap, small-cap, and emerging companies can undermine the liquidity necessary to attract investor interest and facilitate capital necessary for growth.

This bipartisan legislation would direct the SEC to study, evaluate, and

report on issues affecting the ability of emerging growth companies and other small issuers to obtain research coverage, including SEC rules, FINRA rules, State and Federal liability concerns, the 2003 Global Analyst Research Settlements, and MiFID II.

Again, I thank Congressman HUIZENGA and Congressman MCADAMS for this commonsense and bipartisan legislation, which I support.

Mr. Speaker, we have no further speakers, so at this time, I will close. Let me once again urge my colleagues to support this commonsense legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that Mr. HUIZENGA and Mr. MCADAMS worked in a bipartisan manner to bring forth H.R. 2919. Markets work best when there is adequate public information, and the study on additional research provided for in this bill will help ensure that this is the case.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this important legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Speaker, initial public offerings, or IPOs, have historically been one of the most meaningful steps in the lifecycle of a company. "Going public" was the ultimate goal for entrepreneurs. You start a business from scratch, build it up into a successful enterprise, and then open up an opportunity for the public to share in your success.

By completing an IPO, a company is able to raise much-needed capital for job creation and expansion opportunities, while allowing main street investors the opportunity to have an economic piece of the action and ability to participate in the growth phase of a company.

However, over the past two decades, our nation has experienced a 37 percent decline in the number of U.S. listed companies. Equally troubling, we have seen the number of public companies fall to around 5,700. These statistics are concerning because they are similar to the data we saw in the 1980's when our economy was less than half its current size.

For myriad reasons, the public model is no longer viewed as an attractive means of raising capital. Instead, small and emerging growth companies are choosing to go public much later in their lifecycle or choosing not to go public at all.

We must work to change the trajectory. In speaking to the New York Economic Club, SEC Chairman Clayton stated that "Regardless of the cause, the reduction in the number of U.S.-listed public companies is a serious issue for our markets and the country more generally. To the extent companies are eschewing our public markets, the vast majority of Main Street investors will be unable to participate in their growth. The potential lasting effects of such an outcome to the economy and society are, in two words, not good."

I share Chairman Clayton's concerns. We need to ensure that our capital markets are open for innovators and job creators and we must work to right-size regulations for smaller companies as well.

One way that Congress worked to lift burdensome regulations and help small compa-

nies gain access to capital markets was the bipartisan Jumpstart Our Business Startups Act—popularly known as the JOBS Act.

Section 105 of the JOBS Act changed the "gun-jumping rules" to provide an exception from the definition of an offer to allow for the publication or distribution by a broker or dealer of a research report about an emerging growth company that is the subject of a proposed public offering. However, few investment banks have published any pre-IPO research since passage of the JOBS Act, and research coverage in general on small issuers continues to be an issue. This negatively affects investor interest and awareness in a company as well as trading liquidity.

This provision was intended to increase research but unfortunately it has had the opposite effect and instead, there has been a significant decline over recent years in analyst research covering small public companies. According to the U.S. Chamber, "61% of all companies listed on a major exchange with less than a \$100 million market capitalization have no research coverage at all."

For equities with a market cap below \$750 million, the average number of research analysts covering that stock is one, while equities above \$750 million in market cap have an average of 12 research analysts covering the stock.

Additionally, the amount of research written on small companies has declined even as the percentage of individual ownership in small cap companies has increased. Little to no research coverage generally corresponds with lower stock liquidity, and reduced research coverage may be particularly disadvantageous to individual investors who have limited research capabilities on their own.

In fact, one study published June 2017 in the Journal of Finance found that an increase in the number of analysts covering an industry improved the quality of analyst forecasts and information flow to investors. For that reason, it is important to examine current SEC rules and regulations affecting the ability of investment research coverage regarding small issuers. The Treasury Report on Capital Markets recommended a holistic review of rules and regulations regarding research, including the Global Settlement, to determine, which provisions should be retained, amended, or removed.

Our bipartisan bill, the Improving Investment Research for Small and Emerging Issuers Act, would direct the SEC to study and evaluate issues affecting the ability of emerging growth companies and other small issuers in obtaining research coverage, including SEC rules, FINRA rules, state and federal liability concerns, the 2003 Global Research Analyst Settlements, and MiFID II. Not later than 180 days after enactment, the SEC will be required to submit to Congress a report that includes the results of the study and recommendations to assist EGCs and other small issuers in obtaining research coverage.

Among the issues the SEC must consider are factors related to the demand for such research by institutional and retail investors, cost considerations for such research, and the impact on the availability of research coverage for small issuers due to a variety of market and regulatory conditions. The SEC's report must include recommendations to increase the demand for, volume of, and quality of investment research into small issuers, including EGCs.

I'd like to thank the Financial Services Chairwoman, Mrs. WATERS, and Rep. BEN MCADAMS, for recognizing the importance of research in our capital markets and working with me to address this issue.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2919.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXPANDING INVESTMENT IN SMALL BUSINESS ACT OF 2019

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3050) to require the Securities and Exchange Commission to carry out a study of the 10 per centum threshold limitation applicable to the definition of a diversified company under the Investment Company Act of 1940, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3050

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 "Expanding Investment in Small Businesses Act of 2019".

SEC. 2. SEC STUDY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Securities and Exchange Commission shall carry out a study of the 10 per centum threshold limitation applicable to the definition of a diversified company under section 5(b)(1) of the Investment Company Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80a-5(b)(1)) and determine the impacts of such threshold limits upon the protection of investors, efficiency, competition, and capital formation.

(b) CONSIDERATIONS.—In carrying out the study required under subsection (a), the Commission shall consider the following:

(1) The size and number of diversified companies that are currently restricted in their ability to own more than 10 percent of the voting shares in an individual company.

(2) How the investing preferences of diversified companies have shifted over time with respect to companies with smaller market capitalizations and companies in industries where competition may be limited.

(3) The expected impact to small and emerging growth companies regarding the availability of capital, related impacts on investor confidence and risk, and impacts on competition, if the threshold is increased or otherwise changed.

(4) The ability of registered funds to manage liquidity risk.

(5) Any other consideration that the Commission considers necessary and appropriate for the protection of investors.

(c) SOLICITATION OF PUBLIC COMMENTS.—In carrying out the study required under subsection (a), the Commission may solicit public comments.

(d) REPORT.—Not later than the end of the 180-day period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act, the Commission shall issue a report to the Congress, and make such report publicly available on the website of the Commission, containing—

(1) all findings and determinations made in carrying out the study required under subsection (a); and

(2) any legislative recommendations of the Commission.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Our capital markets are the envy of the world. This is due, in part, to the fact that once a company goes public, it can efficiently raise money for mom-and-pop investors who, in turn, can easily buy and sell shares.

However, there is some evidence that initial public offerings, or IPOs, of smaller companies, known as microcap companies, have declined since the dot-com bubble in 2001. This decline accounts for the main reason that the total number of stocks has declined.

I think it is important that we look into why this is the case and find out what policies we should be working on in Congress to ensure that our Nation's small businesses are able to access the public markets.

I support the gentleman from Wisconsin's bill, the Expanding Investment in Small Business Act of 2019, for doing just that. This bill would require the Securities and Exchange Commission to study and solicit public comment on the existing rules restricting a diversified mutual fund's exposure to a single company. It would also require the SEC to determine whether that requirement limits capital formation considering current investing trends and other factors the SEC determines are necessary and appropriate to protect investors.

The SEC would have to issue a report to Congress with its findings and determinations made in carrying out the study and any legislative recommendations, including any recommendation to update the current thresholds.

This bill helps ensure that we have the facts and data necessary to make an informed decision on whether we should change the current diversification limits for mutual funds and whether doing so will provide additional investment in small company IPOs.

I thank Representative STEIL for working with me this Congress to ensure that the revised text of the bill also seeks to promote competition in our capital markets, and Mr. GONZALEZ for cosponsoring this bill.

I urge all Members to vote "yes," and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3050, the Expanding Investment in Small Business Act.

I commend my colleague, an outstanding new member of the Financial Services Committee, Congressman STEIL from Wisconsin, for his hard work on this important bill that will help us make our capital markets stronger and more attractive. Because of his personal experience and his background in public markets as a counsel for a publicly traded company, he has brought to bear particular expertise in forwarding this legislation for our consideration.

Mutual funds have historically played an important role in providing liquidity to newly public companies. Since 1990, the total number of registered mutual funds has grown approximately 10 times; mean fund size has more than doubled; and open-end fund holdings of U.S. corporate equities have reached approximately 24 percent of the entire market. This growth means the investment decisions of mutual funds today are an important aspect of our public capital markets.

As the size of mutual funds has increased in recent years, the diversified fund limit rules, specifically the 10 percent cap on a diversified fund's ownership of an issuer's outstanding shares, have limited funds' ability to take meaningful positions in small-cap companies, according to industry experts.

The current 10 percent cap on mutual fund positions limits interest in small-cap IPOs because as large funds' assets under management grow, the 10 percent cap means that any investment in a small IPO will have a negligible impact on overall fund return.

Declining mutual fund interest in small IPOs also materially weakens the trading environment for small-cap stocks and likely deters small, private firms from joining our public markets, something we should not be discouraging.

H.R. 3050 would require the SEC to study whether the current diversified fund limit threshold for mutual funds to 10 percent constrains their ability to take meaningful positions in small-cap companies.

As part of its report, the SEC shall recommend to Congress any statutory changes that should be undertaken to address the SEC's findings.

This is an important bill for helping us make our capital markets as attractive as possible, especially for smaller companies.

For these reasons, I support H.R. 3050. I commend my colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin, for his leadership and his experience on this issue, and I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gen-

tleman from Wisconsin (Mr. STEIL), the author of this legislation.

Mr. STEIL. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Kentucky.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to support my bill today, the Expanding Investment in Small Business Act.

Small businesses and entrepreneurs are vital to our economy. More than 60 percent of new jobs are created by small businesses, and almost half of our private-sector workforce is employed by firms with fewer than 500 employees.

Small businesses are also an engine for innovation. According to the Small Business Administration, small businesses account for an outsized percentage of patents granted in the most innovative industries.

I see this ingenuity in Wisconsin in Racine, Janesville, Kenosha, and everywhere in-between. Entrepreneurs and startups create good-paying jobs for workers.

It is important that we continue giving job creators the ability to invest in our communities. But in order to grow, hire, and invest in innovation, small businesses need access to capital.

Unfortunately, rules and regulations have made it harder for companies to gain access to capital, made it harder for them to go public, and made it harder for them to stay public. This hurts small companies, and this hurts the broader economy.

In particular, this hurts American workers and their retirement security. Just under half of all households are invested in mutual funds. Many Americans are invested in these funds through 401(k)'s and pension plans. Their retirement security depends upon the ability to invest in a diverse set of growing, innovative companies.

Our rules, though, are burdensome. They shrink the number of publicly traded companies, either by deterring companies from going public or by encouraging them to stay private. In doing so, they limit the opportunities for Americans saving for retirement.

Members of both parties and a wide range of stakeholders and experts have identified the existing mutual fund rules as an area for potential improvement. I thank my colleague, Congressman GONZALEZ from Texas, for joining me in this across-the-aisle effort to support this bill.

This isn't a new idea, but until now, it hasn't gotten done. I am glad to see bipartisan support for taking this important step forward to improving our capital markets.

The Expanding Investment in Small Business Act directs the SEC to consider whether existing mutual fund rules make it harder for small and emerging companies to raise money, so they can grow and invest.

Under the Investment Company Act, a diversified mutual fund may not own more than 10 percent of an issuer's outstanding securities. As mutual funds have grown both in number and in size, they become an important source of

capital, in particular for small businesses.

A substantial mutual fund investment in a small-cap company can easily exceed the 10 percent cap. This likely deters mutual fund investments into growing and innovative companies.

My bill asks the SEC to consider four key items: one, how many mutual funds are currently affected by the 10 percent cap; two, how the investing preferences of diversified mutual funds have shifted over time with respect to smaller companies; three, the potential impact of a change in the 10 percent threshold; and, four, the ability of diversified funds to manage liquidity risk.

This information is necessary so that we can continue to work in a non-partisan manner to ensure that small businesses have access to capital, so they can grow and invest.

Smart, targeted reforms can give us more vibrant capital markets; growing, innovative small businesses; better outcomes for American investors; and, ultimately, a stronger economy.

I look forward to continuing to work with my colleagues toward this goal. I thank Chair WATERS and Ranking Member MCHENRY for their support of this bill, and I urge my colleagues to support its passage.

This bill is an important step forward toward a stronger economy, more dynamic small businesses, and more jobs for American workers.

□ 1800

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. RIGGLEMAN), who is an outstanding new member of the House Financial Services Committee. He is another gentleman who comes to Congress not as a politician, but as an entrepreneur, someone who has built businesses and created jobs himself and understands intimately the need for small businesses and entrepreneurs to have the ability to access capital.

Mr. RIGGLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have to support my good friend from Wisconsin as we go forward. I am also in a very small business type of atmosphere in Virginia. I own a small business, a distillery, and for us, small businesses are one of the most important things we can support as we go forward.

I am here today to support my colleagues and to support Democrats in a bipartisan fashion. This is something that we need to do, we have to do, and I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I don't need the 2 minutes to actually make sure that this happens. I urge my colleagues to support this bill and make sure we support small businesses in everything that we do.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the legislation,

and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time. I want to, again, thank the sponsors of H.R. 3050 and the gentleman from Wisconsin for working with my side on the text of this legislation. I think it is a good bill and will, along with other measures that we are considering today, improve the access of small businesses to U.S. capital markets.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this important piece of legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3050, as amended.

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. STEIL. 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.

EXPANDING ACCESS TO CAPITAL FOR RURAL JOB CREATORS ACT

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2409) to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to expand access to capital for rural-area small businesses, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2409

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 "Expanding Access to Capital for Rural Job Creators Act".

SEC. 2. ACCESS TO CAPITAL FOR RURAL-AREA SMALL BUSINESSES.

Section 4(j) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78d(j)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (4)(C), by inserting "rural-area small businesses," after "women-owned small businesses,"; and

(2) in paragraph (6)(B)(iii), by inserting "rural-area small businesses," after "women-owned small businesses,".

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

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Representatives AXNE and MOONEY for working together to put forth this bipartisan piece of legislation to require the Advocate for Small Business Capital Formation at the Securities and Exchange Commission to pay particular attention to the unique challenges rural-area small businesses face in accessing the funds they need to grow and thrive.

This important bill has gained broad bipartisan support because it is aimed at understanding and addressing real problems faced by Americans all across our country: the capital needs of rural startups and entrepreneurs.

When we created the Advocate for Small Business Capital Formation we recognized that our Nation's small businesses are proven job creators which require special attention from the SEC. However, it is also important for the advocate to recognize that different types of small businesses face unique challenges. For example, as a result of my amendment to the legislation creating the position, the advocate is required to specifically consider the challenges facing minority-owned and women-owned small businesses.

H.R. 2409 would recognize another important category: small businesses in rural areas and require the advocate to pay special attention to and report to Congress on the unique challenges and issues they face.

According to a recent survey by the Small Business Majority, roughly one in five rural small businesses rated access to capital as one of the top three challenges to maintaining or growing their business in their community. What is more, these businesses largely get their funds from personal savings, and only 13 percent said that they received investments or gifts from friends or family. So I think it is time for the SEC to look into why that is and see what, if anything, we can be doing to encourage capital formation for our Nation's rural small businesses.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support this important bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2409, the Expanding Access to Capital for Rural Job Creators Act. As a Member of Congress who represents a rural area, I want to commend the work of Congresswoman AXNE and Congressman MOONEY for their bipartisan commitment to help rural small businesses access capital.

In the House Financial Services Committee, we continue to highlight the importance of capital formation for individuals in underbanked rural communities.

Small and rural communities in Kentucky and other places are extremely vulnerable during recessions and during recovery, and their subsequent recoveries are often slower due to a lack of access to capital.

U.S. counties as a whole saw more business establishments close than open during the first 5 years of the most recent financial crisis. This decline was felt disproportionately in rural areas, where the percentage of business closures was higher. Additionally, as our economy recovers, data shows that small businesses and startups are much less likely to form in rural areas than urban areas.

H.R. 2409 is an example of bipartisan legislation that can help solve the biggest issue for a number of rural small businesses, and that is access to capital.

H.R. 2409 would amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to direct the Advocate for Small Business Capital Formation to identify unique challenges to rural-area small businesses when identifying problems that small businesses have with securing access to capital.

Small towns across the country are still struggling to recover from the post-financial crisis recession. It is imperative that we fully understand the challenges facing rural areas so that we can reinvigorate economic growth and diversify rural economies in those areas that need help the most. This bipartisan bill is an important tool for us to better address the capital formation issues facing our rural small businesses and job creators.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2409, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Iowa (Mrs. AXNE), who is the sponsor of H.R. 2409.

Mrs. AXNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of my bill, H.R. 2409, the Expanding Access to Capital for Rural Job Creators Act.

I want to thank my colleagues, Mr. MOONEY, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. RIGGLEMAN, Mr. PAPPAS, and Mr. ROSE for their work and for cosponsoring the Expanding Access to Capital for Rural Job Creators Act, and I want to thank our chairwoman of the Financial Services Committee to help us bring this here today.

As a small business owner, I know how difficult it can be to access the capital you need to succeed, and my friends across the aisle just explained that very well. I thank them so much for the bill that they have brought to the floor. However, rural entrepreneurs face unique challenges when it comes to accessing capital, but far too often their voices are left out of the conversation.

For example, in a recent Federal Reserve survey of small businesses, despite more than 70 percent of rural small businesses being a low credit risk, less than half received the full amount of funding that they were seeking. This restricts growth in rural areas. That same survey found that only 35 percent of rural small businesses expected to increase employment in the next year compared to 51

percent in urban areas. This can create a cycle where younger people leave rural areas because there are no jobs, furthering the decline in certain rural areas across this country.

The bipartisan Expanding Access to Capital for Rural Job Creators Act will ensure that rural small businesses have a seat at the table as Federal policymakers consider new rules that govern investment and capital. The Office of the Advocate of Small Business Capital Formation at the SEC was established to promote the interests of small businesses and help make sure that they have access to capital with a focus on supporting women- and minority-owned businesses.

I would also like to acknowledge the work of Ms. VELÁZQUEZ and others last Congress to include small businesses affected by natural disasters, like the recent flooding in Iowa.

My legislation, H.R. 2409, would expand the focus areas of the advocate to include rural-area small businesses. This data will help Congress and Federal regulators make better-informed decisions on how to best support economic growth in rural America.

By ensuring that Washington listens to the voices of rural small businesses, this legislation will help create jobs in rural Iowa and in rural areas across the country contributing not only to their success but to the economic success of this entire country's GDP.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the chairwoman and my colleagues for their support and working on this issue, and I ask for a "yes" from the House.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, as I said before, the gentleman from Virginia who is going to speak has personal experience in the private sector, is an entrepreneur, and knows a lot about rural America and rural America's need for access to capital as an entrepreneur.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. RIGGLEMAN), who is an outstanding new member of our committee.

Mr. RIGGLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, Representative MOONEY, and I would like to also thank my colleague, Representative AXNE, for introducing this legislation.

I rise today to speak in support of this bill, the Expanding Access to Capital for Rural Job Creators Act.

This bill will expand the mission of the SEC Advocate for Small Business Capital Formation to identify the unique challenges facing rural small businesses and give them expanded access to the capital they need.

As someone who, along with my wife, started a distillery business in the rural part of Virginia, I know many of the challenges faced by small business owners in rural areas. These small business owners are the backbones of communities across America and pillars of the local economies that help these areas thrive.

According to Census data from 2017, one in five Americans live in a rural

area. In my district, the Fifth District of Virginia, approximately 65 percent of the population resides in a rural area. These people deserve the same access to the financial system as urban dwellers and urban businesses.

Running a rural small business is a challenge, and it is important for me as the Representative of the Fifth District to advocate for the needs of these small business owners. By expanding their access to capital, we can help small businesses grow and sustain rural communities.

This bill will allow the SEC to help job creators and improve rural economies across the country. I look forward to working with the SEC and my colleagues to accomplish this mission.

For these reasons and many more, Mr. Speaker, I strongly support this legislation, and I urge everyone else to do the same.

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

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. JOHN W. ROSE), who is another outstanding new member of our committee. The gentleman from Tennessee does, in fact, represent a rural district and is himself a job creator and someone who knows about the need to provide expanded access to credit for rural American entrepreneurs.

Mr. JOHN W. ROSE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2409, the Expanding Access to Capital for Rural Job Creators Act. I want to thank Representatives AXNE and MOONEY for their leadership on this important issue as well as my colleagues, Representatives VELÁZQUEZ, PAPPAS, and RIGGLEMAN, for their original cosponsorship.

Small businesses are truly the heart of job growth in rural communities. The vast majority of the 19 counties in Tennessee's Sixth District are rural, with four being categorized as economically distressed counties.

The workforces in these communities depend on the job opportunities provided by entrepreneurs who build their businesses from the ground up.

In my short time in office, I have visited small businesses in rural communities of Tennessee's Sixth District. The men and women who run and work for these rural small businesses are some of the hardest working people I have ever met.

This bill is simple. It includes rural businesses in the mission of the Office of the Advocate for Small Business Capital Formation. This will allow rural small businesses to receive the capital formation assistance they might need and will require the Securities and Exchange Commission to consider any adverse effects regulations might have on rural small businesses.

□ 1815

Rural small businesses are often overlooked by their capital formation challenges, but their capital formation challenges deserve the same attention as any other type of small business.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to support this commonsense bill.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I inquire through the Chair if my colleague has any remaining speakers on his side.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, as a Representative of a rural congressional district and who has tremendous respect for the hardworking, small business owners of rural America—and in my case, rural, central, and eastern Kentucky—I know how hard it is for folks to access the credit that they need to build a business, to grow jobs, to create greater and better opportunities for themselves and their employees.

Not every small business in America, Mr. Speaker, can access Silicon Valley. Not every small business in middle America can access Wall Street. We need the SEC to have greater sensitivity to rural small business and their unique challenges in terms of access to capital formation.

So I applaud the leadership of the Members who have brought this legislation forward. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation. Vote in favor of rural small business capital formation.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from Iowa (Mrs. AXNE) and the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOONEY) for introducing this important legislation.

This bipartisan bill passed the House by a near unanimous vote last Congress. It is time for it to become law to help rural businesses across this country become even more important job creators.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this important piece of legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2409.

The question was taken.

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

Ms. WATERS. 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.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess for a period of less than 15 minutes.

Accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 17 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1830

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. TITUS) at 6 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed. Votes will be taken in the following order:

Motions to suspend the rules and pass:

H.R. 2515;

H.R. 3050; and

H.R. 2409.

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

WHISTLEBLOWER PROTECTION REFORM 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. 2515) to amend the Securities and Exchange Act of 1934 to amend the definition of whistleblower, as amended, 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 California (Ms. WATERS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 410, nays 12, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 431]

YEAS—410

Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Allred
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Axne
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Bergman
Beyer
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bost
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brady
Brindisi
Brooks (AL)
Brown (MD)

Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Carbajal
Cardenas
Carson (IN)
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Case
Casten (IL)
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Cisneros
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Cline
Cloud
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole

Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael
F.
Dunn
Emmer
Engel
Escobar
Eshoo
Espallat
Estes
Evans
Ferguson
Finkenauer
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fletcher
Flores
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx (NC)
Fudge
Fulcher
Gabbard
Gaetz
Gallagher
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Gibbs
Gohmert
Golden
Gomez
Gonzalez (OH)
Gonzalez (TX)
Gooden
Gosar
Gottheimer
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Green, Al (TX)
Griffith
Grothman
Guthrie
Haaland
Hagedorn
Harder (CA)
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings
Hayes
Heck
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Higgins (NY)
Hill (AR)
Hill (CA)
Himes
Holding
Hollingsworth
Horn, Kendra S.
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Hudson
Huffman
Huizenga
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson (TX)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Keller
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Klim
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger

Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Kustoff (TN)
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamb
Lamborn
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Lesko
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Long
Loudermilk
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marshall
Matsui
McAdams
McBath
McCarthy
McCaul
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McHenry
McKinley
McNerney
Meadows
Meeks
Meng
Meuser
Miller
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Morelle
Moulton
Mucarsel-Powell
Mullin
Murphy
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Newhouse
Norcross
Norman
Nunes
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Olson
Omar
Palazzo
Pallone
Palmer
Panetta
Pappas
Pascarelli
Payne
Pence
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Posey
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reschenthaler

Rice (NY)
Richmond
Riggleman
Roby
Rodgers (WA)
Roe, David P.
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rooney (FL)
Rose (NY)
Rose, John W.
Rouda
Rouzer
Roy
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Rutherford
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scalise
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Long
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shalala
Sherman
Sherrill
Shimkus
Simpson
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Smucker
Soto
Spanberger
Spano
Speier
Stanton
Staubert
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stevens
Stewart
Stivers
Suozi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Timmons
Tipton
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres Small
(NM)
Trahan
Trone
Turner
Underwood
Upton
Van Drew
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Waltz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watkins
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)

Welch
Wenstrup
Westernman
Weston
Williams

Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth

Yoho
Young
Zeldin

NAYS—12

Abraham
Amash
Duncan
Hern, Kevin

NOT VOTING—10

Brooks (IN)
Duffy
Frankel

□ 1859

Messrs. MAST, ABRAHAM, DUNCAN, RICE of South Carolina, and KEVIN HERN of Oklahoma changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: “A bill to amend the Securities and Exchange Act of 1934 to amend the definition of whistleblower, to extend the anti-retaliation protections provided to whistleblowers, and for other purposes.”.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXPANDING INVESTMENT IN
SMALL BUSINESS 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. 3050) to require the Securities and Exchange Commission to carry out a study of the 10 per centum threshold limitation applicable to the definition of a diversified company under the Investment Company Act of 1940, and for other purposes, as amended, 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 California (Ms. WATERS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 417, nays 2, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 432]

YEAS—417

Abraham
Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Allred
Amash
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Axne
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Barragán
Bass

Beatty
Bera
Bergman
Beyer
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bost
Bacon
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brady
Brindisi
Brooks (AL)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)

Buchanan
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Case
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot

Cheney
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Cisneros
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Cline
Cloud
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Conaway
Connolly
Cook
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Cox (CA)
Craig
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Cummings
Cunningham
Curtis
Davids (KS)
Davidson (OH)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny K.
Davis, Rodney
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael
F.
Duncan
Dunn
Emmer
Engel
Escobar
Eshoo
Español
Estes
Evans
Ferguson
Finkenauer
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fletcher
Flores
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxy (NC)
Fudge
Fulcher
Gabbard
Gallagher
Gallego
Garcia (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Gibbs
Gohmert
Golden
Gomez
Gonzalez (OH)
Gonzalez (TX)
Gooden
Gosar
Gottheimer
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Green, Al (TX)
Griffith
Grothman
Guthrie
Haaland
Hagedorn
Harder (CA)
Harris

Hartzler
Hastings
Hayes
Heck
Hern, Kevin
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Higgins (NY)
Hill (AR)
Hill (CA)
Himes
Holding
Hollingsworth
Horn, Kendra S.
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Hudson
Huffman
Huizenga
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson (TX)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Keller
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Kustoff (TN)
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamb
Lamborn
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Lesko
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebbeck
Lofgren
Long
Loudermilk
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marshall
Mast
Matsui
McAdams
McBath
McCarthy
McCauley
McClintock
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern

McHenry
McKinley
McNerney
Meadows
Meeks
Meng
Meuser
Miller
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Morelle
Moulton
Mucarsel-Powell
Mullin
Murphy
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Newhouse
Norcross
Norman
Nunes
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Olson
Omar
Palazzo
Pallone
Palmer
Panetta
Pappas
Pascarella
Payne
Pence
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Posey
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reschenthaler
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Riggleman
Roby
Rodgers (WA)
Roe, David P.
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rooney (FL)
Rose (NY)
Rose, John W.
Rouda
Rouzer
Roy
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Rutherford
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scalise
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shalala
Sherman
Sherrill
Shimkus
Simpson
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)

Smith (WA)
Smucker
Soto
Spanberger
Spano
Speier
Stanton
Stauber
Stefanik
Stell
Steube
Stevens
Stewart
Stivers
Suozi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Timmons

NAYS—2

Casten (IL)

Massie

NOT VOTING—13

Brooks (IN)
Buck
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Frankel

Gaetz
Garamendi
Gianforte
Grijalva
Guest

□ 1908

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXPANDING ACCESS TO CAPITAL
FOR RURAL JOB CREATORS ACT

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. 2409) to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to expand access to capital for rural-area small businesses, 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 California (Ms. WATERS) 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 413, nays 7, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 433]

YEAS—413

Abraham
Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Allred
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Axne
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Barragán
Bass
Bergman

Beyer
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bost
Brady
Brindisi
Brooks (AL)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne

Calvert
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Case
Casten (IL)
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Cisneros
Budd
Clarke (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Cline

Cloud Hill (AR)
 Clyburn Hill (CA)
 Cohen Himes
 Cole Holding
 Collins (GA) Hollingsworth
 Collins (NY) Horn, Kendra S.
 Comer Horsford
 Conaway Houlahan
 Connolly Hoyer
 Cook Hudson
 Cooper Huffman
 Correa Huizenga
 Costa Hunter
 Courtney Hurd (TX)
 Cox (CA) Jackson Lee
 Craig Jayapal
 Crawford Jeffries
 Crenshaw Johnson (GA)
 Crist Johnson (LA)
 Crow Johnson (OH)
 Cuellar Johnson (SD)
 Cummings Johnson (TX)
 Cunningham Jordan
 Curtis Joyce (OH)
 Davids (KS) Joyce (PA)
 Davidson (OH) Kaptur
 Davis (CA) Katko
 Davis, Danny K. Keating
 Davis, Rodney Keller
 Dean Kelly (IL)
 DeFazio Kelly (MS)
 DeGette Kelly (PA)
 DeLauro Kennedy
 DelBene Khanna
 Delgado Kildee
 Demings Kilmer
 DeSaulnier Kim
 DesJarlais Kind
 Deutch King (IA)
 Dingell King (NY)
 Doggett Kinzinger
 Doyle, Michael Kirkpatrick
 F. Krishnamoorthi
 Duncan Kuster (NH)
 Dunn Kustoff (TN)
 Emmer LaHood
 Engel LaMalfa
 Escobar Lamb
 Eshoo Lamborn
 Espallat Langevin
 Estes Larsen (WA)
 Evans Larson (CT)
 Ferguson Latta
 Finkenauer Lawrence
 Fitzpatrick Lawson (FL)
 Fleischmann Lee (CA)
 Fletcher Lee (NV)
 Flores Lesko
 Fortenberry Levin (CA)
 Foster Levin (MI)
 Foxx (NC) Lewis
 Fudge Lieu, Ted
 Fulcher Lipinski
 Gabbard Loebach
 Gallagher Lofgren
 Gallego Long
 Garamendi Loudermilk
 Garcia (IL) Lowenthal
 Garcia (TX) Lowey
 Gibbs Lucas
 Gohmert Luetkemeyer
 Golden Lujan
 Gomez Luria
 Gonzalez (OH) Lynch
 Gonzalez (TX) Malinowski
 Gooden Maloney,
 Gottheimer Carolyn B.
 Granger Maloney, Sean
 Graves (GA) Marchant
 Graves (LA) Marshall
 Graves (MO) Mast
 Green (TN) Matsui
 Green, Al (TX) McAdams
 Griffith McBath
 Grothman McCarthy
 Guthrie McCaul
 Haaland McClintock
 Hagedorn McCollum
 Harder (CA) McEachin
 Harris McGovern
 Hartzler McHenry
 Hastings McKinley
 Hayes McNerney
 Heck Meadows
 Hern, Kevin Meeks
 Herrera Beutler Meng
 Hice (GA) Meuser
 Higgins (LA) Miller
 Higgins (NY) Mitchell

Moolenaar
 Mooney (WV)
 Moore
 Morelle
 Moulton
 Mucarsel-Powell
 Mullin
 Murphy
 Nadler
 Napolitano
 Neal
 Neguse
 Newhouse
 Norcross
 Norman
 Nunes
 O'Halleran
 Ocasio-Cortez
 Olson
 Omar
 Palazzo
 Pallone
 Palmer
 Panetta
 Pappas
 Pascarell
 Payne
 Pence
 Perlmutter
 Perry
 Peters
 Peterson
 Phillips
 Pingree
 Pocan
 Porter
 Posey
 Pressley
 Price (NC)
 Quigley
 Raskin
 Kirkpatrick
 Ratcliffe
 Reed
 Reschenthaler
 Rice (NY)
 Rice (SC)
 Richmond
 Riggleman
 Roby
 Rodgers (WA)
 Roe, David P.
 Rogers (AL)
 Rogers (KY)
 Rooney (FL)
 Rose (NY)
 Rose, John W.
 Rouda
 Rouzer
 Roybal-Allard
 Ruiz
 Ruppersberger
 Rush
 Rutherford
 Sanchez
 Sarbanes
 Scalise
 Scanlon
 Schakowsky
 Schiff
 Schneider
 Schrader
 Schrier
 Schweikert
 Scott (VA)
 Scott, Austin
 Scott, David
 Sensenbrenner
 Serrano
 Sewell (AL)
 Shalala
 Sherman
 Sherrill
 Shimkus
 Simpson
 Sires
 Slotkin
 Smith (MO)
 Smith (NE)
 Smith (NJ)
 Smith (WA)
 Smucker
 Soto
 Spanberger
 Spano
 Speier
 Stanton
 Stauber
 Steil
 Steube

Stevens
 Stewart
 Stivers
 Suozzi
 Swalwell (CA)
 Takano
 Taylor
 Thompson (CA)
 Thompson (MS)
 Thompson (PA)
 Thornberry
 Timmons
 Tipton
 Titus
 Tlaib
 Tonko
 Torres (CA)
 Torres Small
 (NM)

Amash
 Biggs
 Burchett

Boyle, Brendan
 F.
 Brooks (IN)
 Diaz-Balart
 Duffy

Trahan
 Trone
 Turner
 Underwood
 Upton
 Van Drew
 Vargas
 Veasey
 Vela
 Velázquez
 Visclosky
 Wagner
 Walberg
 Walden
 Walker
 Walorski
 Waltz
 Wasserman
 Schultz

NAYS—7

Gaetz
 Gosar
 Massie

NOT VOTING—12

Frankel
 Gianforte
 Grijalva
 Guest
 Ryan

□ 1918

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.

PROTECTING AFFORDABLE MORTGAGES FOR VETERANS ACT OF 2019

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Financial Services and the Committee on Veterans' Affairs be discharged from further consideration of the bill (S. 1749) to clarify seasoning requirements for certain refinanced mortgage loans, 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 (Mr. GOLDEN). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 1749

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 “Protecting Affordable Mortgages for Veterans Act of 2019”.

SEC. 2. SEASONING REQUIREMENTS FOR CERTAIN REFINANCED MORTGAGE LOANS.

(a) GINNIE MAE.—Section 306(g)(1) of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1721(g)(1)) is amended by striking the second sentence.

(b) VETERANS LOANS.—Section 3709(c) of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the matter before paragraph (1), by striking “is refinanced” and inserting “is a refinanced”; and

(2) by striking paragraphs (1) and (2) and inserting the following new paragraphs:

“(1) the date on which the borrower has made at least six consecutive monthly payments on the loan being refinanced; and

“(2) the date that is 210 days after the first payment due date of the loan being refinanced.”.

(c) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this Act may be construed to restrict or otherwise modify the authorities of the Government National Mortgage Association.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

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

Mr. BABIN. 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 I 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. BABIN. Mr. Speaker, I urge the Speaker to immediately schedule this important bill so we can take care of the most innocent of lives that we have in America.

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

CALLING FOR THE RESIGNATION OF LABOR SECRETARY ALEXANDER ACOSTA

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

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, serial sexual abuser Jeffrey Epstein has been arrested again. Federal prosecutors have charged him with running a sex trafficking ring where he paid to have sex with girls as young as 14 years old.

More than that, officials said Epstein's abuse happened between 2002 and 2005, 3 years before he received a sweetheart deal to spend a mere 18 months in prison and avoid Federal trial for sexual abuse of 36 underaged girls.

The prosecutor who made that deal is our current Secretary of Labor, Alexander Acosta.

That is why I am calling for Secretary Acosta to resign. His actions in the Epstein case prove that he prefers to protect sex offenders over teenage abuse victims.

He prefers to protect millionaire criminals over the common man, so how can we trust him to protect millions of American workers from corporate abuse when he clearly supports the abusers? We can't.

That is why he needs to resign. Then, we can let the FBI conduct a thorough investigation of his actions to ensure that nothing like this ever happens again.

RECOGNIZING LIEUTENANT GENERAL QUINTAS

(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. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Major General Lee Quintas for his service to our Nation with the 3rd Infantry Division at Fort Stewart.

On June 17, Major General Quintas departed to be the Deputy Commanding General for the U.S. Army Forces Command at Fort Bragg. However, he is leaving both Fort Stewart and the First Congressional District of Georgia in a better place.

Major General Quintas' colleagues admire him as an extraordinary leader with extensive experience who ensures soldiers and units are ready for any mission.

During his 30 years of service with the United States military, he has done everything, from deploying in Iraq to leading the 3rd ID in hurricane response missions in Georgia.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Major General Quintas for his service to our Nation and the First Congressional District of Georgia. He has been a great leader for the 3rd Infantry Division.

Mr. Speaker, I wish Major General Quintas the best of luck in his new position at Fort Bragg.

REMEMBERING MIKE ASSANTE

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

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise with deep sadness to remember a luminary in the field of cybersecurity.

Michael Assante passed away last Friday. The many tributes that have poured in from people in the ICS security community are a testament to his pioneering work and his kind soul.

I, too, have been touched by Mike's work. Mike and his colleagues at Idaho National Laboratory first briefed me many years ago on the Aurora vulnerability that showed how a bad actor could use malware to cause physical damage to the electric grid and potentially knock out power to millions.

That brief first piqued my interest in cybersecurity and led to my cofounding the Congressional Cybersecurity Caucus with Congressman MCCAUL.

Mike was many things—a brilliant researcher, a loving husband, a ferocious fighter of the cancer that eventually claimed his life—but I will always remember him, as will so many who went through his SANS Institute courses, as an educator.

I cherished my time with Mike because I knew he would help me understand how Congress could better secure the operational technology underlying our daily lives.

Michael Assante made a difference. He can never be replaced, but I will

continue to honor his legacy by fighting to improve our Nation's cybersecurity.

HONORING JUDY GENSHAFT UPON RETIREMENT AS UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH FLORIDA PRESIDENT

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

Mr. SPANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Dr. Judy Genshaft for her 19 years of service as president of my alma mater, the University of South Florida.

During her tenure, she emphasized research. That commitment has been a major part of why USF has been rated as one of the Nation's top 25 public universities for research.

Her advocacy for technology had a direct impact on the city of Tampa, which has grown into one of the most successful tech hubs in the world.

Under her leadership, USF's endowment nearly doubled; its 4-year graduation rate tripled; and now, all USF students graduate at the same rate, regardless of their race, ethnicity, or family income.

On a personal level, she is also an immensely generous donor, having helped fund the USF Honors College and then made an additional gift to endow its deanship.

More impressive than these numbers are Judy's contagious energy and her genuine concern for her students. She regularly worked 12-hour days and still made time to talk with students whenever she saw them.

Mr. Speaker, Judy is a woman clearly guided by purpose. I am so grateful for everything that she has done and continues to do to make my alma mater, the University of South Florida, better for our students and our city.

PROTECTING THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

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

Ms. GARCIA of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the health and safety of millions are at risk. Today, the Fifth Circuit heard oral arguments aimed at repealing the Affordable Care Act.

Texas Attorney General Ken Paxton wants to end healthcare coverage for people with preexisting conditions, young adults, and pregnant women. Texas already has the highest number of uninsured people anywhere in the United States, and that number would increase by 1.7 million if these protections ended, including many in my district.

We know that America suffers when people go uninsured. We can't afford to let our families, our neighbors, our fellow Texans lose these protections.

Premiums and out-of-pocket costs for doctors' appointments and hospital visits will increase significantly.

House Democrats will continue to fight to expand access to affordable, quality healthcare and to lower prescription drug prices.

□ 1930

HONORING CLARENCE HOLLOWELL

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

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mr. Clarence Hollowell from Jacksonville Beach, Florida, for his service to our country and to our Jacksonville community.

Mr. Hollowell is a veteran of the United States Army, who now spends his weekdays serving his community as a U.S. postal worker and his weekends at local cemeteries cleaning the headstones of our fallen veterans. From start to finish, each headstone takes about 2 to 3 weeks to clean and, incredibly, Mr. Hollowell has cleaned over 600 of them. He does so selflessly, purchasing his own materials, and meticulously scrubbing each headstone with a toothbrush until the stone glistens white.

In his own words, Mr. Hollowell says that "Everybody's got to have a project, and I think if you can help the community, even better."

On behalf of the Fourth District of Florida, I thank Mr. Hollowell for his service and his inspiration to his community.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY MUST SERVE THE NATION

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I have known the men and women who have served in the Department of Homeland Security and have dealt with the border for many, many years. I have respected the work that they have done. It is tragic, however, that as we continue to serve under this administration, we now find the Department of Homeland Security in a major cover-up: the unaccompanied children who have been separated from their families, the disallowances of Members to visit and do their oversight work to see the conditions, and the rejection of the Department of Homeland Security's Office of Inspector General who wrote a direct memo to the secretary that said there is an urgent crisis that you must deal with at the border, and for this secretary to go on national television and deny it.

You can applaud the men and women who work, but you cannot applaud bad acts. You cannot applaud what is happening in Mexico, which I just came back from. The migrants who are there are not being taken care of. They are in desperate need. Some of them will

not have a place to live, some of them will not have food, and it is because of the policies of this administration.

The Department of Homeland Security must serve the Nation, it must not serve one single President. I maintain that we are going to fight to fix this broken immigration system.

RECOGNIZING WEST JEFFERSON'S 33RD ANNUAL CHRISTMAS IN JULY FESTIVAL

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

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate the city of West Jefferson in North Carolina's Fifth District on yet another successful Christmas in July Festival. For the last 33 years, the festival has taken place on the first weekend of July to celebrate Ashe County's vibrant and nationally renowned Christmas tree industry.

The dedicated volunteers of the festival committee and board of directors bring together this wonderfully patriotic community around America's independence and the best Christmas trees in the country. As a former Christmas tree grower myself, I can attest to the importance of recognizing this often overlooked, yet highly significant, farming industry, not just during the Christmas season, but all year round.

It is not only an honor to represent these patriots and tree growers, it is an honor for me to share this tradition with them every year.

PROTECT HEALTHCARE FOR ALL AMERICANS

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

Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL. Mr. Speaker, 9 years ago, the House passed the Affordable Care Act to ensure that tens of millions of Americans had health insurance.

Thanks to the ACA, over a million Floridians were able to get healthcare coverage.

In these past 9 years, Republicans have consistently tried to repeal and sabotage the Affordable Care Act. As a result, families in Florida are often unable to afford their healthcare.

Today, the President tried once again to repeal the Affordable Care Act. If the President gets his way, more than 1.6 million Floridians would lose their coverage, and insurance companies could charge even more, resulting in higher costs for American families. Women could be charged more than men for the same services, and people living with preexisting conditions could lose coverage.

Floridians cannot afford these attacks on their healthcare. I implore the Senate to pass the bills that we have already sent them to protect healthcare for all Americans.

TRIBUTE TO ELSIE WAITES

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Mrs. Elsie Waites, who passed away on May 28, 2019.

Mrs. Waites was a native Louisianan from Gloster and was born on May 9, 1920. Throughout her life, she was always known as someone who loved and cared for those around her.

Of her many accomplishments, Mrs. Waites was an avid volunteer in her local community, helping young children achieve their dreams. She also took it upon herself to organize a local quartet group, where she sang for several years traveling throughout the State.

While Mrs. Waites lived an extraordinary life dedicated and devoted to service and compassion, her first priority was always her family. She was a loving mother and grandmother to 8 children, 21 grandchildren, 44 great-grandchildren, and 8 great-great-grandchildren.

One of Mrs. Waites' children, Mrs. Barbara Norton, is my good friend and former colleague in the Louisiana House of Representatives.

I wish to extend my sincere and deepest sympathies to all of the family and friends whose lives were blessed by Mrs. Waites. I pray that God's grace gives them comfort during this time, and that they are able to reflect on all the joyful memories that she provided.

Proverbs 31 reminds us that:

A woman who fears the Lord is to be praised. Honor her for all that her hands have done . . . Her children arise and call her blessed.

INJUSTICE AT THE SOUTHERN BORDER

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

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address the continued injustices at our southern border.

Recent reports have continued to highlight the conditions at DHS detention camps are deplorable, inhumane, and abusive to children. Current and former Border Patrol agents have attested to the horrible conditions these children are being subjected to.

Now that we have provided emergency funding, we must stop this abuse by the Trump administration in its tracks. We need far greater accountability, we need to set required standards for medical care, we need to strictly limit the time spent in detention facilities, and we need to institute protocols to ensure compassionate processing of children and families.

What is going on at our border does not reflect our values. It does not reflect who we are. And the impact on these children will last a lifetime.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to work with us to stop this stain on our great Nation's long history of compassion, refuge, and inclusion.

AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to condemn President Trump, his administration, and all the anti-life Republicans in Congress who seek to strike down the Affordable Care Act using the judicial system this time. Their callousness would cut off millions of Americans from their affordable healthcare plans.

Today, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit began hearing oral arguments in *Texas v. United States*, a case supported by the Trump administration that would strike down every health benefit afforded to the American people under the Affordable Care Act.

If Republicans strike down the Affordable Care Act, then the protections for 130 million Americans with pre-existing conditions, more than a third of our people, would be erased, including nearly 5 million Ohioans. The uninsured rate would go up by 65 percent. The Affordable Care Act's historic Medicaid expansion, which covers 17 million people, would go out the window. And protections for women that prevent insurance companies from charging them higher rates than men would disappear, as well.

These popular and lifesaving provisions would be repealed.

Mr. Speaker, since its inception, the Affordable Care Act has provided quality coverage for more than 16 million Americans. Let's ensure that high-quality healthcare remains a right for all, not a privilege for just a few.

CONGRATULATING JOE DIETTERICK

(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. Mr. Speaker, when Joe Dietterick was told by his guidance counselor that he should join the Vineland High School crew team, the Fighting Clan, he wasn't interested at first. But Joe, a 16-year-old with cerebral palsy, isn't one to back down from a challenge. All he needed was one practice on the lake, pushing his boat through the water with his doubles partner, Jason Wheeler, to immediately fall in love with rowing.

Joe and Jason went on to become Vineland High School's first adaptive boat to row in the Atlantic County rowing championships, and they also went on to compete in the Stotesbury Cup Regatta.

Joe's perseverance and willingness to challenge himself is an inspiration to

his teammates; to his coach, Paul Myers; and to all who gave him the Most Courageous award at their team's award banquet. Joe says that the comradery and friendship that he has found with his teammates is what means the most to him.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. Dietterick for being an important part of our community. He is an inspiration and he is a hero.

AFFORDABLE CARE ACT LAWSUIT

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

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I just put this placard up to emphasize what our Democratic Caucus is attempting to do. We have a program called "For the People," and we are trying to deal with the issues of healthcare across this Nation.

We know, as do basically all the American public, that healthcare is, in many cases, not affordable. So how can we deal with this?

Well, one way is to deal with the cost of prescription medicines. We have a program. We have actually voted it off the floor. It is over in the Senate where it will linger as the Grim Reaper. Senator MCCONNELL, kills legislation that would be for the people. So this is one example of many that we Democrats are trying to address.

Back in 2010, we addressed this issue, at least in part, with the Affordable Care Act, which was promptly called ObamaCare by our Republican colleagues at that time. They campaigned against it and, ultimately, succeeded in winning the House in the 2010 election, and then spent 2011, 2012, 2013, 2014, 2015, 2016, and 2017 in an effort to repeal the Affordable Care Act. Fortunately, they did not succeed.

When the new President, Mr. Trump, came to office, they tried, once again, to repeal the Affordable Care Act in 2017. They failed, largely because a Senator from Arizona, who was then suffering from cancer, voted no in the Senate. So I thank Senator McCain for having the courage and the understanding of what it meant to have a preexisting condition.

□ 1945

So here we are today with all kinds of charts that I am not going to put up. I am just going to speak directly to this issue.

As was said just a moment ago by my colleague from Ohio, the appellate court in New Orleans is taking up an issue that Republicans, including the President, have put before the court. Unable to gain a repeal in the Congress of the United States, they are now pursuing in the courts of the land a repeal put forward by, I think, 16 attorneys general—all Republicans—to use the courts to repeal the Affordable Care Act.

I want us to understand what this means. The fight of the last 8 years, unsuccessfully, in the court of the people, the Congress and the Senate of the United States, being unsuccessful, they are now attempting in the courts of this land to do what they could not do through the representatives of the people of the United States.

The cynical effort to do this actually began with the December 2017 tax cuts that the Republicans rammed through Congress without one hearing: not a hearing in the Ways and Means Committee, not a hearing in the Senate Committee on Finance, not a hearing at all.

Attached to that legislation was a repeal of the mandate that was in the Affordable Care Act that every American must either purchase insurance or have insurance through their employer. That repeal then opened the door to the current attempt now in the appellate court in New Orleans that could give rise to a decision that might ultimately be made by the U.S. Supreme Court that would totally repeal all aspects of the Affordable Care Act.

So what does this mean? Mr. Speaker, what does this mean for you and me?

I hope you do not have a preexisting condition. I do, because I am over 65, and 130 million Americans have a preexisting condition. The repeal of the Affordable Care Act would remove the protections that those Americans have that would guarantee them coverage without discrimination.

Mr. Speaker, I was the insurance commissioner in California in the early 1990s and again in 2002 to 2005. I know what it means when the insurance companies discriminate based upon preexisting conditions. I have seen the documents that they would require men and women to fill out before they would issue a health insurance program.

Every conceivable issue that a human being would have, from high blood pressure to, indeed, being a female, was on that list, and the insurance companies had unilateral, total discretion to charge more or not provide insurance at all.

So the President of the United States, at this moment, together with those attorneys general and, apparently, the support of our Republican colleagues are, at this moment, attempting to reestablish a burden on 130 million Americans who do have a preexisting condition, who are protected but, if they have their way in court, would lose that protection and face, once again, the onerous and, in many cases, deadly burden of having a preexisting condition and not being able to get healthcare insurance or having to pay several times more because of their preexisting condition.

Who among us does not have that? Well, perhaps the other 40 percent—actually, 50 percent of Americans who stand at risk of developing high blood pressure, diabetes, or some other illness.

That is not all. In my district in the Sacramento Valley of California, the Affordable Care Act has allowed the creation of what we call Federally Qualified Health Centers, which now are the principal providers of initial healthcare in my district.

It is not just for poor people, not just for transients who have moved from one job to another, but for people who have been insured for years but, because of a lack of medical services, could not get insurance.

These Federally Qualified Health Centers are totally dependent upon the Affordable Care Act. Repeal the Affordable Care Act and those clinics are gone, and the services that they provide will not be in communities, both urban and rural, across America.

How bad is it that those attorneys general are so stuck on repealing ObamaCare that they are ignoring the reality that millions upon millions of Americans have come to depend upon these clinics? If the Affordable Care Act is found to be contrary to law and the Constitution by the courts and by the cynical, diabolical repeal of one section of the Affordable Care Act, those people will not be able to get primary care services.

And that is not all. The Affordable Care Act expanded the Medicaid program across this Nation, and some 15 million Americans have been able to gain healthcare access through the Medicaid programs. In California, we call it Medi-Cal. The Medi-Cal program in California provides, perhaps, 3 million Californians with access to healthcare services. That, too, the expansion will be gone, and the support for States across this Nation will be eliminated if the Affordable Care Act is found to no longer exist because of court action.

How cynical, how sad, how harmful, but that is what they are pursuing. And that is not all. There is a problem that existed before the Affordable Care Act.

Young men and women found coverage in some universities, in some jobs through either the university and the fees or through an employer; but most, when they became 18 years of age, lost their family insurance. The Affordable Care Act said that is not good. They would be able to stay on their family's insurance until the age of 26, where, presumably, they would be better able to buy insurance themselves or be able to have a job in which insurance would be provided.

Insurance is expensive, so the exchanges were set up across the Nation, insurance exchanges where people could shop for insurance. Those exchanges provided not only access to insurance markets, but they also provided, through the Affordable Care Act, tax credits that would make the insurance affordable to them.

Nope, it is going to be gone. It is going to disappear if the court in New Orleans rules against the Affordable Care Act.

And so how will they afford insurance? Well, they won't. And in many States where there are Federal exchanges—California not included, because California set up its own State exchange. But in those States that have a Federal exchange, it won't exist. The ability to shop for insurance will be diminished or eliminated and, along with it, the subsidies. So those people, some 9 million who now enjoy those subsidies, will not receive them.

It goes on and on.

Are you a senior? Are you on Medicaid? If so, you are in the last year in which the doughnut hole will no longer exist, beginning 4 years ago. The doughnut hole, the prescription drugs doughnut hole in which prior to the Affordable Care Act there was a subsidy, part D, for prescription drugs, that ended at about \$1,500 of prescription costs.

Then there was a doughnut hole in which the individual on Medicare would have to pay for insurance, and that was somewhere around \$4,000. And then above that, Medicare would once again pick up the cost or most of the cost.

In the Affordable Care Act, we specifically set up a system so that over a 4-year period, the doughnut hole would disappear. It would shrink each and every year. It would rise from \$1,500 to \$2,000, \$3,000, and so forth. And next year, it would be gone.

I am sorry for the seniors. The Affordable Care Act, if found by the court to no longer be constitutional, would reemerge immediately upon an action by either the appellate court or, I suppose, ultimately, the Supreme Court. So, welcome the doughnut hole back.

If someone happens to be a senior, they better start pocketing money—which I am sure they don't have, to begin with—to prepare for the day when the cynical action of these attorneys general—Republicans, every single one of them—and the President would once again reestablish the awesome, terrible prescription drugs doughnut hole.

How small-minded can you be? Apparently, there is no end to it. So here we are. Our effort on this Democratic side of the aisle is for the people, not for some ideological mumbo jumbo, but for the people. We want a healthcare program that provides solid benefits for Americans.

The Affordable Care Act takes us a long, long way toward that goal. It doesn't achieve it totally, and we have more to do. Many of us talk about Medicare for All, and we hope to get there some day. But in the meantime, we have the Affordable Care Act, and our Republican colleagues are doing everything they can since its institution in 2010 to do away with it, and they have never, ever provided a substitute.

Do you remember that repeal and replacement mantra? There has never been a replacement program that made any sense whatsoever.

So, we are for the people. We want to deal with the cost of prescription drugs, not to increase them for seniors, as our Republican colleagues are attempting to do; not to put Americans out of the insurance market, as they are attempting to do, by eliminating the guaranteed coverage regardless of your healthcare status; not to put people out of insurance if they are 18 to 26 years of age, as our Republican colleagues are attempting to do; not to eliminate the clinics that millions upon millions of Americans now depend on for their primary care, as our Republican colleagues are attempting to do.

□ 2000

We want it for the people. We want healthcare coverage for every American. We want it to be affordable, and we want it to be available.

So here we are on a day in which the appellate court in New Orleans is hearing from the President's lawyers in the Department of Justice that 13 million Americans should lose their health coverage and that 130 million Americans should be, once again, facing insurance discrimination because of an existing healthcare issue. We are hearing from the President's lawyers that it is good to eliminate the clinics, that it is good to eliminate the subsidies that some 9 million Americans are able to get to so that they can afford insurance, and that the exchanges that provide a marketplace for people to sort out what kind of an insurance policy they want should be eliminated.

The President's lawyers are out there purposely harming Americans all because the President has said we must repeal the ObamaCare program.

I am sorry. I disagree. I want Americans to have healthcare coverage. I was an insurance commissioner for years, and I fought the insurance companies every single day. Then I came here in 2009 and was able to vote, providing on this floor the vote that allowed the Affordable Care Act to move out of this House to the Senate and eventually become law—the 218th vote. I am proud of that vote because I know from my personal experience that the Affordable Care Act dealt with real problems that Americans had and gave Americans a real opportunity to get healthcare and to get healthcare services.

Here we are with the President of the United States actively this day doing everything he could not achieve in the Congress but rather now in the courts doing everything he can to harm Americans—how cynical, how terrible, and how harmful. But that is where we are.

We will see what the court does. Hopefully, they will be sympathetic to 130 million Americans, to 9 million Americans, to 15 million Americans, to children, and to young adults 18 to 25. Maybe they will be sympathetic. We will see what happens.

But if the Affordable Care Act is somehow through the courts repealed and there is no replacement, then I

want the American people to understand who is responsible for the harm that will immediately be inflicted upon Americans. It is our President and it is his colleagues who have aided and abetted and who today in-State attorneys general are arguing for the harm that will come to Americans.

We haven't given up the fight, and we will never give up the fight so that every American has affordable health insurance, whatever that may be.

We have come a long way with the Affordable Care Act, and we will fight all along the way. Should we lose this battle, we are never, ever going to give up our goal of providing quality, affordable healthcare to every American.

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

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

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 3 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 2348

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. PERLMUTTER) at 11 o'clock and 48 minutes p.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2500, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2020, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

Mr. MCGOVERN, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 116-143) on the resolution (H. Res. 476) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2500) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes, and providing for consideration of motions to suspend the rules, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

PUBLICATION OF BUDGETARY MATERIAL

STATUS REPORT ON CURRENT SPENDING LEVELS OF ON-BUDGET SPENDING AND REVENUES FOR FY 2019

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET,
Washington, DC, July 9, 2019.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: To facilitate application of sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, I am transmitting

an updated status report on the current levels of on-budget spending and revenues for fiscal year 2019. This status report is current through July 1, 2019. The term “current level” refers to the amounts of spending and revenues estimated for each fiscal year based on laws enacted or awaiting the President’s signature.

Table 1 compares the current levels of total budget authority, outlays, and revenues to the overall limits filed in the Congressional Record on May 10, 2018, as adjusted, for fiscal year 2019. These comparisons are needed to implement section 311(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, which establishes a rule enforceable with a point of order against measures that would breach the budget resolution’s aggregate levels.

Table 2 compares the current levels of budget authority and outlays for legislative action completed by each authorizing committee with the limits filed in the Congressional Record on May 10, 2018, for fiscal year 2019. These comparisons are needed to enforce the point of order under section 302(f) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, which prohibits the consideration of measures that would breach the section 302(a) allocation of new budget authority for the committee that reported the measure. It is also needed to implement section 311(c), which provides an exception for committees that comply with their allocations from the point of order under section 311(a).

Table 3 compares the current status of discretionary appropriations for fiscal year 2019 with the section 302(b) suballocations of discretionary budget authority and outlays among Appropriations subcommittees. The comparison is needed to enforce section 302(f) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 because the point of order under that section equally applies to measures that would breach the applicable section 302(b) suballocation. The table also provides supplementary information on spending in excess of the base discretionary spending limits allowed under section 251(b) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

Table 4 displays the current level of advance appropriations in fiscal year 2019 appropriations bills. All of the advance appropriations are for accounts identified pursuant to H. Res. 6 and the statement of the

Chairman published in the Congressional Record on January 8, 2019. This table is needed to enforce a rule against appropriations bills containing advance appropriations that: (i) are not identified in the statement of the Chairman published in the Congressional Record on January 8, 2019 or (ii) would cause the aggregate amount of such appropriations to exceed the level specified in section 103(c) of H. Res. 6.

In addition, a letter from the Congressional Budget Office is attached that summarizes and compares the budget impact of legislation enacted after the adoption of the budget resolution against the budget resolution aggregate in force.

If you have any questions, please contact Jennifer Wheelock or Raquel Spencer.

Sincerely,

JOHN YARMUTH,
Chairman.

TABLE 1—REPORT TO THE SPEAKER FROM THE COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET, STATUS OF THE FISCAL YEAR 2019 CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET, REFLECTING ACTION COMPLETED AS OF JULY 1, 2019

(On-budget amounts, in millions of dollars)

	Fiscal Year 2019
Appropriate Level: ¹	
Budget Authority	3,752,421
Outlays	3,551,738
Revenues	2,590,496
Current Level: ¹	
Budget Authority	3,641,063
Outlays	3,547,252
Revenues	2,590,070
Current Level over (+)/under (–) Appropriate Level:	
Budget Authority	– 111,358
Outlays	– 4,486
Revenues	– 426

¹ The resolution includes emergencies enacted in 2018, adjusted for inflation. Current level excludes all emergencies.

TABLE 2—DIRECT SPENDING LEGISLATION, COMPARISON OF AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE LEGISLATIVE ACTION WITH 302(a) ALLOCATIONS FOR BUDGET CHANGES, REFLECTING ACTION COMPLETED AS OF JULY 1, 2019

(Fiscal Years, in millions of dollars)

House Committee	2019	
	BA	Outlays
Agriculture		
Allocation	0	0
Current Level	2,414	1,401
Difference	2,414	1,401
Armed Services		
Allocation	0	0

TABLE 2—DIRECT SPENDING LEGISLATION, COMPARISON OF AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE LEGISLATIVE ACTION WITH 302(a) ALLOCATIONS FOR BUDGET CHANGES, REFLECTING ACTION COMPLETED AS OF JULY 1, 2019—Continued

(Fiscal Years, in millions of dollars)

House Committee	2019	
	BA	Outlays
Current Level	0	0
Difference	0	0
Education and Labor		
Allocation	0	0
Current Level	0	0
Difference	0	0
Energy and Commerce		
Allocation	0	0
Current Level	386	173
Difference	386	173
Financial Services		
Allocation	0	0
Current Level	23	22
Difference	23	22
Foreign Affairs		
Allocation	0	0
Current Level	0	0
Difference	0	0
Homeland Security		
Allocation	0	0
Current Level	0	0
Difference	0	0
House Administration		
Allocation	0	0
Current Level	0	0
Difference	0	0
Judiciary		
Allocation	0	0
Current Level	0	0
Difference	0	0
Natural Resources		
Allocation	0	0
Current Level	0	0
Difference	0	0
Oversight and Reform		
Allocation	0	0
Current Level	1	1
Difference	1	1
Science, Space, and Technology		
Allocation	0	0
Current Level	0	0
Difference	0	0
Small Business		
Allocation	0	0
Current Level	0	0
Difference	0	0
Transportation and Infrastructure		
Allocation	0	0
Current Level	42	55
Difference	42	55
Veterans’ Affairs		
Allocation	0	0
Current Level	– 1	4,397
Difference	– 1	4,397
Ways and Means		
Allocation	0	0
Current Level	13	7
Difference	13	7

TABLE 3—DISCRETIONARY APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2019—COMPARISON OF CURRENT LEVEL WITH APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE 302(a) ALLOCATION AND APPROPRIATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE 302(b) SUBALLOCATIONS

(in millions of dollars)

Appropriations Subcommittee	302(b) Suballocations as of August 10, 2018 (H.Rpt. 115–897)		Current Status Reflecting Action Completed as of July 1, 2019		Current Status less 302(b)	
	BA	OT	BA	OT	BA	OT
Agriculture, Rural Development, FDA	23,242	24,677	23,042	24,491	– 200	– 186
Commerce, Justice, Science	62,520	72,145	64,118	70,889	1,598	– 1,256
Defense	674,591	625,811	674,383	624,840	– 208	– 971
Energy and Water Development	44,700	44,476	44,640	44,335	– 60	– 141
Financial Services and General Government	23,423	24,045	23,423	24,085	0	40
Homeland Security	58,087	59,384	61,576	59,602	3,489	218
Interior, Environment	35,252	35,015	35,552	34,975	300	– 40
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education	178,997	184,114	179,973	185,820	976	1,706
Legislative Branch	4,880	4,770	4,836	4,720	– 44	– 50
Military Construction, Veterans Affairs	98,057	90,691	98,057	90,809	0	118
State, Foreign Operations	54,018	50,280	54,218	49,957	200	– 323
Transportation, Housing & Urban Development	71,800	132,364	71,079	132,524	– 721	160
Subtotal (Section 302(b) Allocations)	1,329,567	1,347,772	1,334,897	1,347,047	5,330	– 725
Unallocated portion of Section 302(a) Allocation ²	5,330	– 8611	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
TOTAL (Section 302(a) Allocation)	1,334,897	1,339,161	1,334,897	1,347,047	0	7,886
Comparison of total appropriations and 302(a) allocation			General Purpose		OCO ³	
			BA	OT	BA	OT
302(a) Allocation			1,257,897	1,299,110	77,000	40,051
Total Appropriation			1,257,897	1,306,996	77,000	40,051
			0	7,886	0	0

Memorandum	Amounts Assumed in 302(b) ⁴				Amounts enacted					
			OCO		Program Integrity		Emergency require- ments		Disaster Relief	
	BA	OT	BA	OT	BA	OT	BA	OT	BA	OT
Spending in Excess of Base Budget Control Act Caps for Sec. 251(b) designated Categories										
Agriculture, Rural Development, FDA	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	5,300	2,982	n.a.	n.a.
Commerce, Justice, Science	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	1,160	377	n.a.	n.a.
Defense	n.a.	n.a.	67,914	37,071	n.a.	n.a.	1,196	634	n.a.	n.a.
Energy and Water Development	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	3,274	114	n.a.	n.a.
Financial Services and General Government	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	91	34	n.a.	n.a.
Homeland Security	n.a.	n.a.	165	127	n.a.	n.a.	1,865	728	12,000	600
Interior, Environment	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	1,581	1,001	n.a.	n.a.
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	1,897	1,573	3,493	346	n.a.	n.a.
Legislative Branch	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	10	5	n.a.	n.a.
Military Construction, Veterans Affairs	n.a.	n.a.	921	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	1,645	12	n.a.	n.a.
State, Foreign Operations	n.a.	n.a.	8,000	2,853	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	10	n.a.	n.a.
Transportation, Housing & Urban Development	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	5,772	204	n.a.	n.a.
Totals	92,557	42,259	77,000	40,051	1,897	1,573	25,387	6,447	12,000	600

¹ Spending designated as emergency is not included in the current status of appropriations shown on this table.

² Totals include 302(a) adjustments for Overseas Contingency Operations and General Purposes amounts that differ from amounts anticipated in the 302(b) suballocations.

³ Totals include an adjustment for Overseas Contingency Operations included in the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2019 (P.L. 116–6).

⁴ Totals assume an allowable 302(b) adjustable for Disaster Relief, pursuant to a revised 302(a) allocation filed in the Congressional Record on February 14, 2019.

TABLE 4—ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS PURSUANT TO SECTION 103(c) OF H. RES. 6 AS OF JULY 1, 2019

[Budget authority in millions of dollars]

For 2020:

Accounts Identified for Advance Appropriations Appropriate Level	28,852
Enacted advances:	
Accounts identified for advances:	
Employment and Training Administration	1,772
Education for the Disadvantaged	10,841
School Improvement	1,681
Career, Technical, and Adult Education	791
Special Education	9,283
Tenant-based Rental Assistance	4,000
Project-based Rental Assistance	400
Subtotal, enacted advances	28,768
Enacted Advances vs. Section 103(c)(2)(A) limit	– 84
Veterans Accounts Identified for Advance Appropriations Appropriate Level	75,551

TABLE 4—ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS PURSUANT TO SECTION 103(c) OF H. RES. 6 AS OF JULY 1, 2019—Continued

[Budget authority in millions of dollars]

Enacted advances:	
Veterans accounts identified for advances:	
Veterans Medical Services	51,411
Veterans Medical Support and Compliance	7,239
Veterans Medical Facilities	6,142
Veterans Medical Community Care	10,758
Subtotal, enacted advances	75,551
Enacted Advances vs. Section 103(c)(2)(B) limit	0
For 2021:	
Corporation for Public Broadcasting	445
U.S. CONGRESS, CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE, Washington, DC, July 8, 2019.	
Hon. JOHN YARMUTH, Chairman, Committee on the Budget, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.	
DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The enclosed report shows the effects of Congressional action on the fiscal year 2019 budget and is current through July 1, 2019. This report is submitted under section 308(b) and in aid of section 311	

of the Congressional Budget Act, as amended.

The estimates of budget authority, outlays, and revenues are consistent with the allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels printed in the Congressional Record on May 10, 2018, pursuant to section 30104 of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2018 (Public Law 115–123), and section 103(m) of House Resolution 6 of the 116th Congress.

Since our last letter dated February 27, 2019, the Congress has cleared and the President has signed the following legislation that has significant effects on budget authority and outlays in fiscal year 2019:

Pesticide Registration Improvement Extension Act of 2018 (Public Law 116–8);

Medicaid Services Investment and Accountability Act of 2019 (Public Law 116–16);

Additional Supplemental Appropriations for Disaster Relief Act, 2019 (Public Law 116–20);

Emergency Supplemental Appropriations for Humanitarian Assistance and Security at the Southern Border Act, 2019 (Public Law 116–26); and

A bill to provide for a 2-week extension of the Medicaid community mental health services demonstration program, and for other purposes (S. 2047).

Sincerely,

PHILLIP L. SWAGEL,
Director.

Enclosure.

FISCAL YEAR 2019 HOUSE CURRENT LEVEL REPORT THROUGH JULY 1, 2019

[In millions of dollars]

	Budget authority	Outlays	Revenues
Previously Enacted: a,b,c			
Revenues	n.a.	n.a.	2,590,496
Permanents and other spending legislation	2,341,676	2,236,400	n.a.
Authorizing and Appropriation legislation	1,884,827	1,949,095	– 302
Offsetting receipts	– 890,012	– 890,015	n.a.
Total, Previously Enacted	3,336,491	3,295,480	2,590,194
Enacted Legislation			
Authorizing Legislation			
Medicaid Extenders Act of 2019 (P.L. 116–3)	120	8	0
Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2019 (P.L. 116–6, Division H) ^d	2	2	1
Pesticide Registration Improvement Extension Act of 2018 (P.L. 116–8)	0	– 5	0
Medicaid Services Investment and Accountability Act of 2019 (P.L. 116–16)	52	32	0
A bill to provide for a 2-week extension of the Medicaid community mental health services demonstration program, and for other purposes (S. 2047)	5	5	0
Subtotal, Authorizing Legislation	179	42	1
Appropriation Legislation ^{b,c,d,e}			
Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2019 (Divisions A–G, P.L. 116–6) ^{b,c,d,e}	480,297	311,576	– 125
Subtotal, Appropriation Legislation	480,297	311,576	– 125
Total, Enacted Legislation	480,476	311,618	– 124
Adjustments to Entitlements and Mandatories	– 175,904	– 59,846	0
Total Current Level ^c	3,641,063	3,547,252	2,590,070
Total House Resolution ^f	3,752,421	3,551,738	2,590,496
Current Level Over House Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Current Level Under House Resolution	111,358	4,486	426

Source: Congressional Budget Office.

n.a. = not applicable; P.L. = public law.

^a Includes the budgetary effects of legislation enacted by Congress during the 115th Congress.

^b Sections 1001–1004 of the 21st Century Cures Act (P.L. 114–255) require that certain funding provided for 2017 through 2026 to the Department of Health and Human Services—in particular the Food and Drug Administration and the National Institutes of Health—be excluded from estimates for the purposes of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (Deficit Control Act) or the Congressional Budget Act of 1974. Therefore, the amounts shown in this report do not include \$781 million in budget authority and \$770 million in estimated outlays.

^c For purposes of enforcing section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act in the House, the resolution, as approved by the House of Representatives, does not include budget authority, outlays, or revenues for off-budget amounts. As a result, amounts in this current level report do not include those items.

^d The Continuing Appropriations Act, 2019 (P.L. 116–5), as amended, extended several immigration programs through February 15, 2019, that would otherwise have expired at the end of fiscal year 2018. The estimated budgetary effects of those previously enacted extensions are charged to the Committee on Appropriations, and are included in the budgetary effects of P.L. 116–6 shown in the “Appropriation Legislation” portion of this report. In addition, division H of P.L. 116–6 further extended those same programs through the end of fiscal year 2019. Consistent with the language in title III of division H of P.L. 116–6, and at the direction of the House Committee on the Budget, the budgetary effects of extending those immigration programs for the remainder of the fiscal year are charged to the relevant authorizing committees, and are shown in the “Authorizing Legislation” portion of this report.

^e In the House of Representatives, and pursuant to section 314(d) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, amounts designated as an emergency requirement shall not count for purposes of title III and title IV of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, and are excluded from current level totals. The table below displays emergency-designated funding enacted during the 116th Congress which are excluded from current level totals. (Those amounts do not include \$1,680 million in budget authority and \$25 million in outlays stemming from P.L. 115–254, which was enacted during the 115th Congress):

	Budget au- thority	Outlays	Revenues
Discretionary Emergency Requirements			
Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2019 (Divisions A–G, P.L. 116–6)	0	10	0
Additional Supplemental Appropriations for Disaster Relief Act, 2019 (P.L. 116–20)	19,121	5,364	0
Emergency Supplemental Appropriations for Humanitarian Assistance and Security at the Southern Border Act, 2019 (P.L. 116–26)	4,586	1,048	0
Total, Discretionary Emergency Requirements	23,707	6,422	0

^f Section 30104 of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2018 (P.L. 115–123) required—in the absence of a concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2019—that the Chair of the House Committee on the Budget publish the aggregate spending and revenue levels for fiscal year 2019; those aggregate levels were first published in the Congressional Record on May 10, 2018. P.L. 115–123 also allows the Chair of the House Committee on the Budget to revise the budgetary aggregates:

	Budget au- thority	Outlays	Revenues
Original Aggregates Printed on May 10, 2018:	3,747,016	3,551,514	2,590,496
Revision:			
Adjustment for H.R. 5895, the Energy and Water, Legislative Branch, and Military Construction and Veterans Affairs Appropriations Act, 2019	921	0	0
Adjustment for H.J. Res. 31, the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2019	4,484	224	0
Revised House Resolution	3,752,421	3,551,738	2,590,496

PUBLICATION OF BUDGETARY MATERIAL

STATUS REPORT ON CURRENT SPENDING LEVELS OF ON-BUDGET SPENDING AND REVENUES FOR FY 2020

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET,
Washington, DC, July 9, 2019.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: To facilitate application of sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, I am transmitting an updated status report on the current levels of on-budget spending and revenues for fiscal year 2020. This status report is current through July 1, 2019. The term “current level” refers to the amounts of spending and revenues estimated for each fiscal year based on laws enacted or awaiting the President’s signature.

Table 1 compares the current levels of total budget authority, outlays, and revenues to the overall limits filed in the Congressional Record on May 3, 2019, as adjusted, for fiscal year 2020 and for the 10-year

period of fiscal years 2020 through 2029. These comparisons are needed to implement section 311(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, which establishes a rule enforceable with a point of order against measures that would breach the budget resolution’s aggregate levels. The table does not show budget authority and outlays for years after fiscal year 2020 because appropriations for those years have not yet been completed.

Table 2 compares the current levels of budget authority and outlays for legislative action completed by each authorizing committee with the limits filed in the Congressional Record on May 3, 2019, for fiscal year 2020, and for the 10-year period of fiscal years 2020 through 2029. These comparisons are needed to enforce the point of order under section 302(f) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, which prohibits the consideration of measures that would breach the section 302(a) allocation of new budget authority for the committee that reported the measure. It is also needed to implement section 311(c), which provides an exception for

committees that comply with their allocations from the point of order under section 311(a).

Table 3 compares the current status of discretionary appropriations for fiscal year 2020 with the section 302(b) suballocations of discretionary budget authority and outlays among Appropriations subcommittees. The comparison is needed to enforce section 302(f) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 because the point of order under that section equally applies to measures that would breach the applicable section 302(b) sub-allocation.

In addition, a letter from the Congressional Budget Office is attached that summarizes and compares the budget impact of legislation enacted after the adoption of the budget resolution against the budget resolution aggregate in force.

If you have any questions, please contact Jennifer Wheelock or Raquel Spencer.

Sincerely,

JOHN YARMUTH,
Chairman.

TABLE 1—REPORT TO THE SPEAKER FROM THE COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET, STATUS OF THE FISCAL YEAR 2020, AND 2020–2029 CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET, REFLECTING ACTION COMPLETED AS OF JULY 1, 2019

(On-budget amounts, in millions of dollars)

	Fiscal Year 2020	Fiscal Years 2020–2029
Appropriate Level: ¹		
Budget Authority	3,798,577	n.a.
Outlays	3,726,329	n.a.
Revenues	2,740,533	34,847,515
Current Level: ¹		
Budget Authority	2,521,707	n.a.
Outlays	3,005,128	n.a.
Revenues	2,740,538	34,847,317
Current Level over(+) / under(–) Appropriate Level:		
Budget Authority	–1,276,870	n.a.
Outlays	–721,201	n.a.
Revenues	5	–198

n.a. = Not applicable because annual appropriations Acts for fiscal years 2021 through 2029 will not be considered until future sessions of Congress.

¹ Current Level excludes all emergencies.

TABLE 2—DIRECT SPENDING LEGISLATION, COMPARISON OF AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE LEGISLATIVE ACTION WITH 302(a) ALLOCATIONS FOR BUDGET CHANGES, REFLECTING ACTION COMPLETED AS OF JULY 1, 2019

(Fiscal years, in millions of dollars)

House Committee	2020		2020–2029 Total	
	BA	Outlays	BA	Outlays
Agriculture:				
Allocation	0	0	0	0
Current Level	0	0	0	0
Difference	0	0	0	0
Armed Services:				
Allocation	0	0	0	0
Current Level	0	0	0	0
Difference	0	0	0	0
Education and Labor:				
Allocation	0	0	0	0
Current Level	0	0	0	0
Difference	0	0	0	0
Energy and Commerce:				
Allocation	0	0	0	0
Current Level	0	0	–5	–5
Difference	0	0	–5	–5

TABLE 2—DIRECT SPENDING LEGISLATION, COMPARISON OF AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE LEGISLATIVE ACTION WITH 302(a) ALLOCATIONS FOR BUDGET CHANGES, REFLECTING ACTION COMPLETED AS OF JULY 1, 2019—Continued
[Fiscal years, in millions of dollars]

House Committee	2020		2020–2029 Total	
	BA	Outlays	BA	Outlays
Financial Services:				
Allocation	0	0	0	0
Current Level	0	0	0	0
Difference	0	0	0	0
Foreign Affairs:				
Allocation	0	0	0	0
Current Level	0	0	0	0
Difference	0	0	0	0
Homeland Security:				
Allocation	0	0	0	0
Current Level	0	0	0	0
Difference	0	0	0	0
House Administration:				
Allocation	0	0	0	0
Current Level	0	0	0	0
Difference	0	0	0	0
Judiciary:				
Allocation	0	0	0	0
Current Level	0	0	0	0
Difference	0	0	0	0
Natural Resources:				
Allocation	0	0	0	0
Current Level	0	0	0	0
Difference	0	0	0	0
Oversight and Reform:				
Allocation	0	0	0	0
Current Level	0	0	0	0
Difference	0	0	0	0
Science, Space, and Technology:				
Allocation	0	0	0	0
Current Level	0	0	0	0
Difference	0	0	0	0
Small Business:				
Allocation	0	0	0	0
Current Level	0	0	0	0
Difference	0	0	0	0
Transportation and Infrastructure:				
Allocation	0	0	0	0
Current Level	0	0	0	0
Difference	0	0	0	0
Veterans' Affairs:				
Allocation	0	0	0	0
Current Level	–10	–10	–75	–75
Difference	–10	–10	–75	–75
Ways and Means:				
Allocation	0	0	0	0
Current Level	0	0	–234	–234
Difference	0	0	–234	–234

TABLE 3—DISCRETIONARY APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2020, COMPARISON OF CURRENT LEVEL WITH APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE 302(a) ALLOCATION AND APPROPRIATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE 302(b) SUBALLOCATIONS
[In million dollars]

Appropriations Subcommittee	302(b) Suballocations as of June 21, 2019 (H. Rpt. 116–124)		Current Status Reflecting Action Completed as of July 1, 2019 ¹		Current Status less 302(b)	
	BA	OT	BA	OT	BA	OT
Agriculture, Rural Development, FDA	24,310	22,900	9	8,715	–24,301	–14,185
Commerce, Justice, Science	73,895	77,400	0	26,550	–73,895	–50,850
Defense	690,161	662,402	42	258,855	–690,119	–403,547
Energy and Water Development	46,413	44,800	0	18,716	–46,413	–26,084
Financial Services and General Government	24,950	24,638	0	5,584	–24,950	–19,054
Homeland Security	63,811	60,727	9	25,910	–63,802	–34,817
Interior, Environment	39,527	37,900	0	12,010	–39,527	–25,890
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education	191,718	191,981	24,813	126,224	–166,905	–65,757
Legislative Branch	5,010	5,037	1	851	–5,009	–4,186
Military Construction, Veterans Affairs	106,138	99,507	75,550	87,570	–30,588	–11,937
State, Foreign Operations	56,381	50,924	0	33,700	–56,381	–17,224
Transportation, Housing & Urban Development	75,771	133,300	4,400	83,569	–71,371	–49,731
Total, (Section 302(b) Allocations)	1,398,085	1,411,516	104,824	688,254	–1,293,261	–723,262
Comparison of total appropriations and 302(a) allocation					BA	OT
302(a) Allocation ²					1,384,010	1,410,812
Total Appropriation					104,824	688,254
					–1,279,186	–722,558

¹ Amounts reflected are those discretionary items that were previously enacted. As of July 1, 2019, there are no enacted appropriations bills for FY2020.

² The 302(b) includes amounts designated for disaster relief contained in the Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2020. The 302(a) will be adjusted after that bill is reported.

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, July 8, 2019.
Hon. JOHN YARMUTH,
Chairman, Committee on the Budget,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The enclosed report shows the effects of Congressional action on the fiscal year 2020 budget and is current through July 1, 2019. This report is submitted

under section 308(b) and in aid of section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act, as amended.

The estimates of budget authority, outlays, and revenues are consistent with the allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels printed in the Congressional Record on May 3, 2019, pursuant to sections 1 and 2 of House Resolution 293 of the 116th Congress.

This is CBO's first current level report for fiscal year 2020.

Sincerely,

Enclosure.

PHILLIP L. SWAGEL.

FISCAL YEAR 2020 HOUSE CURRENT LEVEL REPORT THROUGH JULY 1, 2019

[In millions of dollars]

	Budget Authority	Outlays	Revenues
Previously Enacted ^a			
Revenues	n.a.	n.a.	2,740,533
Permanents and other spending legislation	2,402,273	2,307,950	n.a.
Appropriation legislation	0	595,528	n.a.
Offsetting receipts	- 954,573	- 954,573	n.a.
Total, Previously Enacted	1,447,700	1,948,905	2,740,533
Enacted Legislation			
Blue Water Navy Vietnam Veterans Act of 2019 (P.L. 116-23)	- 10	- 10	0
Taxpayer First Act (P.L. 116-25)	0	0	5
Total, Enacted Legislation	- 10	- 10	5
Adjustments to Entitlements and Mandatories	1,074,017	1,056,233	0
Total Current Level ^b	2,521,707	3,005,128	2,740,538
Total House Resolution ^c	3,798,577	3,726,329	2,740,533
Current Level Over House Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	5
Current Level Under House Resolution	1,276,870	721,201	n.a.
Memorandum			
Revenues, 2020-2029			
House Current Level ^{a, b}	n.a.	n.a.	34,847,317
House Resolution ^c	n.a.	n.a.	34,847,515
Current Level Over House Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Current Level Under House Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	198

Source: Congressional Budget Office.

n.a. = not applicable; P.L. = public law.

a. For purposes of enforcing section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act in the House, the resolution, as approved by the House of Representatives, does not include budget authority, outlays, or revenues for off-budget amounts. As a result, amounts in this current level report do not include those items.

b. In the House of Representatives, and pursuant to section 314(d) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, amounts designated as an emergency requirement shall not count for purposes of title III and title IV of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, and are excluded from current level totals. In addition, emergency funding designated that was not designated pursuant to the Deficit Control Act does not count for certain budgetary enforcement purposes. Those amounts, which are not included in the current level totals, are as follows:

	Budget Authority	Outlays	Revenues
Discretionary Emergency Requirements			
Additional Supplemental Appropriations for Disaster Relief Act, 2019 (P.L. 116-20)	8	4,951	0
Emergency Supplemental Appropriations for Humanitarian Assistance and Security at the Southern Border Act, 2019 (P.L. 116-26)	0	1,300	0

c. On May 3, 2019 the Chair of the House Committee on the Budget published the aggregate spending and revenue levels for fiscal year 2020 pursuant to H. Res. 293. In accordance with section 314 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, section 251 (b) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, and section 1 of H. Res. 293 the Chair of the House Committee on the Budget may revise the budgetary aggregates. Revisions to date are listed below.

	Budget Authority	Outlays	Revenues
Original Aggregates Printed on May 3, 2019:	3,709,585	3,676,452	2,740,533
Revisions:			
Adjustment for H.R. 2740, Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2020	1,842	1,481	n.a.
Adjustment for H.R. 2745, Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2020	921	7	n.a.
	Budget Authority	Outlays	Revenues
Adjustment for H.R. 2839, Department of State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 2020	8,000	2,174	0
Adjustment for H.R. 2968, Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2020	68,079	38,227	0
Adjustment for H.R. 3052, Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2020	2,250	2,250	0
Adjustment for H.R. 3055, Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2020	7,500	5,400	0
Adjustment for H.R. 3351, Financial Services and General Government Appropriations Act, 2020	400	338	0
Revised House Resolution	3,798,577	3,726,329	2,740,533

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE
PRESIDENT

Cheryl L. Johnson, Clerk of the House, reported that on June 28, 2019, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills:

H.R. 2940. To extend the program of block grants to States for temporary assistance for

needy families and related programs through September 30, 2019.

H.R. 3401. Emergency Supplemental Appropriations for Humanitarian Assistance and Security at the Southern Border Act, 2019.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 49 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, July 10, 2019, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for Official Foreign Travel during the second quarter of 2019, pursuant to Public Law 95-384, are as follows:

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DANIEL SILVERBERG, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 13 AND APR. 18, 2019

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Daniel Silverberg	4/14	4/16	United Arab Emirates		946.00		9,883.00				10,829.00
	4/16	4/17	Bahrain		356.00						356.00
Committee total					1,302.00		9,883.00				11,185.00

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

DANIEL SILVERBERG, Apr. 30, 2019.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DANIEL SILVERBERG, EXPENDED BETWEEN MAY 28 AND JUNE 2, 2019

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Daniel Silverberg	5/30	5/31	Malaysia		260.00		10,883.00				11,143.00
	5/31	6/2	Singapore		837.00						837.00
Committee total					1,097.00		10,883.00				11,980.00

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

DANIEL SILVERBERG, June 3, 2019.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, WYNDEE PARKER, EXPENDED BETWEEN MAY 30 AND JUNE 2, 2019

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Wyndee Parker	5/30	6/2	Singapore		1,227.00		15,798.00				17,025.00
Committee total					1,227.00		15,798.00				17,025.00

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

WYNDEE PARKER, July 1, 2019.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2019

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Ted Deutch	4/5	4/7	Jordan		803.29		8,024.83				8,828.12
Ryan Doherty	4/5	4/7	Jordan		803.29		14,210.43				15,013.72
Hon. Ted Deutch **	4/22	4/28	Qatar		**		**		**		**
**	4/22	4/28	Oman		**		**		**		**
**	4/22	4/28	UAE		**		**		**		**
Casey Kustin **	4/22	4/28	Qatar		**		**		**		**
**	4/22	4/28	Oman		**		**		**		**
**	4/22	4/28	UAE		**		**		**		**
Gabriella Zach **	4/22	4/28	Qatar		**		**		**		**
**	4/22	4/28	Oman		**		**		**		**
**	4/22	4/28	UAE		**		**		**		**
Hon. Joe Wilson **	4/22	4/28	Qatar		**		**		**		**
**	4/22	4/28	Oman		**		**		**		**
**	4/22	4/28	UAE		**		**		**		**
Hon. Michael McCaul	4/16	4/17	Italy		479.22		(3)				479.22
	4/17	4/19	Cote d'Ivoire		713.58		(3)				713.58
	4/19	4/20	Rwanda		290.00		(3)				290.00
	4/20	4/21	Tunisia		202.06		(3)				202.06
	4/21	4/22	Portugal		332.00		(3)				332.00
Hon. Vicente Gonzalez **	4/21	4/29	Argentina		**		**		**		**
**	4/21	4/29	Brazil		**		**		**		**
**	4/21	4/29	Colombia		**		**		**		**
Hon. Albio Sires*	4/24	4/25	Curacao		305.00		(3)		2,272.75		2,577.75
**	4/25	4/30	Colombia		1,747.00		(3)		27,597.00		29,344.00
Sadaf Khan	4/24	4/25	Ecuador		147.00		(3)		1,137.25		1,284.25
**	4/25	4/30	Colombia		1,747.00		(3)				1,747.00
**			Ecuador		147.00				**		147.00
Alexander Brockwehl	4/24	4/25	Curacao		305.00		(3)				305.00
**	4/25	4/30	Colombia		1,747.00		(3)				1,747.00
**			Ecuador		147.00				**		147.00
Hon. Ted Deutch	4/24	4/25	Curacao		305.00		(3)				305.00
**	4/25	4/30	Colombia		1,747.00		(3)				1,747.00
**			Ecuador		147.00				**		147.00
Casey Kustin	4/24	4/25	Curacao		305.00		(3)				305.00
**	4/25	4/30	Colombia		880.00		1,399.48				2,279.48
**			Ecuador		147.00				**		147.00
Hon. Ted Yoho	4/24	4/25	Curacao		305.00		(3)				305.00
**	4/25	4/30	Colombia		1,747.00		(3)				1,747.00
**			Ecuador		147.00				**		147.00
Hon. Gregory Meeks	4/24	4/25	Curacao		305.00		(3)				305.00
**	4/25	4/30	Colombia		1,747.00		(3)				1,747.00
**			Ecuador		147.00				**		147.00
Claire Figel	4/24	4/25	Curacao		305.00		(3)				305.00
**	4/25	4/30	Colombia		1,747.00		(3)				1,747.00
**			Ecuador		147.00				**		147.00
Jaclyn Cahan*	4/16	4/18	Egypt		789.00		6,124.23		94.09		7,007.32
	4/18	4/21	Cyprus		768.96				1,607.93		2,376.89
Grant Mullins	4/15	4/18	Egypt		727.00		6,124.23				6,851.23
	4/18	4/21	Cyprus		803.45						803.45
Peter Billerbeck	4/15	4/19	Egypt		1,092.00		4,480.93				5,572.93
Katy Crosby*	4/12	4/15	Jordan		1,409.20		3,913.60	*	119.44		5,442.24
*	4/15	4/18	Turkey		904.20			*	443.37		948.57
Meghan Gallagher	4/12	4/15	Jordan		1,049.20		4,911.43				5,960.63
	4/15	4/18	Turkey		782.00						782.00
Mira Resnick	4/14	4/16	UAE		880.00		9,285.02				10,165.02
	4/16	4/18	Bahrain		376.00						376.00
Sajit Gandhi**	4/21	4/29	Sri Lanka		**		**		**		**
**	4/21	4/29	Maldives		**		**		**		**
Jennifer Hendrixson-White**	4/21	4/29	Sri Lanka		**		**		**		**
**	4/21	4/29	Maldives		**		**		**		**
Hon. Karen Bass**	4/13	4/20	Germany		**		**		**		**
**	4/13	4/20	Djibouti		**		**		**		**
**	4/13	4/20	Niger		**		**		**		**
Dr. Janette Yarwood**	4/13	4/20	Germany		**		**		**		**
**	4/13	4/20	Djibouti		**		**		**		**
**	4/13	4/20	Niger		**		**		**		**
Gabriella Zach**	5/23	5/31	Cyprus		**		242.60		**		242.60
Eric Jacobstein	5/28	5/31	Mexico		853.76		842.44				1,696.20
Sadaf Khan	5/28	5/31	Mexico		853.76		843.18				1,696.94

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2019—
Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Carlos Monje	5/28	5/31	Mexico		853.76		843.18				1,696.94
Lesley Warner *	5/25	5/28	South Africa		657.65		10,325.00		190.26		11,172.91
*	5/28	6/2	Mozambique		1,328.00		931.84		1,458.00		3,717.84
Taylor Redick	5/25	5/28	South Africa		685.15		10,358.95				11,044.10
*	5/28	6/2	Mozambique		1,328.00		988.44				2,316.44
Alex Sadler	5/28	5/31	Haiti		333.00		696.93				1,029.93
Alexander Brockwehl	5/28	5/31	Haiti		333.00		519.11				852.11
Sarah Markley	5/28	5/31	Haiti		333.00		696.93				1,029.93
Hon. Eliot Engel *	5/24	5/26	Lebanon		150.00		11,909.64		13,534.47		25,594.11
*	5/26	5/27	Cyprus		267.82				618.81		886.63
*	5/27	5/30	Israel		1,715.00				11,840.04		13,555.04
Jason Steinbaum	5/24	5/26	Lebanon		150.00		5,579.43				5,729.43
*	5/26	5/28	Cyprus		535.65						535.65
Mira Resnick	5/24	5/26	Lebanon		420.00		8,851.94				9,271.94
*	5/26	5/28	Cyprus		267.82						267.82
Tim Mulvey	5/27	5/31	Israel		1,715.00						1,715.00
*	5/24	5/26	Lebanon		420.00		7,170.35				7,590.35
Sajit Gandhi	5/26	5/27	Cyprus		267.82						267.82
*	5/27	5/31	Israel		1,715.00						1,715.00
*	5/26	5/27	India		256.00		9,228.83				9,484.83
*	5/27	5/28	Nepal		281.00				626.59		907.59
*	5/28	5/30	Bhutan		744.00						774.00
Jennifer Hendrixson-White	5/31	6/3	Singapore		1,222.76						1,222.76
*	5/26	5/27	India		256.00		10,799.83				11,055.83
*	5/27	5/28	Nepal		281.00						281.00
*	5/28	5/30	Bhutan		744.00						744.00
Bryan Burack	5/31	6/2	Singapore		816.00						816.00
*	5/26	5/27	India		256.00		9,228.83				9,484.83
*	5/27	5/28	Nepal		281.00						281.00
*	5/28	5/30	Bhutan		744.00						744.00
Brendan Shields	5/31	6/3	Singapore		1,222.00						1,222.00
*	5/26	5/27	India		256.00		10,799.83				11,055.83
*	5/27	5/28	Nepal		281.00						281.00
*	5/28	5/30	Bhutan		744.00						744.00
Committee total	5/31	6/2	Singapore		1,222.00						1,222.00
					54,749.40		159,331.46		61,141.00		275,221.86

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
³ Military air transportation.
* Indicates Delegation costs.
** Indicates a cancelled mission.

HON. ELIOT L. ENGEL, June 28, 2019.

BUDGETARY EFFECTS OF PAYGO LEGISLATION

Pursuant to the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 (PAYGO), Mr. YAR-

MUTH hereby submits, prior to the vote on passage, the attached estimate of the costs of H.R. 1988, the Protect Affordable Mortgages for Veterans Act,

ESTIMATE OF PAY-AS-YOU-GO EFFECTS FOR H.R. 1988

as amended, for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

	By fiscal year, in millions of dollars—												
	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2019–2024	2019–2029
NET INCREASE OR DECREASE (–) IN THE DEFICIT													
Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Impact	–3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	–3	–3

Components may not sum to totals because of rounding.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker’s table and referred as follows:

1520. A letter from the Under Secretary, Acquisition and Sustainment, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department’s report to Congress titled, “Distribution of Department of Defense Depot Maintenance Workloads for Fiscal Years 2018 through 2020”, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2466(d)(1); Public Law 100-456, Sec. 326(a) (as amended by Public Law 106-65, Sec. 333); (113 Stat. 567); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1521. A letter from the Acting Principal Director, Defense Pricing and Contracting, Acquisition and Sustainment, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter of notification of the requirement to authorize subcontract placement, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2350b(d)(1); Public Law 104-106, Sec. 4321(b)(10)(B); (110 Stat. 672); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1522. A letter from the Under Secretary, Personnel and Readiness, Department of De-

fense, transmitting a letter authorizing Captain John V. Menoni, United States Navy, to wear the insignia of the grade of rear admiral (lower half), pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 777(b)(3)(B); Public Law 104-106, Sec. 503(a)(1) (as added by Public Law 108-136, Sec. 509(a)(3)); (117 Stat. 1458); ; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1523. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, Acquisition, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter requesting a meeting to discuss the way forward on the feasibility of developing a budget request for the full Future Years Defense Program that project estimated expenditures and proposed appropriations for contracted services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1524. A letter from the Acting Principal Deputy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Repeal of Transportation Related DFARS Provisions and Clauses (DFARS Case 2019-D020) [Docket: DARS-2019-0028] (RIN: 0750-AK63) received June 28, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec.

251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1525. A letter from the Acting Principal Deputy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Annual Representations and Certifications-Alternate A (DFARS Case 2019-D030) [Docket: DARS-2019-0027] (RIN: 0750-AK69) received June 28, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1526. A letter from the Acting Principal Deputy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Repeal of DFARS Clause “Price Adjustment” (DFARS Case 2018-D048) [Docket: DARS-2019-0032] (RIN: 0750-AK08) received June 28, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1527. A letter from the Acting Principal Deputy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Only One Offer (DFARS Case 2017-D009) [Docket: DARS-2018-0008] (RIN: 0750-AJ19) received June 28, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1528. A letter from the Deputy Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Affairs, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Allocation of Assets in Single-Employer Plans; Benefits Payable in Terminated Single-Employer Plans; Interest Assumptions for Valuing and Paying Benefits received June 28, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1529. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Affairs, Office of the General Counsel, Consumer Product Safety Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Safety Standard for Stationary Activity Centers [Docket No.: CPSC-2018-0015] received June 28, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1530. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of Section 73.622(i), Post-Transition Table of DTV Allotments Station WNL0(TV), Buffalo, New York [MB Docket No.: 19-118] (RM-11838); Amendment of Section 73.622(i) Post Transition Table of DTV Allotments Station WUTV(TV), Buffalo, New York received June 28, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1531. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final guidance letter — Clarification of Regulatory Path for Lead Test Assemblies received June 28, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1532. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to transnational criminal organizations that was declared in Executive Order 13581 of July 24, 2011, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); Public Law 94-412, Sec. 401(c); (90 Stat. 1257) and 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); Public Law 95-223, Sec. 204(c); (91 Stat. 1627); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1533. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Addition of Entities to the Entity List and Revision of an Entry on the Entity List [Docket No.: 190503424-9424-01] (RIN: 0694-AH83) received June 28, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1534. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Department of Education, transmitting a copy of the Fiscal Year 2017 FAIR Act Inventory and a Summary of Fiscal Year 17 Inventory, 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.

1535. A letter from the Executive Vice President and Chief Financial Officer, Federal Home Loan Bank of Dallas, transmitting the Federal Home Loan Bank of Dallas 2018 management report and financial statements, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 9106(a)(1); Pub-

lic Law 97-258 (as amended by Public Law 101-576, Sec. 306(a)); (104 Stat. 2854); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

1536. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting the Federal Procurement Data System GSA Report, pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 644(h)(3)(A)(ii); Public Law 85-536, Sec. 15(h)(3)(A)(ii) (as amended by Public Law 114-328, Sec. 1802); (130 Stat. 2650); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

1537. A letter from the Chief Administrative Officer, transmitting the quarterly report of receipts and expenditures of appropriations and other funds for the period April 1, 2019, to June 30, 2019 (H. Doc. No. 116-47); to the Committee on House Administration and ordered to be printed.

1538. A letter from the Division Chief, Regulatory Affairs, Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Required Fees for Mining Claims or Sites [LLW0320000-L1999000.PP0000] (RIN: 1004-AE64) received July 2, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1539. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Monroe, GA [Docket No.: FAA-2019-0206; Airspace Docket No.: 19-ASO-6] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received June 28, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1540. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of VOR Federal Airways V-18, V-102, and V-278 in the Vicinity of Guthrie, TX [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0769; Airspace Docket No.: 18-ASW-10] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received June 28, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1541. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment and Revocation of Air Traffic Service (ATS) Routes in the Vicinity of Manistique, MI [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0220; Airspace Docket No.: 17-AGL-24] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received June 28, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1542. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; CFM International S.A. Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2019-0212; Product Identifier 2019-NE-05-AD; Amendment 39-19660; AD 2019-12-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 28, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1543. A letter from the Chairman, National Transportation Safety Board, transmitting the Board's 2018 Annual Report to Congress, pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 1117; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1544. A letter from the Regulation Development Coordinator, Office of Regulation Policy and Management, Office of the Secretary (00REG), Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule — VA Acquisition Regulation: Special Contracting Methods (RIN: 2900-AQ19) received June 28, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1545. A letter from the Chairman, Labor Member and Management Member, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting the Annual Report Required by Railroad Retirement Act of 1974 and Railroad Retirement Solvency Act of 1983, pursuant to 45 U.S.C. 231f-1; Public Law 98-76, Sec. 502 (as amended by Public Law 104-66, Sec. 2221(a)); (109 Stat. 733) and 45 U.S.C. 231u(a)(1); Aug. 29, 1935, ch. 812, Sec. 22(a)(1) (as amended by Public Law 107-90, Sec. 108(a)); (115 Stat. 890); jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means and Transportation and Infrastructure.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

Mr. TAKANO: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 1988. A bill to clarify seasoning requirements for certain refinanced mortgage loans, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 116-138 Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. NADLER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 677. A bill to amend gendered terms in Federal law relating to the President and the President's spouse (Rept. 116-139). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. NADLER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2368. 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 (Rept. 116-140). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. NADLER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1986. A bill to amend section 175b of title 18, United States Code, to correct a scrivener's error (Rept. 116-141). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. NADLER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1569. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to add Flagstaff and Yuma to the list of locations in which court shall be held in the judicial district for the State of Arizona (Rept. 116-142). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MCGOVERN: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 476. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2500) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes, and providing for consideration of motions to suspend the rules (Rept. 116-143). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi (for himself, Mr. McEACHIN, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. ADAMS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CLAY, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. RUSH, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. RICHMOND, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr.

BUTTERFIELD, Ms. BASS, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Ms. LEE of California, and Ms. PRESSLEY):

H.R. 3628. A bill to require motor carriers to mitigate hardships due to unwarranted and excessive passenger delays and to assess fines to bolster motor carriers' accountability to consumers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. LYNCH:

H.R. 3629. A bill to amend the Fair Credit Reporting Act to establish clear Federal oversight of the development of credit scoring models by the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. PALLONE (for himself and Mr. WALDEN):

H.R. 3630. A bill to amend title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act to protect health care consumers from surprise billing practices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, 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. SOTO (for himself, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. SABLAN, Mrs. RADEWAGEN, Mr. SAN NICOLAS, Mr. SERRANO, and Mr. FITZPATRICK):

H.R. 3631. A bill to amend titles XI and XIX of the Social Security Act to provide for a temporary increase to the limit on Medicaid payments for territories of the United States and the Federal medical assistance percentage for such territories under the Medicaid program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DEFAZIO (for himself, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. FERGUSON, and Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas):

H.R. 3632. A bill to ensure that authorizations issued by the Secretary of Transportation to foreign air carriers do not undermine labor rights or standards, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. KELLY of Illinois:

H.R. 3633. A bill to modify the unconditional ownership requirement for women-owned and minority-owned small business concerns for purposes of procurement contracts with the Small Business Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. SABLAN (for himself, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. SAN NICOLAS, Ms. PLASKETT, Mrs. RADEWAGEN, and Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico):

H.R. 3634. A bill to provide for greater transparency and information with respect to Federal expenditures under the Medicaid and CHIP programs in the territories of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 3635. A bill to repeal the debt ceiling; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. UNDERWOOD:

H.R. 3636. A bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to submit to Congress certain reports relating to the health care and treatment provided by the Department of Veterans Affairs to women veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RUSH (for himself and Mrs. RODGERS of Washington):

H.R. 3637. A bill to amend title VII of the Public Health Service Act to authorize as-

sistance for increasing workforce diversity in the professions of physical therapy, occupational therapy, audiology, and speech-language pathology, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. HOULAHAN:

H.R. 3638. A bill to revise postaward explanations for unsuccessful offerors for certain contracts in the Federal Acquisition Regulation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Ms. HOULAHAN:

H.R. 3639. A bill to direct the Secretary of State to establish a standard parental leave policy applicable to Department of State employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. LURIA (for herself and Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee):

H.R. 3640. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to assist blind veterans who have not lost use of a leg in acquiring specially adapted housing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. PORTER:

H.R. 3641. A bill to enhance civil penalties under the Federal securities laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. ADAMS:

H.R. 3642. A bill to amend the Fair Credit Reporting Act to fix the consumer report dispute process, to ban misleading and unfair consumer reporting practices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. PORTER:

H.R. 3643. A bill to amend the Revised Statutes to grant State attorneys general the ability to issue subpoenas to investigate suspected violations of State laws that are applicable to national banks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. BURGESS (for himself, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. MARCHANT, and Mr. THOMPSON of California):

H.R. 3644. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to extend the Independence at Home medical practice demonstration program under the Medicare program; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CLAY (for himself, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. NORTON, Mr. POCAN, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. GRIMALVA, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. RUSH, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. PRESSLEY, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. MOORE, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia):

H.R. 3645. A bill to amend title 13, United States Code, to provide that individuals in prison shall, for the purposes of a decennial census, be attributed to the last place of residence before incarceration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. COHEN (for himself, Mr. COOPER, Mr. BURCHETT, Mr. JOHN W. ROSE of Tennessee, and Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee):

H.R. 3646. A bill to direct the Secretary of Transportation, acting through the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration, to revise section 91.145 of title 14, Code of Federal Regulations, such that the term "sporting" does not limit the types of major

events described in such section; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. COX of California (for himself and Mr. YOUNG):

H.R. 3647. A bill to provide temporary impact aid construction grants to eligible local educational agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H.R. 3648. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to improve defense access road resilience, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. DELAURO (for herself, Mr. COLE, Ms. BASS, Mr. MULLIN, and Ms. DEGETTE):

H.R. 3649. A bill to support the provision of treatment family care services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. EMMER:

H.R. 3650. A bill to provide temporary safe harbor for the tax treatment of hard forks of convertible virtual currency in the absence of administrative guidance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FORTENBERRY:

H.R. 3651. A bill to facilitate the use of certain land in Nebraska for public outdoor recreational opportunities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. GABBARD:

H.R. 3652. A bill to provide for the study and promotion of hemp; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committees on Education and Labor, Small Business, Armed Services, Energy and Commerce, Financial Services, 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 Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas:

H.R. 3653. A bill to amend section 1342 of title 31, United States Code (the Antideficiency Act), to define the term voluntary services; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. HIGGINS of New York (for himself and Mr. REED):

H.R. 3654. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide Medicare coverage for all physicians' services furnished by doctors of chiropractic within the scope of their license, 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. HOLLINGSWORTH (for himself, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. COMER, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. GUEST, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. MASSIE, and Mr. BOST):

H.R. 3655. A bill to allow the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, to issue depredation permits for the taking of black vultures to livestock farmers to prevent harm to livestock, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. HUDSON (for himself, Mr. MARSHALL, and Mr. BUCHSHON):

H.R. 3656. A bill to improve patient access to health care services and provide improved

medical care by reducing the excessive burden the liability system places on the health care delivery system; to the Committee on the Judiciary, 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. KATKO (for himself, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mrs. ROBY, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. CLINE, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, and Ms. DEAN):

H.R. 3657. A bill to require the Comptroller General of the United States to study how certain individuals who are granted pretrial release are monitored, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. LEE of Nevada:

H.R. 3658. A bill to require policies and programs to prevent and treat gambling disorder among members of the Armed Forces and their dependents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ROSE of New York (for himself, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. REED, and Ms. STEVENS):

H.R. 3659. A bill to establish an Anti-Bullying Roundtable to study bullying in elementary and secondary schools in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. TRAHAN (for herself and Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL):

H.R. 3660. A bill to direct the Secretary of Homeland Security and the Secretary of Health and Human Services to notify Congress of each foreign national who dies in the custody of the Secretary, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER (for himself, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. NORTON, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. HAALAND, Mr. NEGUSE, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. PRESSLEY, Ms. OMAR, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. HECK, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. COHEN, Mr. NADLER, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Ms. MENG, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mrs. LOWEY, and Mr. SUOZZI):

H. Con. Res. 52. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that there is a climate emergency which demands a massive-scale mobilization to halt, reverse, and address its consequences and causes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. STIVERS (for himself and Mr. HASTINGS):

H. Res. 475. A resolution calling on the President to work toward equitable, constructive, stable, and durable Armenian-Turkish relations based upon the two countries' common interests and the United States' significant security interests in the region; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BRADY:

H. Res. 477. A resolution requiring that the House authorize any judicial proceeding on behalf of any committee; to the Committee on Rules.

By Ms. SÁNCHEZ (for herself, Mr. AGUILAR, Mrs. AXNE, Mr. BACON, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Ms. BASS, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE

of Pennsylvania, Mr. BRINDISI, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CASTEN of Illinois, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. COOK, Mr. CORREA, Mr. CRIST, Mr. DEFazio, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. DELBENE, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. FINKENAUER, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mrs. FLETCHER, Mr. GALLEGGO, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. HIMES, Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. HURD of Texas, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. KATKO, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCKINLEY, Ms. MENG, Mr. MORELLE, Mrs. MURPHY, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. NORCROSS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. PETERS, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. POCAN, Ms. PORTER, Mr. RESCIENTHALER, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RUSH, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. SABLAN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SIREs, Mr. SOTO, Mr. STANTON, Mr. STAUBER, Ms. STEVENS, Mr. SUOZZI, Ms. TITUS, Mr. TONKO, Mrs. TORRES of California, Mr. VAN DREW, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. VELA, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. WELCH, Ms. WEXTON, Ms. WILD, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. MALINOWSKI, and Ms. SPANBERGER):

H. Res. 478. A resolution expressing support for the designation of Journeyman Lineman Recognition Day; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. TIPTON:

H. Res. 479. A resolution seeking the return of the USS Pueblo to the United States Navy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN (for herself, Mr. HORSFORD, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. OMAR, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Ms. MOORE, Mr. COHEN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. PRESSLEY, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. BASS, and Mr. ESPAILLAT):

H. Res. 480. A resolution acknowledging the racial disparities in diagnosing and treating mental health among youth in communities of color; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, 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.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

90. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Maine, relative to H.P. 1184, Joint Resolution, memorializing the President of the United States and the United States Congress to allow the importation of affordable and safe prescription drugs; which was referred to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

91. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, relative to House

Concurrent Resolution No. 66, to memorialize the United States Congress to take such actions as are necessary to recognize the historical significance of Juneteenth Independence Day to the United States and observe Juneteenth nationally as a holiday; which was referred to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

92. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Missouri, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 34, urging the Baseball Hall of Fame to induct John Jordan "Buck" O'Neil into the Baseball Hall of Fame; which was referred to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

93. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, relative to House Joint Memorial 1, respectfully urging the Congress of the United States to pass, and the President to sign, the Forest Management for Rural Stability Act before the close of the federal fiscal year 2019; which was referred jointly to the Committees on Natural Resources, Agriculture, and 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. THOMPSON of Mississippi:

H.R. 3628.

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

Article I Section II

By Mr. LYNCH:

H.R. 3629.

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

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution

By Mr. PALLONE:

H.R. 3630.

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

Authority under Article 1 Section 8

By Mr. SOTO:

H.R. 3631.

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

Article 1, Section 8, of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. DEFazio:

H.R. 3632.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1, Clause 3, and Clause 18 of the Constitution.

By Ms. KELLY of Illinois:

H.R. 3633.

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

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. SABLAN:

H.R. 3634.

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

Under Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution.

By Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 3635.

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 Ms. UNDERWOOD:

H.R. 3636.

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

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. RUSH:

H.R. 3637.

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

Article 1, Section 8

By Ms. HOULAHAN:

H.R. 3638.

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

U.S. Const. Article 1 Section 8

By Ms. HOULAHAN:

H.R. 3639.

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

U.S. Constitution, Article I, Section 8

By Mrs. LURIA:

H.R. 3640.

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

U.S. Constitution, Article I, Section 8.

By Ms. PORTER:

H.R. 3641.

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

Article 1, Section 8

By Ms. ADAMS:

H.R. 3642.

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

Article I, Section 8

By Ms. PORTER:

H.R. 3643.

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

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. BURGESS:

H.R. 3644.

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

The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States

By Mr. CLAY:

H.R. 3645.

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

Section II and Section XIII of Article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 3646.

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

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. COX of California:

H.R. 3647.

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

Article 1 Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H.R. 3648.

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

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

Clause 1, "The Congress shall have Power To.. pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States;"

Clause 14, "To make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces;"

Clause 18, "To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers..."

By Ms. DELAURO:

H.R. 3649.

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

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. EMMER:

H.R. 3650.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution

By Mr. FORTENBERRY:

H.R. 3651.

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

The constitutional authority for this bill is pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. GABBARD:

H.R. 3652.

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

The United States Constitution including Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas:

H.R. 3653.

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

Article 1 Section 8: Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. HIGGINS of New York:

H.R. 3654.

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

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH:

H.R. 3655.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. HUDSON:

H.R. 3656.

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

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. KATKO:

H.R. 3657.

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

Article III, Section I and Article I, Section 8, Clause 18.

By Mrs. LEE of Nevada:

H.R. 3658.

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

Article 1, Section 8 of the constitution gives Congress the power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defence and general welfare of the United States.

By Mr. ROSE of New York:

H.R. 3659.

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

Article 1, Section 8: to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mrs. TRAHAN:

H.R. 3660.

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

Article I, section 8, Clauses 1 and 18 of the United States Constitution, to provide for the general welfare and make all laws necessary and proper to carry out the powers of Congress.

H.R. 33: Ms. JACKSON LEE.

H.R. 35: Ms. MATSUI.

H.R. 40: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 41: Mr. HASTINGS and Ms. LEE of California.

H.R. 141: Mr. LUJÁN.

H.R. 196: Mrs. DEMINGS.

H.R. 216: Mr. ABRAHAM.

H.R. 218: Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. KEVIN HERN of Oklahoma, and Mr. GRAVES of Missouri.

H.R. 281: Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio.

H.R. 303: Mr. NEGUSE.

H.R. 397: Mr. MEEKS, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. BEYER, Mr. LEWIS, and Mr. KEATING.

H.R. 510: Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. NEGUSE, and Mr. COLE.

H.R. 555: Mrs. FLETCHER.

H.R. 586: Mr. ARRINGTON and Mr. DUNCAN.

H.R. 587: Ms. SEWELL of Alabama and Mr. PETERSON.

H.R. 655: Mr. ROUDA.

H.R. 663: Mr. LEVIN of California, Ms. MENG, and Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 677: Mr. TAYLOR.

H.R. 687: Ms. ADAMS.

H.R. 712: Ms. MENG.

H.R. 717: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

H.R. 724: Mr. COOK and Mr. EMMER.

H.R. 728: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 737: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK and Ms. PORTER.

H.R. 748: Ms. ESCOBAR.

H.R. 757: Mrs. LESKO.

H.R. 763: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.

H.R. 776: Mr. COLE.

H.R. 803: Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, and Mr. ROGERS of Alabama.

H.R. 838: Mr. KEATING, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. TRONE, and Mr. SIMPSON.

H.R. 873: Ms. HILL of California.

H.R. 874: Mr. SCHNEIDER.

H.R. 884: Mr. LUETKEMEYER and Ms. WILD.

H.R. 886: Mrs. AXNE.

H.R. 895: Mr. COLE.

H.R. 897: Mr. MARCHANT.

H.R. 919: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.

H.R. 945: Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma, Mr. CISNEROS, Mr. PERLMUTTER, and Ms. JUDY CHU of California.

H.R. 955: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 981: Mr. ROUDA.

H.R. 1002: Mr. CISNEROS and Mr. HARDER of California.

H.R. 1007: Mrs. LEE of Nevada.

H.R. 1011: Mr. LOWENTHAL and Mr. CÁRDENAS.

H.R. 1043: Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 1058: Mr. O'HALLERAN.

H.R. 1078: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. BRINDISI, Mr. PETERSON, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York,

Mr. CISNEROS, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. PALLONE, and Mr. LEVIN of California.

H.R. 1128: Mr. HORSFORD, Mrs. AXNE, and Mr. GALLEGU.

H.R. 1133: Mr. ENGEL and Mrs. MCBATH.

H.R. 1135: Mr. FORTENBERRY.

H.R. 1139: Mr. LEVIN of California.

H.R. 1154: Mr. MOULTON and Mr. HARDER of California.

H.R. 1166: Mr. FORTENBERRY and Mr. NEAL.

H.R. 1171: Mr. KING of New York, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 1174: Mr. RASKIN and Ms. JACKSON LEE.

H.R. 1175: Mr. HORSFORD.

H.R. 1185: Mr. BROWN of Maryland.

H.R. 1195: Mr. PASCRELL.

H.R. 1225: Mr. HUDSON and Mr. BUTTERFIELD.

H.R. 1230: Mr. ROUDA.

H.R. 1236: Mr. O'HALLERAN.

H.R. 1266: Mr. HUFFMAN and Mr. RYAN.

H.R. 1276: Mr. GALLEGU.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

- H.R. 1305: Mr. SUOZZI.
H.R. 1342: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.
H.R. 1358: Mrs. DAVIS of California.
H.R. 1370: Mrs. BUSTOS.
H.R. 1373: Ms. WATERS, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. MENG, and Mr. LEVIN of Michigan.
H.R. 1375: Mr. WELCH.
H.R. 1379: Mr. MALINOWSKI, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. STEVENS, Mr. MCEACHIN, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. SHALALA, and Ms. MATSUI.
H.R. 1380: Mr. CÁRDENAS.
H.R. 1393: Mr. RUIZ.
H.R. 1400: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.
H.R. 1418: Mr. CARTER of Georgia.
H.R. 1424: Mr. BANKS.
H.R. 1440: Mr. BALDERSON.
H.R. 1441: Mr. GREEN of Tennessee.
H.R. 1444: Mr. FERGUSON.
H.R. 1446: Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. MCNERNEY, and Mr. ENGEL.
H.R. 1507: Mr. SWALWELL of California.
H.R. 1527: Ms. ESHOO.
H.R. 1530: Mr. CISNEROS, Mr. HARDER of California, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Miss RICE of New York, Ms. WILD, Ms. LEE of California, and Mr. PERLMUTTER.
H.R. 1534: Ms. OMAR.
H.R. 1545: Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, and Mrs. LESKO.
H.R. 1550: Mr. LEVIN of Michigan.
H.R. 1568: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.
H.R. 1581: Ms. UNDERWOOD and Mr. KHANNA.
H.R. 1605: Mr. PALAZZO.
H.R. 1636: Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Mr. POSEY, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Ms. BONAMICI, and Mrs. TRAHAN.
H.R. 1641: Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. HOLDING, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. CASE, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. GALLEG0, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mrs. RODGERS of Washington, Mr. UPTON, Mrs. MILLER, and Mr. PERRY.
H.R. 1679: Mr. ALLEN, Mr. STIVERS, and Mr. ROUDA.
H.R. 1688: Mr. CISNEROS and Ms. JACKSON LEE.
H.R. 1715: Mr. BEYER.
H.R. 1728: Mrs. LESKO.
H.R. 1730: Mr. CARTER of Georgia and Mr. MEEKS.
H.R. 1748: Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. OMAR, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. HILL of California, Ms. HAALAND, and Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 1749: Mr. CUELLAR.
H.R. 1771: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. ROUDA.
H.R. 1784: Mr. GARAMENDI.
H.R. 1837: Mrs. ROBY, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. THOMPSON of California, and Ms. ESCOBAR.
H.R. 1840: Mrs. WALORSKI and Mr. ROUDA.
H.R. 1854: Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mrs. LEE of Nevada, Mr. GALLEG0, and Mr. HUDSON.
H.R. 1855: Mr. MARCHANT and Mr. FLEISCHMANN.
H.R. 1857: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
H.R. 1858: Mr. COMER.
H.R. 1869: Mr. BERA, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. MAST, and Mrs. TRAHAN.
H.R. 1872: Mr. VAN DREW and Mr. ABRAHAM.
H.R. 1878: Ms. MATSUI, Mr. LEVIN of California, and Mrs. AXNE.
H.R. 1901: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
H.R. 1903: Mrs. MCBATH and Mrs. WAGNER.
H.R. 1933: Mr. CISNEROS.
H.R. 1934: Mr. CARSON of Indiana and Ms. JACKSON LEE.
H.R. 1943: Ms. JUDY CHU of California and Mrs. DINGELL.
H.R. 1963: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H.R. 1968: Mr. KILDEE, Ms. FRANKEL, Ms. SLOTKIN, Mr. LEVIN of California, Ms. CRAIG, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. SCANLON, and Ms. SÁNCHEZ.
H.R. 1988: Mr. CLEAVER and Mr. TAYLOR.
H.R. 1998: Mr. CISNEROS and Ms. LEE of California.
H.R. 2013: Mr. KEATING.
H.R. 2048: Mr. TED LIEU of California.
H.R. 2073: Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 2117: Mr. FITZPATRICK and Ms. BARRAGÁN.
H.R. 2123: Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. KHANNA, and Mr. CASE.
H.R. 2124: Mr. YOHO.
H.R. 2147: Mr. TRONE.
H.R. 2156: Mr. WELCH, Mr. QUIGLEY, and Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 2168: Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 2178: Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. CARBAJAL, and Mr. LANGEVIN.
H.R. 2189: Mr. VAN DREW.
H.R. 2203: Mr. STANTON and Mr. KHANNA.
H.R. 2206: Mr. SCHWEIKERT.
H.R. 2208: Ms. MENG.
H.R. 2213: Ms. JUDY CHU of California and Mr. BRINDISI.
H.R. 2216: Mr. GRIFFITH.
H.R. 2224: Mr. KIM.
H.R. 2225: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
H.R. 2245: Mr. HASTINGS and Mrs. MURPHY.
H.R. 2250: Ms. ESHOO and Mr. LOWENTHAL.
H.R. 2256: Mrs. LURIA, Ms. WILD, and Ms. JAYAPAL.
H.R. 2261: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
H.R. 2278: Mr. MEADOWS.
H.R. 2279: Mr. COX of California, Mr. KILMER, Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio, and Mr. PALAZZO.
H.R. 2311: Mr. KILMER, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. GALLEG0, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. PETERS, Mr. VELA, Mr. POCAN, Mr. WELCH, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KINZINGER, and Mr. SCHIFF.
H.R. 2327: Ms. SPANBERGER.
H.R. 2328: Mr. RASKIN, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, and Mrs. DINGELL.
H.R. 2336: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.
H.R. 2339: Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. TED LIEU of California.
H.R. 2354: Mr. LOEBSACK.
H.R. 2368: Mr. BILIRAKIS.
H.R. 2381: Mr. AMODEI.
H.R. 2382: Mr. STIVERS, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. COX of California, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. DELGADO, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. PORTER, Mr. BOST, Ms. SCHRIER, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. BARRAGÁN, and Mr. CROW.
H.R. 2386: Mr. FITZPATRICK and Mr. CALVERT.
H.R. 2392: Mrs. LESKO.
H.R. 2402: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.
H.R. 2404: Ms. LEE of California.
H.R. 2405: Mr. SARBANES.
H.R. 2406: Mrs. LURIA and Mr. PALAZZO.
H.R. 2407: Mr. EVANS.
H.R. 2415: Ms. BROWNLEY of California and Ms. ESCOBAR.
H.R. 2420: Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. JACKSON LEE, and Mr. LEVIN of California.
H.R. 2422: Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 2426: Mr. YOHO and Ms. BONAMICI.
H.R. 2433: Mr. MITCHELL.
H.R. 2438: Mrs. LAWRENCE.
H.R. 2442: Mr. PAPPAS and Mr. BRINDISI.
H.R. 2445: Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas.
H.R. 2449: Ms. OMAR, Mr. SIRES, Ms. NORTON, and Ms. WILSON of Florida.
H.R. 2467: Mr. DEFazio.
H.R. 2468: Mr. CÁRDENAS and Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas.
H.R. 2471: Mr. BUCHANAN.
H.R. 2481: Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, and Mrs. LAWRENCE.
H.R. 2489: Mr. COOPER and Mr. HASTINGS.
H.R. 2498: Mr. SMITH of Missouri and Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 2501: Mr. SUOZZI, Ms. UNDERWOOD, and Mr. KIM.
H.R. 2504: Mrs. BUSTOS and Mr. STIVERS.
H.R. 2508: Mr. BALDERSON.
H.R. 2515: Mr. TAYLOR and Mr. CLEAVER.
H.R. 2517: Ms. PORTER.
H.R. 2541: Mr. HARDER of California.
H.R. 2577: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.
H.R. 2585: Mr. COX of California.
H.R. 2593: Mr. WENSTRUP.
H.R. 2594: Miss RICE of New York.
H.R. 2595: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 2599: Mr. SERRANO and Miss RICE of New York.
H.R. 2600: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 2620: Mr. BUTTERFIELD and Mr. FORTENBERRY.
H.R. 2643: Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio.
H.R. 2644: Mr. BUCSHON.
H.R. 2653: Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. BERA, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. PETERS, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. GRIMALVA, Mr. KINZINGER, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. TONKO, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. KILMER, Mr. HIMES, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CÁRDENAS, and Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 2662: Mr. KHANNA, Ms. MOORE, and Mrs. LAWRENCE.
H.R. 2678: Mr. MORELLE.
H.R. 2679: Mr. BRINDISI.
H.R. 2698: Mr. SCHRADER and Mr. LUJÁN.
H.R. 2706: Mr. SUOZZI and Mr. CRENSHAW.
H.R. 2708: Mr. VEASEY, Miss RICE of New York, and Ms. SCHRIER.
H.R. 2711: Mr. QUIGLEY.
H.R. 2720: Mr. LOWENTHAL.
H.R. 2721: Ms. SLOTKIN.
H.R. 2741: Ms. LEE of California and Mr. KEATING.
H.R. 2764: Mr. BLUMENAUER and Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 2775: Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, and Mr. SCHNEIDER.
H.R. 2782: Mr. KATKO.
H.R. 2808: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
H.R. 2809: Mr. SWALWELL of California.
H.R. 2815: Ms. PINGREE, Mr. LAMBORN, Ms. BASS, Miss RICE of New York, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. HARDER of California, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. COLLINS of New York, and Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL.
H.R. 2825: Mr. BRINDISI and Mr. QUIGLEY.
H.R. 2850: Mrs. BUSTOS.
H.R. 2854: Mr. MORELLE.
H.R. 2866: Mrs. LURIA.
H.R. 2874: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 2882: Mr. ESPAILLAT.
H.R. 2913: Mr. WEBER of Texas.
H.R. 2918: Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. SUOZZI, Ms. LEE of California, and Ms. WILD.
H.R. 2923: Ms. SCANLON and Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 2955: Mr. GREEN of Tennessee.
H.R. 2969: Mr. MAST, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and Mr. BUCHANAN.
H.R. 2975: Mr. KIM.
H.R. 3006: Mr. GRAVES of Missouri.
H.R. 3033: Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY.
H.R. 3050: Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas and Mr. TAYLOR.
H.R. 3073: Ms. PINGREE.
H.R. 3077: Mr. ZELDIN, Mr. LEVIN of California, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. TITUS, Ms. HILL of California, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. BRINDISI, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. REED.
H.R. 3080: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.
H.R. 3082: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mrs. TORRES of California, and Mr. SCHNEIDER.
H.R. 3093: Mr. HIMES.
H.R. 3103: Mr. STEUBE.
H.R. 3106: Mr. CISNEROS and Mr. RUSH.
H.R. 3113: Mr. RASKIN, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. PERRY, and Ms. JUDY CHU of California.

H.R. 3125: Ms. STEVENS.
 H.R. 3127: Mrs. WALORSKI.
 H.R. 3137: Ms. WEXTON.
 H.R. 3142: Mr. BISHOP of Utah.
 H.R. 3159: Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee and Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia.
 H.R. 3182: Mrs. BEATTY and Mr. COLE.
 H.R. 3183: Mr. PENCE.
 H.R. 3189: Mr. KIM and Ms. JUDY CHU of California.
 H.R. 3190: Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. TLAIB, Ms. SPANBERGER, and Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY.
 H.R. 3192: Mr. DESAULNIER.
 H.R. 3197: Mr. LOWENTHAL.
 H.R. 3206: Ms. KAPTUR.
 H.R. 3207: Ms. HOULAHAN.
 H.R. 3219: Ms. PINGREE.
 H.R. 3241: Mr. KIM.
 H.R. 3248: Mr. COHEN.
 H.R. 3250: Mr. SCHNEIDER.
 H.R. 3254: Ms. NORTON.
 H.R. 3262: Mr. SERRANO.
 H.R. 3265: Mr. GRIJALVA and Mr. ENGEL.
 H.R. 3275: Ms. KAPTUR and Mr. TURNER.
 H.R. 3279: Mr. CLEAVER and Mr. MEEKS.
 H.R. 3297: Mr. SUOZZI.
 H.R. 3302: Mrs. AXNE and Mr. HORSFORD.
 H.R. 3306: Mr. TONKO.
 H.R. 3312: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.
 H.R. 3315: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. ESCOBAR, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, and Ms. JACKSON LEE.
 H.R. 3332: Mr. TED LIEU of California.
 H.R. 3350: Mr. MITCHELL and Mr. JOYCE of Ohio.
 H.R. 3366: Mr. RASKIN and Ms. SCANLON.
 H.R. 3369: Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. CROW, Mr. KILMER, and Mr. MCGOVERN.
 H.R. 3370: Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY and Mrs. DINGELL.
 H.R. 3374: Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. PANETTA, and Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois.
 H.R. 3375: Mr. SARBANES, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. FINKENAUER, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. HAALAND, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. KINZINGER, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. MENG, Mr. DELGADO, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. BOST, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Ms. DEAN, Mr. CRIST, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. TRONE, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. CISNEROS, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. COX of California, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Ms. WILD, Mr. VAN DREW, Mr. CASE, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. HORSFORD, Mrs. TRAHAN, and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.
 H.R. 3378: Mr. WELCH, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. MOORE, Mr. AGUILAR, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. VELA, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. TONKO,

Mr. VARGAS, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. VEASEY.
 H.R. 3381: Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mrs. HAYES, and Mr. ROUDA.
 H.R. 3400: Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. SMUCKER, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. KATKO, and Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas.
 H.R. 3414: Mr. ROUDA.
 H.R. 3418: Ms. JACKSON LEE.
 H.R. 3442: Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana.
 H.R. 3446: Mrs. LOWEY.
 H.R. 3447: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.
 H.R. 3448: Ms. KELLY of Illinois and Mr. KHANNA.
 H.R. 3451: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. GOMEZ, Ms. DELAULO, and Mr. GALLEGGO.
 H.R. 3452: Ms. ESHOO, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. GALLEGGO, Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL, and Ms. MOORE.
 H.R. 3456: Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. MOORE, Mr. TONKO, Ms. HAALAND, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. GRIJALVA.
 H.R. 3461: Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. ROUDA, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. Dingell, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. PETERS, and Ms. PINGREE.
 H.R. 3463: Ms. HAALAND, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. TLAIB, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. AGUILAR, Ms. MENG, Ms. LEE of California, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. RYAN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. SHALALA, Ms. Velázquez, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. Grijalva, Ms. PINGREE, and Mr. DEFazio.
 H.R. 3465: Ms. ESCOBAR and Mrs. LURIA.
 H.R. 3477: Mr. CUELLAR and Mr. BEYER.
 H.R. 3487: Mr. AGUILAR and Mr. PETERS.
 H.R. 3499: Ms. NORTON.
 H.R. 3500: Mr. KING of New York.
 H.R. 3501: Mr. SHERMAN and Mr. TRONE.
 H.R. 3502: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. Kilmer, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. FLORES, Mr. SUOZZI, and Ms. Velázquez.
 H.R. 3503: Mr. VELA.
 H.R. 3516: Mrs. DINGELL and Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.
 H.R. 3517: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
 H.R. 3524: Mr. AGUILAR and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.
 H.R. 3534: Ms. SEWELL of Alabama.
 H.R. 3562: Mr. WELCH.
 H.R. 3572: Mr. SARBANES, Mr. DEFazio, Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. CASE, and Mr. RASKIN.
 H.R. 3579: Mr. ENGEL.
 H.R. 3585: Ms. SHALALA.
 H.R. 3594: Mr. GOSAR and Mr. BUDD.
 H.R. 3621: Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ.
 H.R. 3627: Mr. STAUBER.
 H.J. Res. 2: Mr. CASTEN of Illinois.
 H.J. Res. 38: Mr. BROWN of Maryland.
 H.J. Res. 48: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia and Mr. KEATING.

H. Con. Res. 10: Mr. PETERSON.
 H. Con. Res. 25: Ms. NORTON.
 H. Con. Res. 29: Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, and Mr. GRIJALVA.
 H. Res. 23: Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio, Mr. TURNER, and Ms. UNDERWOOD.
 H. Res. 33: Mr. PHILLIPS.
 H. Res. 45: Mr. JOHN W. ROSE of Tennessee.
 H. Res. 60: Ms. PORTER.
 H. Res. 141: Mr. LOWENTHAL.
 H. Res. 220: Mr. BACON and Mrs. AXNE.
 H. Res. 246: Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. BERGMAN, Mr. PERRY, and Ms. ESCOBAR.
 H. Res. 255: Ms. HAALAND.
 H. Res. 326: Mr. CÁRDENAS and Mr. MCEACHIN.
 H. Res. 335: Mr. MCGOVERN.
 H. Res. 374: Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. BABIN, and Mr. CURTIS.
 H. Res. 379: Mr. GARAMENDI and Ms. GABBARD.
 H. Res. 402: Mr. COURTNEY.
 H. Res. 410: Mr. PAYNE.
 H. Res. 442: Mr. TURNER.
 H. Res. 452: Ms. JUDY CHU of California.
 H. Res. 456: Mr. TAYLOR and Mr. LYNCH.
 H. Res. 472: Mr. CROW.

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:

Amendment No. 1 to be offered by Representative ADAM SMITH (NE) to H.R. 2500, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2020, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

32. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Mr. Gregory D. Watson, a citizen of Austin, TX, relative to urging Congress to enact legislation that would prohibit a potential employer — including the Federal government, a State government, or a local unit of government — from requiring disclosure of an employment applicant's Social Security number until a conditional or firm offer of employment is formally made to that applicant; which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 165

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JULY 9, 2019

No. 114

Senate

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

PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

Our Father in Heaven, how great You are. Today, lead our lawmakers in their work. May they be messengers of unity and hope.

Lord, make them productive servants who strive to honor You. Remind them to act with justice, love, mercy, and humility. May they speak words that bring life as they seek to live with integrity.

Sovereign Lord, strengthen our Senators to seize opportunities that bring peace, hope, and freedom.

We pray in Your great Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH). The majority leader is recognized.

NOMINATIONS

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, the Senate has continued to make headway in the personnel business. This week, we are confirming a number of President Trump's thoroughly qualified nominees to important vacancies in the Federal courts and in the administration.

As I have said, it is unfortunate for this institution that our Democratic

colleagues have made it their routine practice to require not just rollcall votes but cloture votes as well on non-controversial nominees for lower profile positions—regular cloture votes on district judges, cloture votes on Assistant Secretaries, and, later this week, a cloture vote on an Assistant EPA Administrator.

These are the sorts of important but lower profile positions the Senate used to quickly process on a voice vote. When these sorts of people were qualified, they were voice-voted by Senates of both parties for Presidents of both parties. That was the norm.

New partisan hurdles will not deter the Senate from doing our job. We will continue to spend the time it takes to put impressive, impartial men and women on the Federal judiciary and give the President—more than 2 years into his administration—finally, more of his team in place in the executive branch.

Yesterday afternoon, we voted to advance the nomination of Daniel Bress to serve on the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit. Mr. Bress comes with strong credentials, the academic pedigree, the legal experience, and, most importantly, a demonstrated commitment to the rule of law.

I am glad we voted to advance his nomination yesterday, and I urge our colleagues to confirm him later today.

Next, we will consider three district court nominees: T. Kent Wetherell to the Northern District of Florida, Damon Leichty to the Northern District of Indiana, and Nicholas Ranjan to the Western District of Pennsylvania.

After them, we will confirm several nominees to serve in the administration: Robert King to be Assistant Secretary of Education, John Pallasch to be Assistant Secretary of Labor, and Peter Wright to be Assistant Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

In each of these cases, the President has presented us with thoroughly well-

qualified individuals to serve the Nation in these very important roles. This week, the Senate will give them the straightforward consideration and confirmations they deserve.

THE ECONOMY

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, on another matter, Fourth of July celebrations weren't the only thing for American families to smile about last week. We received even more positive news about the strong U.S. economy that American workers and job creators are building with a big assist from Republican policies.

More than 200,000 new jobs were created in June alone. The economy is overflowing with opportunities. American workers are in high demand and more and more previously sidelined individuals are getting to clock back in.

The last administration's so-called recovery disproportionately helped a few major metropolitan areas, but it left whole communities and whole regions of our country more or less in the dust. Not these days. The results have been very different under Republicans' pro-growth, pro-opportunity policy agenda. Now we are seeing a real all-American recovery.

As the New York Times reported last week, "Only recently have the economic gains filtered down to Black and Hispanic workers, those with less education, and others who face discrimination or other barriers to employment."

So it is all kinds of American workers, all kinds of families, all kinds of small towns and farm counties and smaller cities and suburbs. This all-American recovery is benefiting our whole country with job opportunities, wage growth, net investment, and new optimism.

Two and a half years ago, Republicans started out with a pretty simple philosophy. It goes like this: The American people can accomplish great things and build prosperity for their

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



Printed on recycled paper.

S4705

families if Washington mostly stays out of the way.

We needed the Federal Government to stop creating so many economic headwinds and start creating a few tailwinds. So we achieved historic tax reform, major regulatory reform, and all kinds of economic policies geared toward helping workers and middle-class families earn more and then send less to the IRS.

The way Republicans see it, these ideas are actually no-brainers. So as long as you believe in the promise and potential of American workers and small businesses, this is clearly the way to go, and the results continue to speak for themselves.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session and resume consideration of the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Daniel Aaron Bress, of California, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

MAJOR LEAGUE BASEBALL PARK SAFETY

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, if you are a baseball fan, and many of us are, this is a big day—the day of the All-Star game.

I would like to spend just a few moments reflecting on an important issue for the fans of baseball across America.

Thirty-five million people every year enjoy one of America's great summer experiences—seeing a game at a Major League Baseball park. Fans join their friends and family to eat hot dogs, nachos, peanuts, and so much more. We sing the national anthem together at the start of the game and “Take Me Out to the Ball Game” at the seventh inning stretch, a tradition started by a man named Harry Caray in a place called Wrigley Field.

Some—the more dedicated fans—keep scorecards of home runs, RBIs, and earned run averages. Sadly, there is another statistic that has been seeing more and more attention lately—injuries to fans.

A Bloomberg report from 2014 estimated 1,750 fans suffer injuries in Major League Baseball parks every

season. Some are hit by balls; others are injured trying to escape being hit by a ball. This is far too many.

On May 29, a 2-year-old girl was hit by a foul ball at Houston's Minute Maid Park. She suffered bleeding, bruises, and brain contusions from the ball's impact. Her skull was fractured. She continues to suffer seizures.

What makes her injuries even more disturbing is that they likely could have been prevented had the safety netting behind homeplate been extended.

Cubs outfielder Albert Almora, who hit the ball, was so devastated by the little girl's injuries that he could barely speak. One will never forget the image of his head bowed, crying, when he saw the damage that was done to this innocent little 2-year-old girl by a foul ball that he hit.

What did he say afterward? “I want to put a net around the whole stadium.”

In the weeks following, we have seen more injuries in the stands. On June 10, a woman was struck by a line drive at Guaranteed Rate Field in Chicago. Two weeks later, a young woman was hit by a foul ball at Dodger Stadium in Los Angeles.

A survey by the polling organization FiveThirtyEight found that 14,000 more foul balls were hit in 2018 than 1998, and there is just no way—no way—for fans to entirely protect themselves. Here come these baseballs at 105 miles an hour off the bat. Even if you are watching it intently, you just can't protect yourself or the people you love who are watching the game with you. Bryant Gumbel made that point on his cable TV show on this very subject.

If fans can't do more, baseball teams can. In 2017, after a child was hit by a line drive at Yankee Stadium in New York, I wrote a letter to Major League Baseball commissioner Rob Manfred. I urged the league to extend safety netting at all Major League Baseball stadiums past the home plate to the far edge of each dugout. To their credit, the league did exactly that.

It is now clear, however, that is not enough. The little girl at Minute Maid Park was 10 feet beyond current netting.

In June, the Chicago White Sox became the first Major League Baseball team to announce it is going to extend netting to the foul poles. Let me tip my hat to Jerry Reinsdorf, the owner of the Chicago White Sox, for leading the way with this safety measure. The Washington Nationals, the Texas Rangers, and the Pittsburgh Pirates are all planning to do the same, and the Los Angeles Dodgers are conducting a study before making a protective strategy permanent.

I commend all these clubs for their leadership and commitment to fan safety, but I think we need more. We need a leaguewide standard.

Last month, my colleague from Illinois, Senator TAMMY DUCKWORTH, and I wrote to Commissioner Manfred calling

on all 30 Major League Baseball teams to extend the protective netting to the right- and left-field corners.

Folks who complain that extending the safety netting to the foul poles will create an obstructed view ignore the obvious—right now, the most expensive seats in baseball are behind the nets, and people don't complain. It is something you get used to, and you can get used to the safety of it as well. We should be reminded that the most expensive and popular seats have been behind netting for decades.

In 2002, a 13-year-old girl named Brittanie Cecil died after being struck in the head by a hockey puck at a National Hockey League game in Columbus, OH. The National Hockey League responded quickly, ordering protective netting behind the goal. Major League Baseball should show equal concern for its fans.

Ensuring the safety of fans at baseball stadiums is a tradition that stretches back to 1879, when the Providence Grays put up a screen behind homeplate to shield fans from the area that was called “the slaughter pen” at that time.

The increasing number of fans hit by balls makes it clear that new safety standards are needed at ballparks.

Today, we will see Major League Baseball's finest players at the All-Star game. Baseball fans deserve the best too. I urge Commissioner Manfred and all baseball teams to extend safety netting at Major League Baseball parks to the foul poles. Let's not wait until next season. Increasing fan safety is a win for everyone.

PRESCRIPTION DRUG COSTS

Madam President, if you ask the American people about issues they truly care about, let them volunteer what they think about, what they worry about, the No. 1 item on the list is the cost of prescription drugs.

We all know the problem. You reach a point where you need a drug or someone in your family needs a drug, and then you face the reality of what it is going to cost. If you are lucky, and you have a good health insurance plan, it covers the cost—no worries—but for many people, that is not the case. They have copays and deductibles or sometimes no real coverage when it comes to the cost of prescription drugs.

Of course, the prices of these drugs are way beyond our control. You go to a drugstore, and you are shocked to learn that what sounded like a great idea in the doctor's office turns out to be a very expensive idea at the cash register. For some people, it is an inconvenience, an annoyance, but for other people, it is a burden they just can't bear. They can't pay the cost. It is just too much.

Some of these drugs are just not minor additions to your life; they may be matters of life and death. In those circumstances, what are you to do?

I am reminded of people I have met across my State of Illinois as I have talked about this issue. One group

stands out because there are many of them—people who are suffering from diabetes.

Of course, they know that using insulin and taking care of themselves is the way to have a good, normal life, but it turns out that the cost of insulin has gone up dramatically.

Did you know that insulin was discovered in Canada almost 100 years ago? The researchers who discovered this drug—this life-saving drug for diabetes—said at the time that they were going to surrender their legal patent rights to sell the drug for \$1, give it away for \$1. Do you know why? They said it was because no one should make a profit on a life-or-death drug. That was almost 100 years ago. But what are we faced with today? We are faced with a dramatic increase in the cost of insulin, a life-or-death drug.

I have sat down with parents and their children and talked about what they go through to have enough insulin so that their diabetic daughter can survive. It is incredible. Mothers in retirement go back to work to take a job to pay for the daughter's insulin.

The cost of insulin has gone up dramatically. In 1999, Humalog—a very common form of insulin made by Eli Lilly—ran about \$39 a vial. What has happened to the cost of that drug in 20 years? It has gone up to \$329, a dramatic increase on a drug that was discovered 100 years ago.

At the same time, Eli Lilly is selling that drug in Canada for \$39—\$329 in the United States. Why? Because the Canadian Government has said to Eli Lilly: That is the most you can charge in our country. We are going to fight for the people who live in Canada to have affordable drugs.

Let me ask an obvious question. Who is going to fight in the United States for affordable drugs for our people, for those sons and daughters with diabetes—and not just for diabetes but so many other conditions for which life-and-death drugs are now being priced way beyond the reach of ordinary Americans? Do you know who is supposed to fight? We are supposed to fight for it. That is why we were sent here—Members of the U.S. Senate and the House of Representatives—to pass legislation to bring these under control.

Now we have legislation coming forward from the Senate HELP Committee on the issue of healthcare, and many of us had hoped that committee would use this opportunity to put in provisions to bring the cost of prescription drugs under control. Unfortunately, with only one exception, the bill is silent on the major issues.

The measures coming out of the Senate Judiciary Committee, where I serve, don't go to the heart of the matter. They really will not make a big difference on the insulin scandal that we are now facing or on the cost of drugs in general.

I had a simple measure that I introduced with Republican Senator CHUCK

GRASSLEY last year. Think about this. Have you ever seen an ad for drugs on television? If your answer is no, it is because you obviously don't own a television. You can't turn it on without seeing a drug ad, right? And if you watch during the day, when many seniors are watching, it is one after the other after the other.

I have said with amusement here we have even reached the point at which we can not only pronounce but spell the word XARELTO. We see those ads so often for XARELTO and HUMIRA and so many other things that they just bombard us. Why? They bombard us with these ads in the hope that consumers watching those TV ads will go to the doctor and say: Doctor, I need XARELTO.

Well, XARELTO is a blood thinner. There are other alternatives that are much cheaper. But if you ask for that high-priced prescription drug and the doctor doesn't want to get in a debate with you and puts it on the prescription pad, guess what you have just done. You may have the right drug for you at the moment—maybe—but you may have just added to the cost of healthcare by putting the most expensive drug out as an option when another form would work just as well.

In all of the things they tell you about these ads, some of the things I think are the most amazing and amusing are claims like this: If you are allergic to XARELTO, don't take XARELTO. Excuse me. How will I know I am allergic to it? After I take it, maybe.

Those sorts of things and warnings about suicide and death and everything else come at us, but there is one thing that isn't included in those drug ads—one very basic thing. Excuse me, Eli Lilly; excuse me, Sanofi. How much does this cost? They don't tell you because it is shocking sometimes for them to tell you that some of these drugs cost thousands of dollars, and perhaps getting rid of that little red patch on your elbow of psoriasis will not be worth \$5,000 a month if you know the price.

So Senator GRASSLEY and I put this in the bill last year and passed it in the Senate. How about that? It happens so rarely around here. We passed in the Senate a bill that required the drug companies to disclose the actual list price that they list for the cost of the drug. It passed the Senate, and it got killed in a conference with the House when the pharmaceutical companies came in and said: We don't want to tell anybody what these drugs cost.

Then I got an interesting call from the Trump administration. Notice, I am on the Democratic side of the aisle, so I was surprised. Dr. Azar from Health and Human Services called me and said: We like your bill. The President wants to make your bill the law, so we are going to pass a rule that requires drug companies to disclose the cost of pharmaceutical drugs on their ads. Direct-to-consumer advertising

has to tell the cost of the drug. Well, that is progress—a rule in that direction.

Do you know what happened yesterday? In a Federal court hearing in Washington, the judge struck down that rule. The judge said: Congress, you haven't given this administration or any administration the authority to do that on its own. You have to change the law, giving it the authority, or you have to change the law itself to require the disclosure of drug pricing. Does it sound like a radical idea to people that we would disclose to them how much these drugs cost in the drug advertising itself? It isn't unusual for people to list the cost of items we buy every day. When it comes to lifesaving drugs, shouldn't we have that disclosure as well? Well, I hope we will. I hope this bill that is coming to the floor will consider that as well as several other aspects when it comes to prescription drug pricing.

For example, did you know that the Veterans Administration, on behalf of the men and women who have served our country, actually negotiated with the pharmaceutical companies to have lower prices for the drugs that are used in VA hospitals and clinics? They sit down with these same drug companies and negotiate lower prices for our veterans. Good. Our veterans deserve it. But why won't our Federal Government negotiate for those who are under Medicare? Why can't we use the same drug formulary and pricing for the VA when it comes to Medicare? If we want to give our veterans a break—and we should—why wouldn't we give our seniors a break?

I think we ought to have negotiated pricing in Medicare. I think the drug companies will get along just fine. Incidentally, they are pretty profitable today. If we had that commitment for renegotiating for Medicare, it could make a difference.

I also think we ought to take on this insulin issue head-on—head-on. A story on "60 Minutes" recently was about a heartbroken mother from Minnesota whose son was on her health insurance plan under ObamaCare until he reached the age of 26. Then he was on his own. He was managing a restaurant. He didn't have drug coverage, and he was diabetic. He couldn't afford to pay the thousand dollars that was being charged for his insulin, so he decided to ration the dosage himself. It cost him his life. He, unfortunately, died because he couldn't afford enough insulin at the high prices that are currently being charged.

We can change that. We can come to the side of consumers across America, to families who are trying to keep their kids alive, and many others. We can do that because we work in a place called the U.S. Senate, but in order to do that, we have to act like Senators. We have to say to the pharmaceutical companies: I am sorry, but there comes a point where you have pushed it way too far. There comes a point where we

have to step in on behalf of families and consumers in America and speak up on their behalf. Watch closely to see if that happens.

The gentleman who was on the floor, my colleague from Kentucky, will be the person who will decide that. Senator McCONNELL will decide whether we are going to challenge the pharmaceutical companies this year.

Do you remember how I started? It is the No. 1 issue that American families volunteer to us. So is it important? Yes. Secondly, will it make a difference? You bet—not just in Illinois but I bet in Kentucky as well. Many a family can step forward and talk about how tough it is to pay for these prescription drugs.

Do we have a chance to do it? You bet we do. There is a series of bills coming out of committee in the next couple of weeks. We could bring this to the floor of the Senate. Wouldn't that be amazing if the U.S. Senate, instead of doing a handful of nominations of people you have never heard of, ended up actually passing a bill, making a law that addresses the issue of prescription drug pricing in America? That, to me, is a reason we were sent here.

What I would like to see and hope to see is a bipartisan effort. We Democrats are ready to stand up, but there are certain things we believe in. First, we believe in keeping the Affordable Care Act on the books. People with preexisting conditions shouldn't be discriminated against. Families ought to be able to keep their kids on their health insurance plans until kids reach the age of 26. We are willing to fight for that even though this week there is a lawsuit by the Trump administration to do away with it.

Secondly, we believe we should negotiate prices under Medicare so that seniors get the price breaks that our veterans get today and many others do too.

Third, we need to do something about the overpricing by these drug companies, not just price disclosure on the ads but changing the patent laws to give American consumers a fighting chance. Canada is fighting for Canadians. When is America going to fight for Americans?

When it comes to pharmaceutical prices, this is our chance to do it, and we can get it done in the next 2 weeks. Who will decide that? The majority leader from Kentucky, MITCH McCONNELL. He will decide whether this comes to the floor, whether it is important enough to the people living in Kentucky, Illinois, New York, Mississippi, or wherever. It is his choice. It is in his power to make that decision. I hope the American people will reach out to him to encourage him to do that.

I yield the floor.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

U.S. WOMEN'S WORLD CUP VICTORY

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, yesterday, I sent a letter to U.S. soccer that officially invited the U.S. women's soccer team to come to the Senate to celebrate their outstanding World Cup victory. Happily, I heard last night that Megan Rapinoe, one of the team's cocaptains and stars of the tournament, has accepted our invitation. I greatly look forward to scheduling a time when these inspiring women can come to the Nation's Capital.

What they have accomplished on and off the pitch is a credit to our Nation. Millions of young girls and young boys look up to these players. Millions of women, sports fans or not, admire the light they have shown on the disparities between the men's and women's game—part of a broader fight for equal treatment and fair pay in the workplace for all women.

I believe it would be a fitting tribute to this great women's soccer team to bring legislation to the Senate floor that would make it easier for women to get equal pay in the workplace. The House has already passed a bill to do just that. I call on Leader McCONNELL, again, to bring that bill to the floor of the Senate, particularly in light of the great victory of the women's team and the knowledge that they get paid much less than the men, even though they work just as hard and bring, at least in recent years, even greater glory to the United States.

Wouldn't it be great if we could pass that bill while the women's national team is visiting the Chamber? Wouldn't that send a powerful message of our commitment to rooting out discrimination everywhere?

I urge Leader McCONNELL to consider it. Right now that bill lies in Leader McCONNELL's all-too-full legislative graveyard. Perhaps this great victory might spring it free so that we could do something for women's equality.

JEFFREY EPSTEIN

Madam President, on a much less happy note, this week, billionaire Jeffrey Epstein was indicted in New York on Federal sex trafficking charges. The newly released evidence of Epstein's behavior involving dozens of children is sickening, is appalling, is despicable.

Epstein should have been behind bars years ago, but, unfortunately, the Secretary of Labor, Alex Acosta, cut Epstein a sweetheart deal while Acosta was a U.S. attorney in Florida in 2008. While a Federal prosecutor, Acosta signed a nonprosecution agreement that allowed Epstein and his co-conspirators to remain free and evade justice, despite overwhelming evidence.

Mr. Acosta hid this agreement from Epstein's victims. No one can figure out why Mr. Epstein was able to persuade U.S. Attorney Acosta not to prosecute, other than that Epstein could afford high-powered, high-priced attorneys. As the Miami Herald editorial board wrote this morning, it was not just that Acosta failed to get it right in 2008; the evidence suggests "he didn't care to."

Accordingly, I am asking three things. First, I am calling on Secretary Acosta to resign. It is now impossible for anyone to have confidence in Secretary Acosta's ability to lead the Department of Labor. If he refuses to resign, President Trump should fire him. Instead of prosecuting a predator and serial sex trafficker of children, Acosta chose to let him off easy.

This is not acceptable. We cannot have as one of the leading appointed officials in America someone who has done this—plain and simple.

Second, I am calling on the Department of Justice's Office of Professional Responsibility to make public the results of its review of Acosta's handling of the Epstein case. Senators MURRAY and KAINE have called for these findings, but the Justice Department so far has stonewalled, has refused to make them public. This rebuke cannot be kept in the dark, and there should be hearings.

Third, the President needs to answer for the statements he has made about his relationship with Mr. Epstein. In 2002, he said he had known Epstein for 15 years and that he was a "terrific guy" who enjoyed women "on the younger side." Epstein was also reportedly a regular at the Mar-a-Lago Club for years. The President needs to answer for this, and "I don't recall" is not an acceptable answer in this case, particularly since President Trump appointed Mr. Acosta to such a powerful position.

HEALTHCARE

Madam President, on healthcare, today oral arguments begin in *Texas v. United States*, and the fate of our entire healthcare system hangs in the balance due to this nasty, cruel lawsuit led by President Trump's Department of Justice. If the courts ultimately strike down the law, the healthcare of tens of millions of Americans would be gone—gone. Prescription drug costs, high enough as they are, would go up even further. Protections for preexisting conditions that affect more than 100 million Americans would be eliminated. A mother or father whose child had cancer would have to watch them suffer because the insurance company could cut them off and say: We are not paying for this anymore.

We cannot tolerate that. Yet President Trump and his administration and 19 Republican attorneys general filed a suit that would do just that.

The case reveals the depth of the hypocrisy and cruelty of the Republican position on healthcare. Senate Republicans, come campaign season, express unequivocal support for protections for preexisting conditions, but they have repeatedly blocked our attempts to have the Senate intervene in this lawsuit and fight back against the Trump administration's position, which threatens to eliminate these very same protections.

I say to my Republican friends: You can't have it both ways. You can't say "Oh, I want to protect people with preexisting conditions," and then prevent

us from doing something to actually protect them. Instead, they are going along, knees shaking, with President Trump's cruel lawsuit, and that is what every Republican in this Chamber—just about every Republican—has done.

President Trump has himself issued—also totally hypocritical—a laundry list of quotes in support of protections for preexisting conditions. He talks all the time about bringing down prescription drug costs while his administration actively pursues this lawsuit, which would raise the cost of drugs and eliminate protections for preexisting conditions.

How much hypocrisy can America tolerate? It is mind-bending. The hypocrisy is patently obvious. I don't care if you love President Trump. You should be calling him out for this hypocrisy, which will affect the vitality—God's most precious gift to us—the ability to live long and healthy and well. President Trump is trying to take it away, despite what he says to you, Trump supporters.

Senate Democrats will head to the steps of the Capitol to highlight what this lawsuit could mean to average Americans. My Republican friends should take note. The American people are keenly aware of which party is trying to take away their healthcare. Even if it happens through the courts in this Trump-supported lawsuit, they will know that congressional Republicans, by their silence—their meek, supine acquiescence—are complicit in the unraveling of our healthcare system. I believe the American people will hold them accountable at the ballot box if they don't change.

ELECTION SECURITY

Madam President, on election security, tomorrow the Senate will gather for a briefing by senior officials of the defense, law enforcement, and intelligence community on the threats facing our elections in 2020.

Russia has interfered in our elections. Everyone agrees with that. Our administration is doing nothing to stop it from occurring again in 2020, so we need a briefing by law enforcement on how serious the threat is—they have said “serious” in public statements—and what we are doing to stop it.

I am glad that Leader McConnell agreed to my request and has worked with us to schedule a briefing. It should dispel all doubt in this Chamber about the need to take action ahead of next year's Presidential elections.

I would say this: A briefing is important; a briefing is necessary, but it is by no means sufficient. We must then debate and adopt measures to protect our democracy and preserve the sanctity of our elections. Even though Leader McConnell has finally agreed to have this hearing, he has so far been content—once again, a legislative graveyard—to have the Senate do nothing—do nothing—when it comes to one of the greatest threats to our democracy, that a foreign power will reach in and interfere for its own purposes, not to help Americans.

Bipartisan bills exist. We could put them on the floor right now. This is not a partisan issue. Senators Rubio and Van Hollen have the DETER Act. Senators Menendez and Graham have the Russia sanctions bill. But all of these bills have languished, victims of Leader McConnell's legislative graveyard. We have many more options when it comes to election security—legislation from Senators Klobuchar and Warner, Feinstein and Wyden, Blumenthal and many others. It is time we move on these bills. As we continue to negotiate appropriations bills, we should include significant resources for election security. Nothing less than the vitality of and faith in our democracy is at stake.

There are not two sides to this issue. A foreign adversary attacked our democracy. I expect that Special Counsel Mueller's testimony next week will highlight once again that Russia's efforts to interfere in our democracy were sweeping and systematic.

What are we waiting for? What are we waiting for—for them to interfere again and for more Americans, whether they be Republican or Democrat or Independent, left, right, or center, to no longer believe this democracy is legit? For 243 years, since the Declaration of Independence and certainly since the signing of the Constitution a few years later, we have had faith in this democracy, even when the outcome isn't what we want. But that faith is already eroding in good part because foreign powers can interfere in our elections. We cannot—we cannot—let that happen, no matter who you are, what your politics are. But Leader McConnell is standing in the way of what could eat at the roots of our democracy and eventually make this mighty oak, the American experiment, fall. We don't want that to happen.

The briefing tomorrow is a good step, but it is only one step. We need to take more. We need to act, to prepare our democracy for the challenges ahead.

FOX NEWS

Madam President, I felt it was important to point this one out: President Trump amazingly attacked FOX News in the last few days in a series of tweets for coverage he viewed as unfavorable to his administration. This is FOX News, a news outlet that, frankly, is 90 percent or more on the President's side. Their most popular shows seem to just be cheerleaders for President Trump. To me, it is the most biased newscast there is of the major news stations, not that any of them are free of any bias. Yet when President Trump hears a small, dissident tweet, dissident note, from FOX News, and now he attacks it—what kind of thin skin does this man have? What kind of thin skin? But it is worse than his thin skin—when a President can attack a news organization that is overwhelmingly friendly to him, with some of his leading advocates getting prime time space, some of them going to his rallies, it shows he really doesn't believe

in freedom of the press. Dictators—dictators—shut down the press and try to shame the press when they speak truth to power, which is what our President has done in all the years of this Republic.

When President Trump can even attack FOX News because once in a blue moon it says something he doesn't like, that shows he doesn't really deserve to be President because a President must protect our liberties whether or not he is under fire.

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. COTTON. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

REMEMBERING RIVER NIMMO

Mr. COTTON. Madam President, I want to call your attention to a story that is tragic but also heartwarming and uplifting.

Honorary Colonel River “Oakley” Nimmo of Camden, AR, passed away last month at the age of 5 after a protracted struggle with his enemy, a rare form of cancer called neuroblastoma. Oakley's family remembers him as a “sweet, brave boy” who liked to play with power wheels and toy guns, but all those who knew him or who have learned about him will remember Oakley for an act of service that perhaps only a child could perform.

Oakley wanted to be an Army man when he grew up. Even in the advanced stages of his fight with cancer, you would find him at the hospital wearing camouflage fatigues and a helmet, with his trusty rifle by his side and a smile on his face.

Oakley fought his cancer valiantly, going above and beyond the call of duty. He was strengthened along the way by his Arkansas neighbors, who held yard sales and sold bracelets to help the Nimmo family pay for his care. He was also supported by 20,000 prayer warriors on a Facebook page entitled “Prayers for Oakley Nimmo.” But ultimately it was God's will that Oakley should return home to him. He passed away on the 20th of June.

In light of Oakley's heroic struggle, as well as his dream of becoming an Army man, Oakley was named an honorary colonel in the Arkansas National Guard. In the days leading up to his funeral, his family made a simple request: that veterans and servicemembers show up at the funeral in their uniform to give Oakley the proper sendoff. Word got around, and dozens came. Some traveled from nearby towns. Most had never even met this little boy, but it didn't matter—he was a soldier like one of them. Soldiers from the Arkansas National Guard provided funeral honors for Oakley. They presented Oakley's mother, Shelby, with the flag and a special ID tag with

his name on it. Like a true soldier, Oakley was sent off from this world to the moving tune of "Taps" played by a military bugler.

Colonel Nimmo's tour of duty on this Earth was brief, but he did teach an important lesson to all of us. At times, some voices may express doubts about our military, but Oakley reminded us—as perhaps only a child could—that being an Army man, a brave protector of our Nation, is one of the highest honors to which an American can be called.

The veterans and the servicemembers who attended Oakley's funeral were there to honor him, but, in fact, it was a double honor because through his life and dreams, little Oakley honored them in return.

Oakley looked up to our troops in life. Now he looks down on them from above, where he will remain in God's presence and our memory as a brave fighter against cancer, an inspiration, and indeed, for all time, an Army man.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCOTT of Florida). The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

HEALTHCARE

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, yesterday our friend from New York, the minority leader, spoke on the Senate floor about the latest challenge to ObamaCare—the Affordable Care Act—which is being considered by the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals this week. Also, if you can believe the press, he is also going to have a press conference with the Speaker and other notable Democrats to talk about the danger of a court decision on the constitutionality of the Affordable Care Act. As one might imagine, he painted a pretty grim picture of what would happen if the court were to strike down the Affordable Care Act, affirming the judgment of the trial court. Of course, he tried to place the blame squarely on those of us on this side of the aisle. It is strange to me because blaming Republicans in Congress for a yet-to-be-decided court case doesn't make a lot of sense, but it is pretty consistent with the message we have heard from our Democratic friends.

If the minority leader is going to pick a bone with anyone, then I guess his complaint is really about the Constitution itself. Court cases are decided on a case-by-case basis based on what the law is, and, of course, the Constitution is the fundamental law of the United States. So if a court ultimately holds an act of Congress to be unconstitutional, it is because the Constitution prohibits it. And a consensus among all Americans is that the Constitution shall be inviolable, dating

back to the early 19th century. The Supreme Court has made clear that is ultimately their job—not to decide what the policy should be but whether the policy enacted by Congress is consistent with the requirements of the Constitution.

So I find it pretty bizarre that in about an hour, the Democratic leader will join Speaker PELOSI for a news conference to talk about coverage for preexisting conditions, and I have no doubt that once again they will try to blame Republicans as the bad guys and somehow perpetuate this myth that Republicans are opposed to covering people for preexisting conditions in their health insurance policies. They know that is false. They know that is a bald-faced misrepresentation of what our policy choices are in this body and in Congress as a whole. There is one thing that I think there is a consensus on in Congress with respect to healthcare, and that is that preexisting conditions should be covered. In fact, there are pieces of legislation that I have cosponsored in the Senate that do that expressly. The illogical fallacy of their argument is that the only way one can do that is through the Affordable Care Act.

As we know, the Affordable Care Act has been a Trojan horse for a whole lot of other policies that, frankly, are not particularly popular because they have resulted in high deductibles and high premiums and have made it harder and harder for people to afford coverage. It has also precluded individuals from picking the kind of coverage that best suits their family's needs at a price they can afford.

I think it is important for the American people to understand what we all understand—including the Democratic leader and the Speaker—which is that what they are saying about preexisting conditions is false. They know it, we know it, and it can be demonstrated. Yet they persist in saying it because they believe that people are either uninformed, naive, or so partisan that they will not be guided by the facts but, rather, by the partisan rhetoric.

Here is the other strange thing in all of this. Most progressive Democrats—we used to call them liberals; now they call themselves progressives—have embraced Medicare for All as a solution to our Nation's healthcare challenges. As the Presiding Officer knows, Medicare for All would be a recipe to bankrupt Medicare, which has traditionally, legally, and historically been a benefit earned and contributed to by seniors in order to cover their healthcare when they are 65 or older. So dumping 180 million or so additional people into Medicare who have private health insurance is really a recipe for bankrupting it, thus undermining the benefit that seniors thought they were buying into during their entire lives.

Here is the other irony I find. When he was trying to sell the Affordable Care Act, we heard that President Obama said, if you like your existing

healthcare policy, you can keep it. That is what he said. It didn't end up being the case, but that is what he said. Yet now our Democratic colleagues have become so radicalized on healthcare that they are essentially saying, if you have private health insurance you like, you can't keep it. You can't keep it.

This is a very strange place to work sometimes because people say things they know are not true, but they hope they can capitalize on people's ignorance or on their partisanship. Yet, as many have said before, facts are stubborn things, and those are the facts; that there are other ways to cover preexisting conditions other than with the Affordable Care Act. For a party that has embraced this idea of Medicare for All and that wants to destroy privately held health insurance, it seems pretty rich for them to then blame this side of the aisle for wanting to destroy private health insurance that covers preexisting conditions.

A January Gallup poll found that 7 in 10 Americans have a negative view of our healthcare system and have described it as being in a state of crisis or as having major problems, which is to say that ObamaCare is not working as well as the advocates thought. As we know and as I have said, it is not the only way to protect patients who have preexisting conditions.

Earlier this year, I cosponsored a bill that was introduced by our friend from North Carolina, Senator TILLIS, called the PROTECT Act, which would ensure that no American would ever be denied health coverage because of one's having a preexisting condition. Now, the Democratic leader and the Speaker know that. Yet, presumably, today, at 12:30, when they hold their press conferences, they will say all Republicans are opposed to covering preexisting conditions because of this court case in the Fifth Circuit that has yet to be decided. They are just gleeful that this will provide, they think, some way for them to argue what they know is not true—that the Republicans are opposed to covering people's preexisting conditions.

I believe health coverage for these patients shouldn't hang in the balance of a court decision because, ultimately, it is our decision. If we pass the PROTECT Act, it would finally codify what I hope every Member of this body would agree on—that Americans deserve access to healthcare coverage. The PROTECT Act is just one example of the countless healthcare bills that are working their way through the Senate right now.

In addition, in the Senate Finance Committee, we are considering a package of bills to reduce prescription drug prices, just as we have in the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee and in the Judiciary Committee. The HELP Committee overwhelmingly passed a bipartisan bill to reduce healthcare costs, to increase transparency, and to eliminate surprise

medical bills. Last week, the Judiciary Committee unanimously reported out legislation that would keep pharmaceutical companies from gaming the patent system. Our colleagues—or political candidates—can go on TV and try to spin the ObamaCare system all they want, but we are going to continue to work hard to make real meaningful changes to make our healthcare system better.

BORDER SECURITY

Mr. President, on another matter, we know that a record number of migrants is continuing to cross our southern border, and the impact on Texas communities—the State I represent—has been overwhelming.

Detention centers are over their capacities. Customs and Border Protection officers and agents are pulling double duty in their being law enforcement officers and caregivers to children, not because that is what they have been trained to do but because that is what they must do in order to take care of this flood of humanity. Nongovernmental and community organizations are unable to keep up with this pace of the thousands of people who have been coming across the border each and every day.

Before the Senate recessed for the Fourth of July week, which was about 10 weeks after the President requested emergency funds, we finally passed a bipartisan bill to send much needed humanitarian relief. It includes additional funding for the departments and agencies that have depleted their resources in trying to manage this crisis, and it makes \$30 million available in reimbursement for which impacted communities may apply—charges that should be the Federal Government's responsibility and not the local governments'. As I said, after some hand-wringing and delay, the House passed this bill, and the President signed it. I hope my constituents back in Texas who have been working tirelessly to manage this crisis will soon find some relief.

It is important to remember, though, that depleted funding isn't the reason for the crisis; it is only a symptom of a larger problem. In other words, we are dealing with the effects and not the cause of the basic problem. Without getting to the root cause, we are only setting ourselves up for failure, which means we will be back here in another couple of months and will have to pass another emergency appropriations bill for an additional \$4.5 billion to try to deal with the problem we can fix but have refused to.

Sadly, this issue has become so politicized that few are willing to reach across the aisle and find solutions, and most of the proposals we have seen are ultrapartisan. The Democrats who are running for President support things like decriminalizing illegal border crossings or providing free healthcare to undocumented immigrants, both of which are unpopular, unsafe, and completely unaffordable. The vast majority

of Americans oppose open borders and already struggle to manage their own bills. They certainly don't want to be burdened with the costs of people who enter our country illegally and don't pay taxes.

We don't need these radical proposals to solve the crisis at our southern border. Both in the short term and the long term, we need bipartisan solutions that can provide some real relief. If we want to get to the root of the crisis and avoid making emergency funding bills the norm, we need to get down to brass tacks and talk about real reforms that, No. 1, will fix the problem and, No. 2, will stand a chance of actually becoming law.

Right now, there is only one bill, to my knowledge, that has bipartisan and bicameral support, and that is a bill called the HUMANE Act. I introduced this bill with my Democratic friend in the House, HENRY CUELLAR, to address the humanitarian crisis at the border.

First and foremost, the HUMANE Act includes important provisions to ensure that migrants in our custody receive proper care. It requires the Department of Homeland Security to keep families together throughout their court proceedings, and it includes additional standards of care. Beyond suitable living accommodations, the HUMANE Act requires each facility to provide timely access to medical assistance, recreational activities, educational services, and legal counsel.

It would require all children to undergo biometric and DNA screening so family relationships could be confirmed so as to ensure these children would be, in fact, traveling with their relatives rather than with human smugglers or sex traffickers.

In order to better protect children who would be released to Health and Human Services, this bill would place prohibitions on certain individuals who could serve as guardians. For example, no child should be released into the custody of a sex offender or a human trafficker. I would hope we could all agree on that.

In addition to improving the quality of care for those in custody, the HUMANE Act would improve the ways migrants would be processed. It would require the Department of Homeland Security to establish regional processing centers in high-traffic areas, which would serve as a one-stop shop by which the process would take place. This was a recommendation from the bipartisan Homeland Security Advisory Council. It would also alleviate the long wait times that are experienced by many asylum seekers. These centers would have personnel on hand from across the government to assist, including medical personnel and asylum officers.

In addition to these changes, the legislation would also include provisions to make some commonsense improvements, such as additional Customs and Border Protection personnel and training for CBP and ICE employees who work with children.

The HUMANE Act would make much needed reforms to improve the processing and quality of care for migrants. Importantly, it would also take steps to address the flow of those who enter our country by the tens of thousands each month.

I spend a lot of time talking to folks who live and work on the border about the status quo and what we need to do to prevent this crisis from becoming even bigger. The most common feedback I get is that we need to close the loopholes that are being exploited by the people who are getting rich off of trafficking in human beings from Central America, across Mexico, and into the United States.

One of the most commonly exploited loopholes is something called the Flores settlement agreement, which was created to ensure that unaccompanied children don't spend long periods of time in the custody of the Border Patrol. It was and remains an important protection for the most vulnerable people who are found along our border. It also ensures they can be processed and released to either relatives or to the Department of Health and Human Services pending the presentations of their cases before immigration judges when they claim asylum. Yet a misguided 2016 decision by the Ninth Circuit effectively expanded those protections from children to families.

One thing I can say with some certainty is that human smugglers and traffickers are not fools; they are entrepreneurs. They are twisted and criminal, to be sure, but they are entrepreneurs. They know how to exploit the gaps in our system, and they know how to make money while doing it. They know, if adults are traveling alone, they could be detained for long periods of time before they are eventually returned home after presenting their cases before immigration judges. So now, rather than there being single adults who arrive at the border alone, adults are bringing children with them so they can be processed as family units, thus taking advantage of that expansion of the Flores settlement agreement and drawing out the process to the point at which it overloads the system. They realize they can bring a child—any child—and pose as a family so they will be released after 20 days, never to be heard from again.

We have seen a massive increase in the number of families who have been apprehended. In May of 2018, roughly 9,500 families were apprehended. In May of this year, the number skyrocketed to more than 84,000. So, in just 1 year, it went from 9,500 to 84,000. Now, are legitimate families crossing the border? Absolutely. Yet we know many of these people who claim to be related are fraudulent families who use innocent children as pawns to gain entry into the United States. Something that nobody wants to talk about is, often, these children are abused and assaulted along the way, and many arrive at the border in critical health.

If we care about the welfare and the lives of these children, we cannot let these practices continue. It is unfair not only to these children but to the American people and to the immigrants who have waited patiently to enter the United States legally for people to be able to game the system, move to the head of the line, and break all the rules while doing it.

The HUMANE Act would clarify that the Flores agreement applies only to unaccompanied children. It would also provide greater time for processing and immigration proceedings to take place before a family is released from custody.

Eliminating this pull factor is an important way to stop the flow of those illegally entering our country because they know how to game the immigration system.

While the HUMANE Act will certainly not fix every problem that exists in our broken immigration system, it is an important start. It is a necessary start. It is the only bill pending before the Congress that is bipartisan and bicameral, and I would encourage all of our colleagues who are serious about our responsibilities to get to the root of this humanitarian crisis to join us and get this passed and sent to the President for his signature.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

Mr. Kaine. Mr. President, I rise today in support of the Affordable Care Act and to discuss the devastating impact its potential elimination would have on rural families and rural communities.

My State, Virginia, has so many rural communities, and in that, I am with every other Member of this body, and I want to talk specifically about them.

The Trump administration has sought for years to end the Affordable Care Act using every tool available. They have worked on that task here in Congress to repeal it and sabotage it and even dismantle it in the court system. Today marks another milestone in that deeply troubling effort.

The U.S. Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals will hear oral arguments in a case that could strike down the Affordable Care Act in its entirety. If the ACA were struck down, families and communities around the country would bear life-altering consequences, and the healthcare system would be thrown into chaos. Tens of millions of Americans would lose healthcare coverage and protections for preexisting conditions, among the countless other consumer protections that have been put in place by the ACA.

A number of my colleagues are going to be on the floor this afternoon speaking about particular aspects of this that trouble them. I want to focus on one in particular: how important the Affordable Care Act's Medicaid expansion is to rural America and how much

is at stake for those communities should the Affordable Care Act be eliminated.

Medicaid expansion enables low-income, rural residents to get affordable, quality health insurance so they can get the care they need. It is often the case that insurance companies do not compete with the same intensity in rural communities because there are just not enough patients. So it is common in rural America for somebody wanting to buy an insurance policy on the exchange, for example, to maybe have only one option. Medicaid expansion has turned out to be a huge benefit for many low-income people living in rural America. Many of those who are receiving insurance pursuant to Medicaid expansion were previously uninsured, and so for some, it is the first insurance they have had in their lives.

A particular impact of Medicaid expansion has not been on just individuals receiving that Medicaid but on the hospitals that are sort of the healthcare and even economic pillars in rural communities. Rural hospitals often have a difficult time making the finances work. Again, lower patient volumes make it difficult. Medicaid expansion has meant that the care they have been providing that in the past might not have been reimbursed at all—they are now able to at least get a Medicaid reimbursement, and that has been a significant financial benefit to these hospitals.

Mr. President, you understand this because your State is like mine, and there are a lot of rural communities. Rural hospitals are often the lifeblood of rural communities. They can be the largest employers in a town or a county. They often do a tremendous amount of outreach on healthcare and other philanthropic efforts not just within the hospital walls but outside the hospital walls—sponsoring the Little League teams and doing the things that make a community a community.

Residents of rural communities need access to healthcare, but they also need access to jobs and good healthcare information. Rural hospitals provide that.

I have seen the impact of rural hospital closures in Virginia firsthand. Two rural hospitals in Virginia closed in recent years because Virginia did not expand Medicaid initially. In the last year, Virginia has done Medicaid expansion, but before Medicaid expansion was done, we saw hospitals close in two communities in Virginia: Patrick County, which is a south side Virginia county that is on the border with North Carolina, and Lee County, which is a far southwestern Virginia county that is on the border with Kentucky and Tennessee. Two hospitals have closed in those communities.

I got a letter from a mother in Christiansburg, VA, which is actually up near Virginia Tech. Her name is Robin, and she wrote about the closure of the Pioneer Hospital in Patrick County in 2017.

She wrote this:

My mother who recently turned 70 still lives in the county, and we are approaching a point of either moving back to Patrick County or moving my mother to Christiansburg where we currently live. My son has severe food allergies that could lead to anaphylactic shock (which would require immediate medical attention) so this variable also weighs very heavily on my mind when considering the options of how to manage my family's land and take care of my mom. I don't want to live somewhere without access to emergency health care. It seems inconceivable that this is the case in the era in which we live now. . . . Please help get my home county back on the medical map to give its economy and its people a fighting chance.

Blacksburg is probably an hour and a half to 2 hours away. The mother is living in a county that now has no hospital—she has turned 70—so she doesn't have access to the care that she needs. The daughter is trying to decide: Do I move back? But I have a son who needs care because of allergies. Do I have to move my mother out of the home where she would rather stay?

Rural hospitals across the country are struggling to keep their doors open for a number of reasons, but here is an amazing set of statistics. Whether a State expands Medicaid pursuant to the ACA is a massively significant factor in rural hospitals' financial outlook and decisionmaking. Without Medicaid expansion, rural hospitals may be forced to cut vital services or even close. Here is the data point that really says it all: Since January 2010, 107 rural hospitals have closed in the United States, and 93 of those 107 hospitals were in States that had not expanded Medicaid at the time of the closure.

Hundreds more rural hospitals are at risk of closure. Rural hospital closures disproportionately occur in States that have not expanded Medicaid. The success of the Texas case would wipe out the ACA, including Medicaid expansion, and deeply penalize these rural hospitals.

A comprehensive 2018 study published in Health Affairs found that Medicaid expansion is directly associated with hospital financial performance and that expansion substantially reduces the risk of hospital closure, particularly in rural areas. The study also found that going back to pre-ACA eligibility for Medicaid would drive even more rural hospitals to closure.

So we think about Robin's dilemma of a mother living in a rural area where the hospital has closed. If the ACA is struck down and there is no Medicaid expansion, this is going to be faced by more and more rural communities across the country, and that means this is a dilemma individuals and their families will ultimately face.

Research from Georgetown University's Health Policy Institute indicates that the uninsured rate for low-income adults in rural communities fell three times as fast in States that expanded Medicaid as compared to States that did not expand. Turn that around.

States that expand Medicaid find that rural families have a dramatically higher likelihood of having insurance than those in rural areas where the States haven't expanded Medicaid.

As of now, 36 States, including Virginia, have expanded Medicaid and 14 have not. I am thrilled that earlier this year Virginia, after a multiyear battle, finally announced that Medicaid expansion was happening. In less than a year after expansion, nearly 293,000 adults are newly enrolled in Medicaid in Virginia, many of whom never had health insurance before in their lives—293,000 adults in a State where the population is about 8.5 million. That is a significant number of people who have received insurance through Medicaid expansion. They risk losing their eligibility if the administration is successful in its efforts to gut the ACA.

If we care about rural residents and rural communities, there are a number of things we can do.

First, we need to stand up against the administration's attempt to end the ACA, including its Medicaid expansion.

I have now been in public life for 25 years since I was elected to the Richmond City Council in May 1994. I will say that in all of the elections I have been in, up or down, and all the various legislative and other battles, the single most dramatic moment in my life as an elected official was standing on the floor of this body at 2 o'clock in the morning when Senator John McCain, fresh out of a hospital after being diagnosed with a glioblastoma brain tumor, cast the deciding vote, and by one vote—one vote—we saved the Affordable Care Act. I have never in my life in the public realm experienced something that was so dramatic and so consequential.

We have to continue to stand up. I would have thought that vote might have moved us to a new chapter where we would be talking about fixing and improving rather than repealing, but that is not the case, as evidenced by the lawsuit today. But my hope is that we will resist efforts to sabotage and destroy and instead join together in efforts to improve. I have joined with my colleagues to cosponsor a resolution allowing Senate legal counsel to intervene in the lawsuit, to defend the Affordable Care Act.

The second thing we can do to help rural communities is focus on the 14 States that haven't yet expanded Medicaid and provide them a clearer path and encouragement to do so.

I am proud to be an original cosponsor of something called the SAME Act, which would extend the same level of Federal assistance to every State that chooses to expand Medicaid regardless of when the expansion occurs. I think that is important.

Let's use the original Medicaid Program as an example. It was passed in 1965. It was not a mandate; it was an option. The last State—Arizona; State 50—that joined didn't join until 1982.

There was a 17-year period between when the first State joined the then-voluntary Medicaid Program and when the last State joined.

Let's make sure that whenever States join, they are treated the same. If this bill passes, States that choose to expand now—these 14 States—we would make sure that they get the full Federal level of assistance as was available to those States that initially joined, and that should help remaining States get off the sidelines.

Finally, we need to stand up against administrative sabotage to the Affordable Care Act. We shouldn't promote skimpy insurance plans. We shouldn't slash funding for enrollment, outreach, or marketing. We should build on and improve and, yes, fix—because it is not perfect—the ACA to extend its promise of affordable coverage to even more Americans.

That is why I have introduced Medicare-X legislation to establish a public insurance plan that could be offered on the ACA exchanges, beginning in rural areas. My bill would also make the ACA's tax credits more generous, expand tax credit eligibility to additional families, and allow for an enhanced reimbursement rate in rural communities where low patient volumes often pose financial challenges to healthcare providers.

In closing, the ACA has meant the difference between life and death for many families across the country, and I run into them every day.

I am going to be standing with some Senate colleagues on the steps of the Senate in a few minutes talking about a youngster from Winchester, VA, who has a series of significant healthcare challenges that would essentially in the past have made him uninsurable because of preexisting conditions but who now—because of that protection within the ACA, he and his family at least have the peace of mind of knowing that he can't be kicked off insurance or turned down for insurance because he happened to be born with a condition over which he had no control.

If the ACA were to be struck down, families and communities would suffer, and I think that in Virginia, that would particularly be the case in our rural communities.

Again, I am just going to hold up this issue of our rural hospitals. We need to protect rural hospitals not only because of the healthcare they provide but because they are employment centers and centers of community outreach. When we see the closure of rural hospitals overwhelmingly being in States that have not expanded Medicaid, that tells us how valuable that portion of the ACA has been to stabilize the provision of rural healthcare.

I will continue to fight to protect the ACA and the health of my rural communities in Virginia and elsewhere. I encourage my colleagues to do the same.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRUZ). Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE ECONOMY

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, we received more good economic news on Friday with the announcement that the economy created 224,000 jobs in June.

Meanwhile, unemployment remained near its lowest level in half a century. June marked the 16th straight month that unemployment has been at or below 4 percent. That is a tremendous record.

June also marked the 11th straight month that wage growth has been at or above 3 percent. Before 2018, wage growth had not hit 3 percent in nearly a decade.

Friday's announcement was just the latest piece of good news about the economy. Thanks to Republican economic policies, the economy has taken off during the Trump administration. Economic growth is up, wage growth is up, personal income is up, and the list goes on.

Importantly, the benefits of this economic growth are being spread far and wide. One of the distinguishing features of the economic expansion that we have been experiencing is the way it has been reaching those who have trailed behind economically.

Over the past 3 years, pay hikes for the lowest income workers have exceeded pay hikes for the richest workers. Huge numbers of new blue-collar jobs have been created, and the employment situation for minorities has improved substantially.

The unemployment rates for Asian Americans, African Americans, and Hispanic Americans are all at or near record lows. The Wall Street Journal notes that "Nearly one million more blacks and two million more Hispanics are employed than when Barack Obama left office, and minorities account for more than half of all new jobs created during the Trump Presidency."

So where has all this economic progress come from? At the end of the Obama administration, 2½ years ago, the economic outlook wasn't too rosy. The economy was sputtering, and American families were struggling. Some were predicting that a weak economy would be the new normal.

Republicans, however, didn't agree with that. We knew that American workers and American businesses were as dynamic and creative as ever. But we also knew that burdensome regulations and an outdated tax code were holding our economy back and reducing the opportunities available to workers. So when we took office in 2017, we got right to work on improving

our economy in order to improve life for the American people.

We eliminated burdensome regulations that were acting as a drag on economic growth, and we passed a historic reform of our Tax Code to put money in Americans' pockets and make it easier for businesses to grow and to create jobs. Now we are seeing the results: a thriving economy that is extending more opportunities to more Americans.

For all of Democrats' talk about inequality, it is actually Republicans and President Trump who have done something about it. We have helped create an economy that is lifting up people across the entire economic spectrum.

There is still more work to be done, of course. For one thing, we need to make sure that the agriculture economy is able to catch up to the economy at large. But thanks to tax reform and other Republican economic policies, American workers are doing better than they have in a very long time.

It is unfortunate that the gains we have made would be reversed if Democrats have their way. Democrats' plans—from budget-busting government-run healthcare to free college—all have one thing in common: They would cost a lot of money.

Where would the government get most of that money? From tax increases—tax increases on businesses and tax increases on ordinary Americans.

Thanks to the tax relief that Republicans passed, the economy has expanded, paychecks have increased, and more jobs and opportunities have been created.

Raising taxes would result in the opposite: fewer jobs and opportunities, a smaller economy, and more families struggling to get by on smaller paychecks.

Republicans are determined to make sure that doesn't happen. We are committed to building on the progress we have made and further expanding economic opportunity for all Americans.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

HONG KONG

MR. TOOMEY. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about the very high-stakes political and social crisis that has been unfolding in Hong Kong over the past several weeks.

Hong Kong is a very exceptional city. It boasts of a very robust free market economy that has thrived for centuries. It has a very vibrant free press. It has an independent judiciary and a partially democratic election system. Those freedoms, combined with Hongkongers' natural entrepreneurial spirit and appreciation for individual liberty, have made Hong Kong a jewel of the financial and business world, one of the freest places in Asia, and a great place to live—for a time, anyway, as I did back in 1991.

Economic and political achievements are particularly impressive when you

consider that Hong Kong is, after all, a part of China, which has neither a free economy nor a politically free society.

Back in 1997, Great Britain transferred Hong Kong to China on a condition—an explicit written agreement—that Hong Kong's social and economic systems would remain unchanged under a "one country, two systems" arrangement that would last for at least 50 years, until 2047.

The Chinese Government also made a pledge at the time—a pledge that Hong Kong's legislative and executive leaders would be elected through "universal suffrage." Yet, here we are, 22 years later. Hongkongers still do not enjoy complete universal suffrage, and Hong Kong has faced deep and persistent efforts by the mainland to erode the independence and the authority of Hongkongers.

On the surface, this ongoing crisis in Hong Kong was clearly caused by the Hong Kong Government, probably at the behest of the Chinese leadership in Beijing to pass a deeply unpopular extradition bill. This bill would diminish Hong Kong's independent legal system very dramatically, and it would do so by allowing and exposing individuals in Hong Kong—including Hong Kong citizens, foreigners, and even tourists—to being extradited to China.

The accused would then face prosecution by an authoritarian government in mainland China that does not uphold the rule of law, nor does it practice the fair and impartial administration of justice. Let's face it. The judicial system in China is politicized and controlled by the Chinese Communist Party.

Some people are concerned that if this bill were to become law, it would even pave the way for Chinese state-sponsored kidnapping of dissidents. It certainly would have a chilling effect on freedom in Hong Kong, a chilling effect on the ability of Hong Kong people to live their lives and express their views without the fear of political repercussions. It is simply a fact that mainland China is a legal black hole, and Hong Kong's extradition bill would be a step to exposing Hong Kong residents directly to mainland China's opaque and often blatantly unfair legal system.

In response to this threat, the people of Hong Kong have for weeks poured into the streets, calling for a withdrawal of this bill and deeper democratic reforms. Remarkably, last month, one of these protests—one of these demonstrations brought together an estimated 2 million Hongkongers into the streets. It is stunning anywhere in the world that 2 million people would come out to protest anything. But in Hong Kong, it is truly staggering because the total population of Hong Kong is only 7.4 million. That is about one in four Hongkongers who were on the streets protesting.

Just today, the Hong Kong Chief Executive said that bill was dead. But it has not been formally withdrawn, as I

understand it, and I think the threat remains.

It is also important to note that on a deeper level these ongoing protests are really a response to efforts by the Chinese Government to "mainlandize" Hong Kong. It is an effort in which political, cultural, and even physical distinctions between Hong Kong and mainland China are meant to be diminished, the differences blurred, and the distinction eroded.

The extradition bill is just the latest example of the Hong Kong people's struggle for the freedom, democracy, and respect for human rights that they cherish, that they want to hold on to, and that were promised to them when the handover occurred in 1997.

Hongkongers really have a rich history of protest, and I think that history reveals their enduring grassroots desire for the freedoms they have grown to love and cherish and for a democratic form of government that they deserve.

Back in 1989, the Tiananmen Square massacre that we all remember—the 30th anniversary was just last month. On the eve of the massacre, once it was clear the Chinese Communist Government would respond to peaceful protesters with bullets and tanks—once that became clear, about 1.5 million Hongkongers marched in the streets of Hong Kong in solidarity with the students in Tiananmen.

In 2003, the Hong Kong leadership proposed an anti-subversion bill. Hongkongers rightly saw this bill as an attack on their freedom of speech and freedom of association. The Hong Kong leadership proposed it—again, doing it at the behest of the mainland Chinese Government—and 500,000 citizens protested and eventually forced the government to withdraw the bill.

In 2014, the Hong Kong Government announced a reform to change how Hong Kong's Chief Executive was selected. The proposal was meant to continue what already existed, and that was mainland Chinese Communist control over the election process in Hong Kong. One of the mechanisms they used to achieve this was that only candidates vetted by a committee of mostly pro-Beijing supporters would be allowed to seek the office of Chief Executive.

In response to this undemocratic measure, Hong Kong students staged a campaign of civil disobedience and peaceful protest to oppose this effort. Up to a half a million people participated in the movement. Students famously used umbrellas to shield themselves from tear gas and pepper spray that was being launched at them by the police, so much so that the pro-democracy protesters were quickly termed the "Umbrella Movement."

All of these protests and acts of civil disobedience make it clear that Hongkongers want more freedom, not less freedom.

I think this matters. This matters obviously in Hong Kong, but it matters

beyond Hong Kong. It matters to us. It should matter to us. What is happening in Hong Kong is not just important for those residents but for the rest of the world. Today the people of Hong Kong are fighting against an unpopular and unfair extradition bill. They are really fighting for a future in which they can enjoy basic human rights, natural rights that everyone should have, including the right to free speech, the right to a fair trial, the right to be confident that your government will follow the laws of the society in which it exists, and participation in a just and fair representative system of government.

If the Chinese officials in Beijing and the Communist Chinese who rule mainland China have their way, they will extinguish these rights for the people of Hong Kong. If the extradition bill were to become law, it would threaten all of those rights because of the chilling effect of the threat of being extradited to the lawlessness of the Chinese judicial system.

In some important ways, I think Hong Kong can be seen as a canary in a coal mine for Asia. What happens in Hong Kong will at least set expectations, create a climate that will maybe affect what happens in Taiwan over time, other Asian nations that are struggling for freedom in the shadow of China. The fact is, China itself is controlled by an authoritarian government, interested primarily in its own survival. That is the top priority of Beijing's leadership. They have created a modern-day police state. They use mass surveillance, censorship, internet applications in order to control their own citizens. They have imprisoned over a million of their own citizens, the Muslim Uighur minorities, in concentration camps.

China's authoritarianism threatens free and open societies all around the world. A democratic Hong Kong is a direct threat to the Communist regime in Beijing because people across China, naturally, ask the question: Why do Hongkongers get to have more rights and a better life and more freedom than we have? That is the threat the government in Beijing is trying to extinguish.

We, of course, recently had the blessing of being able to celebrate our own Independence Day, when Americans reflect on our own struggle against tyranny, against an unjust government, and our successful effort to throw that off and establish this, the world's greatest, most vibrant, and freest democratic society.

In many ways, the Hongkongers are fighting for some of the very same values as our Founding Fathers did during the American Revolution. I think it is important that we in the United States not turn a blind eye to the struggle for freedom that is happening outside our borders. I think it is important that Americans continue to stand in support of the voices in Hong Kong calling for freedom, for democracy, and re-

spect for basic human rights. I will do what I can in the Senate to support the people of Hong Kong in their peaceful protests for their own freedom, and I call on my colleagues in this administration to join me.

I yield the floor.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:30 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mrs. CAPITO).

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Madam President, if I understand the procedure, are we in morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. We are postcloture on the Bress nomination.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

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

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Madam President, I rise today to oppose the nomination of Daniel Bress to the Ninth Circuit in California.

First, by history and tradition, this is a California seat on the Ninth Circuit. The fact is that Mr. Bress is neither a California attorney nor a California resident. In fact, he has not been a resident of the State for over a decade. He has lived and practiced in the Washington, DC, area for almost his entire adult life.

As California Senators, Senator HARRIS and I know that experience and connection to California are really necessary for a Ninth Circuit judge to be effective on the bench. We know our State, we know our constituents, and we know the challenges they face.

That is why the blue slip is so important. Honoring the blue slip ensures that Senators who understand and are accountable to their constituents have a say in judicial nominations for their home States.

Senator HARRIS's and my blue slips were not returned. That ultimately symbolizes our objections. I was also very disappointed that the White House ignored that and moved forward with Mr. Bress's nomination.

Senator HARRIS and I worked in good faith with the White House to find nominees acceptable to the President and to us. During our negotiations that took place, we informed the White House that we could support several other nominees who were, in fact, selected by the White House. Yet the White House and the Republican members of the Judiciary Committee have claimed we were at an impasse. That is simply not true. For reasons still unknown to us, the White House abandoned our negotiations and nominated Mr. Bress for this seat instead.

I am very disappointed that Republican leadership decided to schedule a vote on Mr. Bress's nomination, given both of our objections to his nomination and our concerns about a lack of connection to our State.

Next, I want to discuss what I mean by a lack of connection to our State.

The White House has greatly exaggerated Mr. Bress's connections to California to justify their decision to move forward with a non-California nominee.

I have studied Mr. Bress's record extensively, and I would like to run through some of what I have found.

Mr. Bress claims to spend a substantial amount of time working in his law firm's San Francisco office. However, as recently as November 2018, Mr. Bress's profile on the Kirkland & Ellis LLP website listed him as an attorney working exclusively in the firm's Washington, DC, office. His profile page likewise provided contact information—phone and fax—only for the Washington, DC, office.

Just before he was nominated, Mr. Bress's Kirkland & Ellis profile was revised to list him as an attorney in both the Washington, DC, and San Francisco, CA, offices of the firm.

In addition, according to a review conducted by my staff, every public legal filing signed by Mr. Bress lists his office as Washington, DC. This includes legal filings submitted in California courts. Mr. Bress has never had an oral argument before the Ninth Circuit—never had an oral argument before the Ninth Circuit.

The chairman of the Judiciary Committee entered a letter into the record at Mr. Bress's hearing identifying 26 cases in California courts that Mr. Bress has been involved in. However, according to Mr. Bress's Senate Judiciary questionnaire, 11 of these 26 cases were asbestos lawsuits for a single client, the chemical company BASF Catalyst. Another four cases were products liability lawsuits involving another single client, the air conditioning manufacturer United Technologies Corporation. So those are two clients. This is hardly the wide breadth of California court experience that one would expect of a Ninth Circuit court appointee.

Mr. Bress does not belong to any legal organizations in California. His children do not attend school in our State. He has voted only once since high school in a California election. And he does not have a California driver's license. Finally, Mr. Bress does not own any property in California outside of one share in a family business venture.

These facts, along with Mr. Bress's residency in the Washington, DC, area—he lives here; his family lives here—make clear to us that he is not a Californian, nor is he suited for the Ninth Circuit.

This is something we have never experienced before; that is, bringing a judge from one coast to put him on the Ninth Circuit on the other coast.

Some of my Republican colleagues have cited past instances when an attorney living and practicing in one State has been nominated and confirmed to a seat in another State. This is highly unusual.

Republicans have been able to provide examples of this occurring only 4 times in the past 20 years, and in each case, it was with the support of the home State Senators. This support is simply not here in this case; this is not the case with this nominee.

California is a diverse and complex State. We have over 40 million people. It is the fifth largest economy in the world. It makes up 14 percent of the U.S. economy. There are 53 Fortune 500 companies that are based in our State. We have the largest ag industry in the country. We produce more manufacturing revenue than any other State. And California technology companies produce 53 percent of all tech revenues in the United States.

This vast and diverse nature of California's people and economy means the Ninth Circuit regularly considers challenging and complex issues of fact and law. These cases require not only the sharpest legal minds but lawyers and judges who know and understand the complexities facing the State of California.

We have an imported judge now coming to the Ninth Circuit. One of our most critical tasks as Senators is to ensure that lifetime appointments to the Federal courts are well qualified and well suited to the seats to which they have been nominated.

Home State Senators are a crucial part of this evaluation process. The Presiding Officer knows this very well. I am so disappointed that the majority has disregarded this.

This disregard of blue slips represents another breakdown of Senate traditions. It is really very disturbing. One thing I have learned over 20 years here is that what goes around comes around. By doing this, it is a major violation of a precedent that this Senate has followed, I believe, to its absolute.

I will vote against Mr. Bress's confirmation, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Thank you very much.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

REMEMBERING JIM TARICANI

Mr. REED. Madam President, I rise today to salute a hometown hero, a dedicated journalist, and a trusted newsman, Jim Taricani, who sadly passed away last month after decades of contributions to Rhode Island and the field of journalism throughout this country.

This is just an example of the tributes that he won by a very, very enthusiastic population of Rhode Island. This is the front page of the Providence Journal on the day of his funeral service.

He was a gentleman. He was a man of integrity, a man of fairness—the quali-

ties that define a great journalist. In fact, the words "great journalist" and "Jim Taricani" are synonymous.

He leaves behind an extraordinary legacy. He was an award-winning investigative journalist who earned multiple Emmys and the coveted Edward R. Murrow Award, and he was a true champion of the First Amendment.

Jim grew up in Connecticut and served the U.S. Air Force, where he was stationed in Europe as a military police officer. But he made his mark when he moved to Rhode Island and embarked on a career in broadcast journalism, first in radio, and then over a 30-year career at WJAR that spanned from the late 1970s through 2014.

Jim began his stint for NBC 10—WJAR—as a general assignment reporter but gained notoriety for covering big stories and uncovering the truth. He went on to found the station's investigative team in 1979.

He earned a reputation for taking on tough stories about organized crime and political corruption. In reporting on these difficult topics, Jim's own integrity, selflessness, and fairness shone through every day and every moment.

Indeed, Jim didn't just talk about principles; he lived them. In February 2001, Jim obtained an FBI surveillance video from a confidential source. It showed a public employee accepting a bribe in the famed Operation Plunder Dome case, which transfixed Rhode Island and Providence, its capital, for many, many months. It marked a significant moment when people could see and hear what corruption looked like. Rather than following a court order to reveal the source of the tape, Jim stood up for the First Amendment, and he was sentenced to 6 months of home confinement.

Several of Jim's friends and colleagues wrote letters to the judge on Jim's behalf, including Christiane Amanpour, who interned for Jim in the early 1980s, when she was a student at URI.

She noted that Jim Taricani taught her "that journalism when done right is a noble profession, that America's unique commitment to freedom of the press is vital to a functioning democracy, [and] that holding public officials to account is the imperative of a corruption-free society."

Indeed, that is what Jim set out to do through his reporting.

He became a strong advocate for other journalists, testifying before Congress about freedom of the press and the challenges journalists face in trying to keep the public informed about their government. His help, his actions, and his activity spurred action. The Senate Judiciary Committee advanced Senator SCHUMER's bipartisan media shield bill. But the work to protect journalists, and to ensure that they can responsibly do their job and inform the public, continues. We must find a bipartisan way forward that balances freedom of the press and public safety.

Jim was also a tremendous advocate for the American Heart Association. A survivor of cardiovascular disease and multiple heart attacks, Jim documented his own process of undergoing a heart transplant, from uncertainty to recovery. Here is how the Providence Journal's television critic described it:

Listed—the title refers to the word from doctors that every heart transplant candidate longs to hear—is the most powerful human interest story I have ever seen on local television. It is courageous first-person journalism, a story that you may never forget.

Taricani, who kept a diary throughout his hospital stay, wanted to have his experience videotaped in order to produce a donor awareness video for the American Heart Association. It was never his intention to broadcast the account, but when the news director, Dan Salamone, suggested it would reach a broader audience if televised, Taricani agreed.

That was Jim. He was not looking to be the story but was willing to share his story if it could help others. Thoughtful, tenacious, and tough—that was Jim Taricani. By the way, 32 days after receiving his new heart, Jim was back at work, which tells you everything you need to know about how passionate he was about journalism and how much he loved his job.

Undoubtedly, the love of his life was his wife, Laurie White, who is a force in her own right and has taken up Jim's cause of freedom of the press and encouraging the next generation of aspiring young journalists to go out and make a difference. She has endowed a lecture series on First Amendment rights at the University of Rhode Island in Jim's honor, which is a fitting tribute.

She said:

Journalists bring sunlight to the stories that otherwise may stay hidden in the shadows. It is my hope that this lecture series will continue his legacy of inspiring the next generation of ethical and responsible journalists.

I expect the series will help increase public understanding of the importance of a free press and the First Amendment for decades to come.

As a journalist and as a person, nothing stopped Jim from following the facts, uncovering the truth, sharing important stories, and enlightening his audience. We are all, in Rhode Island and across the country, deeply saddened by the loss of Jim Taricani, but his example and legacy endure. That legacy will sustain us and inspire us to continue working together to build a just and decent country, and for that we are all grateful to Jim.

Madam President, I yield the floor to my distinguished colleague from Rhode Island, Senator WHITEHOUSE.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Madam President, it is a great honor to join my senior colleague, Senator REED, on the Senate floor to remember someone we both knew very well, Jim Taricani, a

legendary investigative reporter, whom not only we knew well but so many Rhode Islanders knew well.

There was a rule in Rhode Island: When Jim called, you answered. He was also tough. He was always fair. He was the founder of WJAR's I-Team, a storied investigative unit for the NBC affiliate in Rhode Island.

Jim started working as a reporter in the 1970s, when the New England mafia was still active on the streets of Providence. He became known for segments exposing organized crime and for sniffing out public corruption, and, at times, a bit of a combination of both. Jim's news sense and his doggedness were legendary.

Jim was a Rhode Island icon. In a small State, with more than its share of stories to tell and plenty of larger-than-life characters, investigative journalists have always had a particular prominence. For more than three decades, Jim was among the best of them all.

He was brave. When a Federal judge ordered Jim to divulge who had provided him with a tape of a bribe being accepted at Providence City Hall, he opted for a prison sentence rather than give up his source. The courage of Jim Taricani made national headlines. He ended up serving 4 months of home confinement and testified before Congress in 2007 in support of a Federal shield law to protect the freedom of the press.

Rhode Islanders felt a personal connection to Jim for another reason. Jim needed a new heart in the 1990s. After having suffered two heart attacks in his thirties, he shared this health saga on the air, allowing WJAR cameras to follow along as he underwent a heart transplant and navigated his recovery.

From living rooms and kitchen tables across Rhode Island, Rhode Islanders rooted for Jim. As his health improved, he ultimately returned to the newsroom. The transplant would give him 23 more years, which he called his bonus.

Jim passed away last month at the age of 69. With the free press under more strain than almost any other point in our Nation's history, Jim's funeral became a really important moment. The photo Senator REED just showed on the front page of the Providence Journal the next day was a sight to behold. More than 50 journalists showed up to serve as Jim Taricani's honor guard. The honor guard had dozens of reporters from across Rhode Island—not just from WJAR but from all of its competitors too. Journalists came from other parts of the country who had crossed paths with Jim at channel 10 during time they spent in Rhode Island. They had come back to see off a friend, a hero, and a staunch defender of the First Amendment.

I join Senator REED today in thinking of Jim's beloved wife, Laurie White, and the many friends of theirs who mourn Jim's passing. He will be missed.

I yield the floor.

Mr. REED. Madam President, 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. YOUNG. 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.

(The remarks of Mr. YOUNG pertaining to the introduction of S. 2063 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. YOUNG. 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. MURPHY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

Mr. MURPHY. Madam President, I am going to be joined on the floor over the next 45 minutes or so by a number of my colleagues to talk about an exceptional court case that is being heard today in New Orleans, LA.

This is a court case the Trump administration, along with a number of Republican attorneys general, has brought to obliterate the Affordable Care Act, all of it, overnight. The case, if successful, would result in a humanitarian catastrophe in this country.

Why do I say that? Because the plaintiffs in the case, backed by the Trump administration, are arguing that the court should throw out the entire Affordable Care Act, with nothing to replace it, despite the fact that for almost a decade now, I have listened to this President and my Republican colleagues in the Congress object to the Affordable Care Act on the premise that they will have something better to replace it with—in President Trump's words, a replacement that will insure more people, at lower cost, with all the protections the Affordable Care Act has. That plan has not materialized yet because it doesn't exist. It has never existed. It will never exist.

The choice today is between the Affordable Care Act, which insures over 20 million Americans, which guarantees that people with preexisting conditions cannot be discriminated against, and nothing—no protections, no expansion of Medicaid, no subsidies—for individuals to buy private insurance.

Right now, with the support of Republicans in Congress, the Trump administration today is making the argument that the entire Affordable Care Act should be struck down, with nothing—nothing at all—to replace it.

This is my friend John from Middletown, CT. I had breakfast with John last week. That is a picture of John in

his younger years. John was 12 years old when he started to have flulike symptoms but was diagnosed—coincidentally, on the day of the tragedy in Sandy Hook, CT—with a rare form of soft-tissue cancer in the back of his throat.

The treatment process for John was, in his words, horrendous, bringing him to as little as 70 pounds for a period of time, rendering him unable to speak, eat, or drink. He was out of school and in and out of the hospital for almost 2 years.

Six years later, he can only open his jaw a small fraction of the normal range of motion; he can only chew foods out of one side of his mouth; and he has very limited healing ability for any jaw injury.

These issues will never go away for John. He has become an advocate for the Affordable Care Act because he knows—he knows that if the Trump administration's lawsuit is successful, his life as he knows it is over because, once again, insurance companies would deny him treatment. No insurance company would provide John Carlson with insurance, knowing his history of cancer, if they were allowed to make decisions for themselves on who gets coverage and who doesn't. The only reason John gets coverage is that we have said, through the Affordable Care Act, we are not going to hold you responsible for your childhood cancer. We are going to make sure you get insurance no matter what.

These are the stakes right now. These are the stakes for millions of Americans like John whose lives will be upended if this heartless, thoughtless, cruel lawsuit proceeds. We should be talking about how to make the healthcare system better. We should be talking about ways to lower costs. We shouldn't be talking about going backward with no safety net.

What if this lawsuit is successful? I haven't heard a single Republican in the Senate talk about what they would do. I haven't heard the President talk about what his plan is if his lawsuit is successful.

What happens to John? What are you going to do to make sure he still gets the treatment he needs? The answer is, you don't know. The answer is, you are jumping without a net, and you are playing with the lives of millions of Americans.

John is a remarkable young man also because his eyes were opened when he was in the hospital. I want to read you his words. He said this to me a couple of weeks ago, and I asked him to write it down because it is really remarkable the capacity of young people to see beyond their own suffering. He said:

I wanted to take this opportunity today to tell one more story about an experience I had in the hospital during my cancer treatment. This is a story about a young boy who received cancer treatment the same time as me. During my daily physical therapy walks around the childhood cancer floor, I started to notice a pattern. There was always one room—directly across from the nurses station—with the same patient inside. A small

boy, no older than three years old. I can remember asking my parents and nurses, "Why are that baby's parents not with him?" I felt so angry that such a tiny child was left alone and forgotten in a hospital room while going through cancer treatment. I remember seeing the tiny chemotherapy port embedded in his head through the glass door.

"Why would they abandon him like that?" I asked the nurse walking with me that day. She explained to me that he had not been abandoned at all, he was not forgotten nor neglected. She explained that he was left alone due to pure necessity and desperation.

This is John talking. He said:

I learned that both of his parents were working day and night to be able to afford his cancer treatment. Nobody deserves to go through this alone, especially not a three-year-old infant. I shared my story so that his story will not continue to take place in America. I shared my story so that patients fighting for their life will no longer be taken advantage of by the hospitals and insurance companies.

What a miracle that this young man, going through his own cancer treatments, would think of a 3-year-old child who has no parents there with him because his parents are working multiple jobs in order to afford the cancer treatments for their son.

Before the Affordable Care Act went into effect, 750,000 people in this country went into bankruptcy because of medical costs. That does not happen any longer. It doesn't mean our healthcare system is perfect. It doesn't mean it doesn't need more improvement, but why would we want to go back to the day in which a family lost everything simply because their 3-year-old son got cancer? Why would we take this chance with these people's lives?

I, once again, come to the floor to beg my colleagues to stand with us, to stand with us and oppose this lawsuit—this careless, thoughtless lawsuit. At the very least, if you support it, then come to the floor with a real plan for how you are going to take care of John and the millions of Americans who rely on the Affordable Care Act for coverage.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Madam President, I am very pleased to follow my colleague from Connecticut and to continue his thoughts about the utter chaos and catastrophe that would be caused by the success of this lawsuit now before the court of appeals—chaos and catastrophe that would, in effect, turn back the clock to days that I remember well because I was attorney general when preexisting conditions were used as a ruse to deny lifesaving medical care and coverage to people with cancer, brain tumors, and literally lethal diseases.

In those days, as attorney general, I took their fight and made it my own, even sometimes calling presidents of insurance companies over weekends to go to bat for those individuals.

Those bad old days—the days of no protection against preexisting conditions—are over now, but they will

come back if this lawsuit is successful. If this lawsuit wins, young people who are now covered by their parents' policies up to the age of 26 will be without it. If this lawsuit wins, the annual and lifetime caps on benefits will come back. If this lawsuit is successful, preexisting conditions again will come back to haunt people who need and deserve coverage. If this lawsuit wins, millions of people—tens of thousands in Connecticut—will be at risk.

One of them is a young man, Conner Curran, an 8-year-old boy in Ridgefield. His picture is right here. I met Conner 3 years ago when he was 5, and his parents noticed he was lagging behind his twin brother. They brought him to a doctor, expecting maybe a simple diagnosis. Instead, they were told that Conner had Duchenne muscular dystrophy. That is a degenerative, terminal disease. It has no cure. It is life-threatening. In fact, most people with the disease don't survive past their midtwenties.

Conner's family wrote to me, telling me that their beautiful, young, sweet child, at the time just 5½ and full of life, would slowly lose his ability to run, to walk, to lift his arms. Eventually, they said, he would lose his ability to hug them.

Conner needs care—complex care—from multiple specialists, costing tens of thousands of dollars per year. Thanks to the Affordable Care Act, there is no denying him coverage. There is no denying him coverage because of his illness, and he will receive the care he needs.

His family also wrote to me that the reinstatement of lifetime caps or elimination of essential health benefits will hinder his family's ability to access the care Conner needs. In fact, if this lawsuit wins, there will be virtually insuperable obstacles to Conner receiving that vital lifesaving care. If this disease progresses, as seems very possible, he will need access to Medicaid in offsetting costs of living with that disability.

For his family, the question is, Will Medicaid even be there? If that devastating day comes, will he receive the care he needs?

Conner's family shared their concern over what would happen if the repeated and reckless attempts to undermine healthcare succeed and if repeal of the ACA becomes a reality. He and his family are not giving up. They have come to my office since he was diagnosed to fight for a cure and for the Affordable Care Act. They have demonstrated strength and courage, sometimes with tears in their eyes. They raise awareness and fight for their son. I know they would do it a million times over if it meant Conner could have a long and healthy life.

Connor and millions like him are the reasons I am here to fight back against any attempts to repeal the Affordable Care Act. Whether it is in Congress or in the courts, make no mistake, this effort in the courts is another means of

repealing the ACA. The people of Connecticut get it. They understand the agenda here. They want all of us—and I think most of our constituents do as well—to make sure this kind of care is there for Connor and for all of us because all of us will be at risk if the ACA is repealed, whether it is in Congress or the courts.

In Connecticut, there are 1.5 million people living with preexisting conditions. That includes 182,000 children like Connor. If this Republican-backed lawsuit against the Affordable Care Act succeeds, their protections will be eviscerated; they will be lost, not just for a year or two but likely for their lifetime.

The Affordable Care Act ban on lifetime coverage caps is so important to kids like Connor. If the Republican-backed lawsuit against the ACA is successful, he will be one of the more than 1.2 million people in Connecticut who would meet a lifetime coverage limit and be forced to worry about how and if they can pay for their necessary medical care.

In Connecticut, about 25,000 young people get their healthcare coverage under their parents' plans, thanks to the Affordable Care Act's requirement that children can be covered until the age of 26. If the Republican-backed lawsuit against the ACA succeeds, these young adults will be left without coverage.

In Connecticut, over a quarter of a million people have healthcare coverage because of the ACA's Medicaid expansion. Another 110,000 have coverage through the Connecticut ACA exchange. If the Republican-backed lawsuit against the Affordable Care Act succeeds, their healthcare coverage will be gone.

If the Republican-backed lawsuit succeeds, the uninsured rate of Black Connecticut residents would likely double. One in five Latinos under 65 will go uninsured.

All of these people, like Connor, represent our Nation—the best of our Nation—with their dedication to the people they love, and they deserve to be heard. Their voices need to be heard here. They are the true faces of the Affordable Care Act. Every one of them, like Connor, is a life that will be enhanced by continuing the Affordable Care Act. If this Republican-backed lawsuit succeeds, their lives will be at risk, and we will be a lesser nation.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. MANCHIN. Madam President, I come before this body, I come before all of those in America to explain a little bit of what we had before the Affordable Care Act and where we are today.

I wasn't here in 2009 when they passed the Affordable Care Act. I was the Governor of the State of West Virginia, my beautiful State. I can tell you about the type of healthcare in a rural State—a rural, hard-working

State—where people have worked hard all their lives. They have been challenged, but they really have given so much to this great country. Most of them did not have insurance. A lot of people across America had some really good insurance, but a lot of working people—hard-working people or people of less means, poor people—did not have access.

Let me tell you what they used. They used the emergency room—the highest cost of entry with no preventive care, nothing at all to maintain health or wellness—but they would go there in an emergency. That is what most people who didn't have any insurance used.

Let me tell you about the people who basically were working and could not afford the copays where they worked or weren't afforded insurance at places where they worked. If they were ill or if they got hurt at home, working, they would go into work on Monday and make a worker's comp claim, again, at a very high cost to all of the States.

At the end of the year, and I think this is in most States, they would come to you—every hospital, every rural clinic would come to their Governor and their legislature; we would call them DSH payments, disproportionate share—and say: Governor Manchin, if you don't help me with \$10 million or \$12 million—I have given away \$20 million in charity care—we are going to have to close.

We had to scramble around, using taxpayer dollars to keep every rural clinic and hospital open for the people. People forget about all of that.

For those who had wonderful access to insurance or were offered insurance, that was wonderful. We want to make sure they still have that opportunity.

Guess what. We have a way to fix this. There have been two bills sitting on Senator McCONNELL's desk for almost 3 years that would reduce the cost—what we know is wrong with the bill—the Affordable Care Act.

Let me tell you what is right with the Affordable Care Act. I wasn't here in 2009. I would like to have seen changes, but now that I am here, I know what I had before, which wasn't working, and I know what we have now can be a lot better.

In a bipartisan way we have tried to fix this. We have tried to find ways to make sure that people who had good insurance are not going to be exorbitantly charged out of the market or priced out of the market. We are doing everything we possibly can.

I am asking everybody, please, for the sake of humanity, if a person for the first time has ever gotten insurance—and I have told people this. We gave people the greatest wealth card you could ever get, which is a health card, but we didn't give them one shred of evidence as far as information about how to use it—the instructions.

I compare it to this: If you bought a box of Cracker Jacks, you would get the prize inside, and they would show

you how to use that little prize. We never took the time, but now they want to throw it out. Let's make an effort to basically teach people how to live a healthier lifestyle, how to use preventive care, how to have a more productive and a healthier life. We haven't done any of that.

For the first time, we know, scientifically, if a person is addicted to drugs—if they are addicted—it is basically a health problem. It is an illness. An illness needs treatment. For the first time, in a State that has been inundated with opioid addiction and drug addiction, people are able to get treatment, get back into a productive lifestyle and get their lives cleaned up. For the first time they want to take that away. Out of 1.8 million people who live in my State, there are 800,000 West Virginians who have some form of preexisting condition because they have worked in the mines and the factories. They were hard workers. Those people, if you have ever talked to them, if you have ever talked to rural Americans in any State, you can ask: How are you doing?

I am OK. I am OK.

How is your health?

Well, I don't want to be a burden to my family.

Let me tell you what they are telling you when they say "I don't want to be a burden to my family." They are saying: I can't afford insurance. I don't have insurance. I am not going to break my family and put them in bankruptcy to try to keep me alive. So whatever the good Lord has planned for me, I will accept.

That is not who we are as Americans. It is just not who we are. This is what we are trying to change.

We have 20 attorneys general, Republican attorneys general. These are people I know. I don't think they are mean-spirited, but to be this insensitive to the real world and what is going to happen—every hospital, every clinic, every provider is going to be in jeopardy of not having a job or being able to provide the services people need. This thing will come unraveled—unraveled.

We are fighting and hoping and praying that this is not upheld in the court system. How it has gotten this far I do not know. I can tell you, reasonable people would not make this type of decision.

When you look at what is going on—let me tell you, in a bipartisan way, my Republican colleagues have admitted that millions of Americans will lose their health insurance if the Republican attorneys general succeed. They have admitted this. It is bipartisan because we all have the same challenges. Senator TILLIS from North Carolina and nine other Republicans stated that oral arguments in *Texas v. United States* will begin September 5, and if a judge rules in favor of the plaintiffs, protections for patients with preexisting conditions could be eliminated. We know that.

My good friend Senator MURKOWSKI from Alaska said, in her own words, that this lawsuit will take away healthcare coverage from people with preexisting conditions. Senator MURKOWSKI said: "With the uncertainty of the outcome in the upcoming *Texas v. United States* case, this legislation is needed now more than ever to give Alaskans, and all Americans, the certainty they need that protections for those with pre-existing conditions will remain intact."

My Republican colleagues know that if these attorneys general win, it will devastate households, our economy, and millions and millions of Americans' health. That is why I have been working with them to fix the problems of the Affordable Care Act. I introduced the Premium Reduction Act with my Republican colleague and dear friend Senator SUSAN COLLINS from Maine. It would reduce the cost of health insurance in the individual market by supporting and expanding State-based health insurance.

We owe it to every West Virginian with a preexisting condition to fix our healthcare system.

I would like to introduce you to Aiden Jackson Williams. This is Aiden Jackson Williams right here. Aiden is a 6-year-old cancer survivor from West Virginia. At 9 months old, he was diagnosed with an optic glioma and underwent chemotherapy for 16 months. At 2 years old, he was in remission. Aiden continues to get MRIs every 3 to 6 months, and there is a high chance of recurrence of other tumors in his body due to his condition.

With that said, Aiden doesn't let it bother him. His parents are proud to say that today Aiden is doing great. He and his twin sister Reagan both enjoy sports, and he moves around just as well as anybody. To this day, Aiden is their hero and inspiration.

Kids like Aiden have fought and beat cancer. They shouldn't also have to fight to keep their health insurance.

What we are saying is that if the ACA goes away, Aiden will not have the certainty to be able to have health insurance, to have the MRIs to detect early enough to save his life. That is what we are talking about.

This is life and death. This is life and death. This is not just a matter of the ideological differences that we have. We are going to fight and fight hard, and that is why I am here—for Aiden and all West Virginians with preexisting conditions. They are trusting us to do the right thing, along with my colleagues, the Republicans, in a bipartisan way, to fix what, basically, we have to know and what we do know that can be fixed with the bill before us, the Affordable Care Act, but not throw the baby out with the bath water.

I hope that each one of my colleagues will take this seriously and that they will work with us in a bipartisan way to fix the healthcare for Americans that is so needed.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, today President Trump and Republican attorneys general are explaining in court why they think people who got their healthcare through the exchanges or Medicaid expansion should have it ripped away. They are explaining why limits on patients' out-of-pocket costs should go away while limits on their annual and lifetime benefits should come back and why protections for people with preexisting conditions should be struck down.

In other words, Republicans are, once again, fighting to take us back to the bad old days to give big insurance companies all the power, to leave millions of people without any hope of getting the quality affordable care they need and to leave patients and families with fewer protections and higher bills—patients like Lily from Gig Harbor, WA, in my home State.

Lily is a rising high school sophomore. She is a rising soccer star, and she is a patient living with cystic fibrosis. To stay healthy and stay on the field, Lily needs to take several prescriptions a day. She needs to keep expensive medical devices on hand and visit specialists every other month, not to mention the hospital a couple of times a year. Even on a good month, her healthcare can cost thousands of dollars.

For families like hers, the stakes could not be higher. If Republicans win their blatantly partisan lawsuit, insurance companies could kick patients like Lily off their parents' insurance before they turn 26, meaning that instead of worrying whether Lily will continue her soccer career at Gonzaga or UW or somewhere else, her family could spend her senior year worrying how to make sure she can get the healthcare she needs.

If Republicans win, insurance companies could also avoid covering essential health benefits patients need—things like prescription drugs or emergency care. They could remove limits on how much patients have to pay out of pocket and put limits on patients' annual and lifetime benefits, which is particularly challenging for patients, like Lily, who need expensive drugs to treat chronic preexisting conditions.

If Republicans win, insurance companies could discriminate against patients who have preexisting conditions, like cystic fibrosis, by charging them more, excluding benefits, or even denying them coverage completely.

Let's be clear. Lily is just 1 of 30,000 patients in our country with cystic fibrosis and 1 of over 100 million patients in our country living with a preexisting condition.

Like the woman who wrote to me about her severe arthritis, which could be debilitating without treatment, or her husband whose high blood pressure could be deadly without medication, or the mom who wrote to me about her

son's rare form of epilepsy and how, without insurance, the medical costs would crush her family. For these families and so many other patients living with a preexisting condition, the lawsuit Republicans are bringing today is a matter of life and death.

People are watching closely, and they are not going to forget who kept their word to fight for their healthcare, to fight for protections for people with preexisting conditions, and who on the other side blatantly broke that promise by championing a partisan lawsuit that would throw the healthcare of millions of people out the window.

Democrats are not going to stop fighting for families like Lily's; we are not going to stop holding President Trump accountable for his ongoing healthcare sabotage; and we are not going to stop pushing for commonsense steps that help women and families get quality, affordable healthcare or pushing Republicans to work with us to get the train back on the track and stop pulling up the rails.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, I both concur and applaud the senior Senator from Washington State for her comments. We saw Senator MANCHIN here. I know Senator KAINE was here. Senator MURPHY was here. Senator BLUMENTHAL was here. I know there are probably a dozen others, all of whom know people and have talked to people, who get out and, as Lincoln said, listen to people and get their public opinion baths.

They meet people like Susan Halpern from Columbus, whom I will talk about in a few minutes. They talk to them. They meet. They see that what we do here actually matters to people's lives.

They can play games with the Affordable Care Act. They have been doing that for a decade now, literally almost a decade, putting people's healthcare at risk, scaring people, and alarming people, trying to take their healthcare away. These are real people, as these pictures show and as these stories show.

Let me back up for a minute. A Federal judge is hearing arguments in a case that would literally yank health coverage away from millions of Americans.

I know what that means in my State. There are 900,000 people in Ohio who have insurance today because of the Affordable Care Act. There are 100,000 Ohio seniors who have gotten major savings on their prescription drugs through the Affordable Care Act. One million Ohio seniors have had osteoporosis screenings, diabetes screenings, physicals with no copay and no deductible, and preventive care so they don't get sick, saving the healthcare system money, saving taxpayers' dollars, and making their lives better. Yet my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, all of whom have good insurance paid for by taxpayers, want to take it away from them.

Almost any day you could look down the hall—you can open this door and walk down the hall, look down the hall, and you will see the healthcare lobbyists, the drug company lobbyists, the tobacco lobbyists, and the gun lobbyists. You will see one after another going to the Republican leader's office, Senator MCCONNELL. Every one of those lobbyists causes us to spend more dollars on health insurance. The health insurance lobby, the gun lobby, the tobacco lobby, the alcohol lobby, the spirits lobby coming out of Kentucky—all of them cost taxpayers more because it means people's health gets worse because they don't stand up to these interest groups.

We know what is happening in Texas. A partisan judge, an absolutely partisan hack of a judge, ruled in December to strike down the Ohio healthcare law. I know Justice Roberts said we don't talk about Obama judges or Bush judges or Clinton judges or Trump judges. Yes, that is what they say, and that is what Supreme Court Chief Justice Roberts says, but we know what has happened here. We know how Senator MCCONNELL is looking for the most extreme and young judges possible to put on the court to go after labor rights, to go after voting rights, to go after healthcare, costing our citizens their health and costing citizens billions of dollars.

We know the President wants to get rid of the entire Affordable Care Act. If President Trump gets his way, if the court decides to wipe it off the books, to take away the entire healthcare law, here is what happens: tax credits to help you afford your health insurance—gone; protections for preexisting conditions—gone.

Right now, 5 million Ohioans have a preexisting condition. Most of the rest of us will have a preexisting condition at some time in our lives. It is called aging, when people are more likely to develop illnesses and get sick.

So consumer protections built in by Obama, built in by the Affordable Care Act so insurance companies can't deny you coverage, and they can't say: "Sorry, we are not going to insure you" or "You already have insurance"—and they will take the insurance away if you just happen to get too sick and you cost the private insurance companies too much money—gone. Republicans in this body and President Trump want to take those protections away.

The ability to stay on your parents' health insurance until you are 26—gone. We know what that has meant to so many families. If my colleagues would leave this building, leave their foreign travel, leave their nice homes that most of us have in our States and get out and listen to people, they will hear people say: Well, this is really important to my 26-year-old sister or my 26-year-old daughter or my 24-year-old son.

Ohio's entire Medicaid expansion that Republican Governor Kasich did—

gone. Limits on how much you pay out-of-pocket each year—gone. Many more affordable prescription drugs for seniors through closing the doughnut hole under the Affordable Care Act, if they get their way—gone.

Free preventive services, like mammograms and bone density screenings for Medicare beneficiaries—millions of them in my State and tens of millions of them in the country—gone. The list goes on.

There are 5 million Ohioans under 65 who have preexisting conditions. That is half the population of our State.

I am not being an alarmist. We know this is what so many of you who were in the House earlier voted on time and again to try to repeal the Affordable Care Act. You had no replacement. You said you did, but there was no replacement for the Affordable Care Act. It was the repeal of the Affordable Care Act, taking away all of these benefits that tens and tens of million Americans benefit from.

These Ohioans have been able to rest a little easier knowing they can't be turned down for healthcare coverage or have their rates skyrocket because a child has asthma, because a husband has diabetes, or because a wife was diagnosed with breast cancer, but this case intentionally puts all of that at risk.

President Trump has thrown the whole power and all of the attorneys—the battery of lawyers—in the Justice Department into this case to try to take the away the Affordable Care Act. That is what he promised in his campaign; that is what all these Republican Members of the Senate promised; and that is what all the Republican Members of the House promised. Do you know what? A lot of them lost last year because they want to take their insurance away. They are not doing it through Congress because that might be politically risky. They don't want to do that. They are trying to do it through the court system and then blame who knows what for this.

In Columbus, I met Susan Halpern. Ms. Halpern is a cancer survivor. She is pictured here. She told me this:

As a breast cancer survivor and self-employed small business owner in Ohio—

Creating jobs—

I depend on the ACA for my healthcare. I am aware that without the ACA, I would not be able to purchase health insurance for any price. Even though my cancer has been in complete remission for 12 years, I would still be uninsurable.

These stories from Michigan that Senator STABENOW tells, from Washington State that Senator MURRAY just told, that Senator KAINE told, that Senator MURPHY has told, and that Senator BLUMENTHAL has told go on and on. These are all cases where people have insurance, and a bunch of people in this body—all of whom get insurance paid for by taxpayers—are trying to take it away from them. All of these benefits are gone, thanks to the lobbyists lining up in Senator MCCONNELL's

office from the gun lobby, the tobacco lobby, the insurance lobby, the spirits lobby, and all the rest.

Last week, in Cleveland, I met Maya Brown-Zimmerman, who pointed out to me that I had met her many years before when she was a student in high school. She went to high school with my daughter. I met her at a school event once. She has a rare genetic disorder that one of her four children also inherited. Here is what she said:

I cried the day the ACA was passed because it meant a safety net for my family. No lifetime caps on medical coverage, and the guarantee of being able to get health insurance even if something were to happen to my husband's job.

She went on:

Whether or not my family loses these protections literally keeps me awake at night.

Think about that. Think about the selfishness of my Republican colleagues, of President Trump, and of the people in this administration—all the Justice Department lawyers and all these judges. Think about their selfishness. They have a political agenda, and they are keeping Ms. Brown-Zimmerman awake at night because she worries about her insurance. Think about the selfishness. Think about the morality of that.

She said:

I want our elected officials to remember we can't predict when we will need to access the healthcare system and so access to healthcare is an issue that is going to affect us all.

There are not too many people who are not able to sleep in this body. There were not too many people who were not able to sleep in the House as they were all voting to repeal the Affordable Care Act. That doesn't seem to cross their mind, but it crosses the minds of millions of people in Detroit, in Ann Harbor, in Cleveland, and in Mansfield.

Today, tomorrow, and the day after, 14 Ohioans will die of an overdose. Medicaid is the No. 1 tool we have to get people into treatment. Ohio is in the throes of an addiction crisis, like much of the rest of the country but only worse in many cases. We know Medicaid expansion has been a lifeline to so many Ohioans.

Sometime ago, I was at Albert House in Cincinnati, one of the best addiction treatment centers in the country. I sat with a man and his daughter. He put his hand gently on his daughter's arm. He looked at me, and he said: "Senator, my daughter would be dead if it were not for Medicaid." He said: "My daughter would be dead if it were not for Medicaid."

Yet Federal judges—Trump-appointed judges and Bush-appointed judges—and Republican Senators, all of whom get health insurance from the Federal Government, from taxpayers, are apparently willing to have that on their conscience. They are willing to work to repeal the Affordable Care Act with no real replacement. That matters in the life of Ms. Halpern. That

matters in the life of Ms. Brown-Zimmerman, whom I just talked about. That matters in the life of the gentleman in Cincinnati who talked to me about his daughter.

The President wants to make it harder for Ohioans to get that care. I don't know how Members of this Congress and this President—all with good insurance that is paid for by taxpayers—can support dismantling this lifeline that so many Americans rely on.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Madam President, I first want to thank my friend and colleague from Ohio for his passion and for caring so deeply, as we all do in our caucus, fighting for people's healthcare.

It seems every week I am down on the floor saying exactly the same thing: Healthcare is personal; it is not political. Healthcare is personal to every single person in Michigan; it is not political.

Whether a senior is able to afford the medication she needs to treat her chronic condition, that is personal. Whether a single dad is able to take his children to a trusted doctor when they get sick or hurt and keep them on his policy until age 26, that is personal. Whether a woman is charged more for the health insurance coverage she needs to detect cancer early enough so it can be cured, that is personal.

Unfortunately, the law that helps seniors afford their prescriptions, ensures children can remain on their parents' insurance until age 26, requires health insurance policies to charge women the same as a man and to cover lifesaving, preventive care, that law is currently in the intensive care unit on life support.

As we know, since 2010, Senate and House Republicans have voted to repeal or undermine the Affordable Care Act more than 100 different times—100 different times. That didn't sit right with families across Michigan and across the country. They stood up with us, they fought back with us, and together we won.

What Republicans couldn't do in Congress, they are trying to do through the courts. Today, literally, the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals begins hearing arguments in a case brought by 18 different Republican attorneys general and Governors.

In short, these 18 Republican attorneys general and Governors, backed by the Trump administration and President Trump, are trying to take away your healthcare. If they win, healthcare reform could be completely overturned and healthcare taken away. That would take everything away, including Medicaid expansion, which we call Healthy Michigan. In Michigan, we have about 700,000 people getting healthcare now who don't have to pick between working a minimum wage job and getting healthcare. They can do both. Children staying on their parents' insurance plans until age 26—

gone. More affordable drugs for seniors—gone. Protections for people with preexisting conditions—gone.

In other words, it would put insurance companies back in charge of your healthcare, and we all remember what that was like.

Women could once again be charged more for coverage and have to get a rider if they want to get maternity care coverage and prenatal care coverage. Remember when being a woman was considered a preexisting condition? I do. Members of my family do.

Families could once again face yearly or lifetime caps on care when they need it the most, when you think about it.

If the Affordable Care Act is repealed through the courts, the insurance companies would once again be able to say to your doctor: You know, I don't think she really needs 10 cancer treatments or 12 cancer treatments, so we will pay for 5. If addiction treatment or mental health treatment is needed, they could say: I don't think you really need to have more than two sessions if you are an addict. Come on. Today, the doctor decides, with you, what you need in terms of number of treatments, and that is the way it should be.

As I mentioned, nearly 700,000 people in my State are getting healthcare through Healthy Michigan or Medicaid expansion, and they could lose that. In fact, they will lose that.

Our uninsured rate has fallen from 12 percent before the Affordable Care Act to 5 percent. So 12 percent of people were not insured at all, and now it is 5 percent. I would call that a success. Is there more that should be done? Yes. But that is positive, not negative.

The number of people without insurance who have been treated has fallen by 50 percent in Michigan—50 percent. And that is great for all of us. It is certainly great for hospitals that were treating people without insurance before. Someone walks into the emergency room and gets care in the most expensive way, and they don't have insurance. What happens? Everybody else's insurance rates go up. That is what happened. When people were able to get their own insurance coverage, insurance rates went down. In fact, we had over \$400 million in Michigan that was put into the State government as a savings as a result of not paying for people going to the emergency room without insurance.

A record 97 percent of Michigan children can see a doctor now when they get sick—97 percent. I would argue that is a great success, not something to be taken away or something to play politics with.

Michigan seniors are saving money on their prescription drugs through the Medicare Part D Program—something called the doughnut hole, the gap in coverage that we closed.

More than half of our families in Michigan, which includes people with preexisting conditions, are now able to get coverage. The insurance companies

can't say no, and they can't say: When you get sick, you are going to be dropped. They can't deny you from getting the coverage you need if you have a preexisting condition.

One of those people in Michigan is Heidi, who lives in Cedar Springs. She wrote to me in May. I thank Heidi for doing that. Heidi had bought health insurance for years and almost never needed it because she was healthy. In fact, she only used it, she said, when she gave birth to her daughter. That all changed in 2004 when Heidi was diagnosed with breast cancer at the age of 45. She has since had multiple tests, multiple surgeries, and multiple rounds of chemotherapy, all at least partially covered by insurance.

Heidi wrote this:

My fear every day is that I won't have insurance if these changes are made. There is no way any company would insure me. My husband has a life insurance policy that he bought before we were married. . . . We asked about me. The salesman nicely said that I am not insurable. So my plan B is, if I lose my health insurance, I will take that money and save it for my funeral (since I can't even get a life insurance policy for enough for a funeral).

Heidi added this:

I am lucky that I thought insurance was a good thing, and, therefore, paid for it for years through my job.

Heidi depends on protections for people with preexisting conditions. Heidi didn't ask to get breast cancer. It could happen to any of us. Any day, something could happen to any of us or someone in our family. And if you have or will have what is called a preexisting condition, your health insurance will be taken away if this court case, supported by President Trump, his administration, and Republicans, succeeds.

A couple of months ago, I spoke at the Detroit Race for the Cure, which raises money for breast cancer research. It is a wonderful event. We had a beautiful, sunny day. As I stood on the stage and looked out over a crowd of over 10,000 people, mostly women and many wearing pink, I saw women living with preexisting conditions. I saw people like Heidi.

One woman who was standing on the stage near me asked me a question that I will never forget: "Why is it that I have to worry about whether or not I will be able to get insurance in the future? Why?" She added: "Why don't President Trump and other Republicans understand that this is my life? This is my life." It is a very good question. It deserves an answer.

Why don't Republicans in Congress, why don't those 18 attorneys general and Governors, and why doesn't President Trump believe that people like Heidi deserve to have healthcare coverage? Why don't they believe that seniors deserve access to more affordable prescription drugs? Why don't they believe that women should pay the same for their health insurance as men? Why don't they believe that young people should be able to stay on their parents'

insurance until age 26? And why don't they believe that families, not insurance companies, should make healthcare decisions? Families, with their doctors, should be making health decisions, medical decisions, not an insurance company. If this lawsuit succeeds, we are going to go right back to putting your medical decisions in the hands of the insurance companies.

Healthcare isn't political; it is personal. It is time to stop playing politics with people's health. For each of us, it is our life.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to speak for 5 minutes, followed by Senator CORTEZ MASTO for 5 minutes, prior to the series of votes we will have.

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

Mr. WYDEN. Madam President and colleagues, at Fourth of July picnics and parades, it is likely that complicated healthcare policy debates are not exactly a central topic of conversation. I am pretty sure that is the way the Trump administration wanted it to be.

Today, lawyers representing the Trump administration and a number of Republican Governors are attempting to have the Affordable Care Act ripped up and thrown out by a Federal court. They were unable to do that in the Congress, so now they have headed off to try to get it done in the courts. The case is happening in the Fifth Circuit in Louisiana. This is not some theoretical exercise; this is an immediate threat to the healthcare of millions and millions of Americans.

I want to be clear at the outset of these remarks what the bottom line is. The bottom line is that eliminating protections for preexisting conditions is now the official position of the Republican Party. That is the centerpiece of what this court case attacks—the ironclad, airtight guarantee at the heart of the Affordable Care Act that insurance companies cannot discriminate against those with a preexisting condition. The fact is, the Republican Party wants that eliminated.

This attack on Americans' healthcare goes way beyond preexisting conditions. What about prescription drug costs? Prescription drugs are outrageously expensive right now, and the problem is getting worse under the Trump administration. Prices are up more than 10 percent just in the past 6 months. Americans are forced to make life-threatening choices where they really have to balance their food bill against their medicine bill and medicine against other necessities, like shelter. In effect, Americans self-ration because their prescriptions just cost too much.

If this lawsuit succeeds, prescription drug costs are going to skyrocket even higher. If the Affordable Care Act is

thrown out, that will be the end of the requirement that health insurance companies have to cover prescription drugs. Patients will be forced into junk insurance plans that don't cover the care they actually need. Millions of people of limited means would be kicked off their Medicaid coverage. Millions of seniors would face higher drug costs.

The bottom line: If this case is successful, it will launch a forced march back to the days of yesteryear when healthcare was for the healthy and the wealthy. The reason I say that is that is the way it used to be. If you had a preexisting condition in the past, you were just out of luck unless you had an enormous amount of money. The only people who really could benefit were people who were healthy and people who were wealthy. The Affordable Care Act changed that. More than 100 million people got a lifeline protection against discrimination if they had a preexisting condition.

If the lawsuit succeeds, the biggest winners are going to be the largest of the insurance companies and the drug manufacturers. They would get the power they need to once again walk all over the American people.

Here is the kicker: There is no replacement plan if the Affordable Care Act is wiped out. The President keeps saying he has a big, beautiful healthcare plan, and we always get the sense—it reminds you of the movie house in the old days where it would say: Coming soon. Movie coming soon. But it never actually gets there. There is never a grand unveiling, and that is because there isn't a backup plan. This is just an ideological crusade to make winners out of the most powerful corporations and losers out of millions of working Americans.

Democrats in this Chamber have proposals ready to go to take a better path, a better approach, and to protect the healthcare of our people, blocking Trump's lawyers from using taxpayer dollars to destroy the Affordable Care Act, banning junk insurance, which isn't worth much more than the paper it is written on, and standing four-square behind protecting people with a preexisting condition.

That is what the Senate ought to be working on so the Trump administration can't bring on a healthcare nightmare for millions and millions of Americans.

One of our most valuable members of the Senate Finance Committee has joined us now, Senator CORTEZ MASTO, and I am happy to yield to her to close our time before the vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. Madam President, I want to talk today about Kyle Bailey from Sparks, NV. Kyle is 27 years old, and he is an amazing success story. He was born with cystic fibrosis, a genetic condition that affects the lungs and digestive system, making it hard to breathe normally or absorb nutrients.

Cystic fibrosis has no cure, so patients like Kyle spend hours every day on treatments to keep themselves as healthy as possible. With good medical care and lifesaving medications, he has been able to live a full life, creating music and artwork. He is engaged to be married.

Yet Kyle lives in fear. He is afraid he will lose his health insurance and coverage for treatments that keep him alive. That could happen if the Republican Party succeeds in its latest attempt to use the courts to attack the Affordable Care Act and to end its protections for preexisting conditions.

Just today, a Federal appeals court has heard more arguments about whether the ACA is constitutional. On one side are patients like Kyle; on the other side are the Trump administration and 18 Republican State attorneys general, who all want the court to strike down the Affordable Care Act.

We have seen it before. The Republicans have tried to defeat the ACA in Congress and in the courts over 100 times, and each time they have failed because the American people have raised their voices and said: Stop. We want our healthcare coverage.

But just because the ACA survived those attacks doesn't mean it is safe. It is especially scary for those who gained coverage and peace of mind thanks to the Affordable Care Act's strong safeguards for patients.

One of the most important parts of the ACA is its guaranteed protections for people with preexisting conditions. Insurers used to be able to discriminate against people because of their medical history. They would weed out people who were born with genetic conditions, like Kyle, or people who had gotten seriously ill, like Ivy Batmale from Incline Village. At 5 years old, Ivy was diagnosed with acute lymphoblastic leukemia, one of the most common childhood cancers. Ivy beat leukemia, but the years of harsh therapy triggered a reaction that affected her legs. Ivy was told that she would never walk again. She spent years in wheelchairs undergoing surgery and other treatments.

With costly therapies, Ivy got better. This spring, she and her family marched into breakfast with me right here on Capitol Hill to advocate for childhood cancer research. But Ivy, like other childhood cancer survivors, has had lingering health conditions over the course of her life and will need careful monitoring until she is 40 years old. That is why if Republicans give insurance companies the choice, insurers will either refuse to cover people like Ivy and Kyle or they will charge sky-high rates. The ACA keeps the insurance companies from doing that. If judges strike down the ACA, people like Ivy and Kyle will be endangered through absolutely no fault of their own.

Some people may hear stories about Kyle and Ivy and think, well, that is very sad, but it can't affect that many

people. That is wrong. In Nevada alone, in 2015, 1.2 million people under 65 had preexisting conditions. That is half of the nonelderly residents of the State.

A preexisting condition could be as rare as childhood cancer or as common as pregnancy. That means every other Nevadan can face increased insurance rates if the ACA is struck down.

I have met families at roundtables across the Silver State whose kids are some of the 44,000 Nevada children with asthma. Just last week in Las Vegas, I talked to 12-year-old Joey Douglas. Joey's asthma often keeps him from school and sometimes lands him in the hospital for days. He told me that even when he is struggling to breathe, his biggest concern is whether his mom will be able to pay his medical bills. These kinds of worries are the reason that when Kyle wrote to me, he asked me to speak out for people who don't have a voice in healthcare policy in this country—people who are afraid that losing the ACA could mean losing protections that have allowed them to grow up, start a family, follow their passions, and live their lives to the fullest.

Today and every day I am here to fight for people like Kyle and Ivy and countless Nevadans like them. I have repeatedly urged the President and Department of Justice to come down on the side of patients in the Texas case. I have cosponsored legislation to get rid of junk healthcare plans that let insurance companies make an end run around ACA protections for people with preexisting conditions, and I am committed to protecting and strengthening the ACA for all Americans but especially for people like Kyle, Ivy, and Joey.

So I am calling on this President and Republicans in Congress to do what we can to make sure that the Affordable Care Act is not repealed and that we are fighting for healthcare insurance for everyone.

I yield the floor.

NOMINATION OF DANIEL AARON BRESS

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, this week, the Republican leader, Senator MCCONNELL, has scheduled a vote on a nominee to fill a Ninth Circuit seat based in California.

But the nominee, Daniel Bress, is a Washington, DC, lawyer who has only lived in California for 1 year since high school.

Mr. Bress checks many of the usual boxes that we see for Republican judicial nominees: He is very young—only 40 years old—he has a track record of representing big corporate interests, and he is a longtime member of the Federalist Society.

But what is new and different about this nominee is that, by any reasonable standard, he is not a member of the legal community of the State in which he would sit if confirmed.

Mr. Bress is listed by the California bar as an out-of-State attorney. He belongs to no legal societies or organizations in California. He has only worked

on a handful of matters in California courts.

He doesn't own property in California or even have a California driver's license. Mr. Bress's nomination is opposed by California's two Senators, neither of whom have provided a blue slip. He was reported out of the Judiciary Committee with opposition from all committee Democrats.

To my Republicans colleagues, I say this: The vote on the Bress nomination will set a precedent that could come back to haunt your State.

Any Senator who votes to confirm Mr. Bress is giving their blessing to a process that could cause an out-of-state attorney to be seated in a circuit court judgeship in your own State, over the objection of your State's Senators.

There are thousands of well-qualified attorneys living and practicing in California whom the Trump administration could have selected for this California-based Ninth Circuit seat. They bypassed all of them in favor of a Washington, DC, attorney with minimal California ties.

There have been many breakdowns in the Senate's process for confirming judicial nominees under this Republican majority. If the Senate votes to confirm Mr. Bress, it would represent yet another new precedent that diminishes the Senate's advice and consent process. I urge my colleagues to vote no.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASSIDY). The Senator from Florida.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the first vote in the series be 10 minutes in length.

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

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Bress nomination?

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) are necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 53, nays 45, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 191 Ex.]

YEAS—53

Alexander	Cornyn	Graham
Barrasso	Cotton	Grassley
Blackburn	Cramer	Hawley
Blunt	Crapo	Hoeven
Boozman	Cruz	Hyde-Smith
Braun	Daines	Inhofe
Burr	Enzi	Isakson
Capito	Ernst	Johnson
Cassidy	Fischer	Kennedy
Collins	Gardner	Lankford

Lee
McConnell
McSally
Moran
Murkowski
Paul
Perdue
Portman

Risch
Roberts
Romney
Rounds
Rubio
Sasse
Scott (FL)
Scott (SC)

Shelby
Sullivan
Thune
Tillis
Toomey
Wicker
Young

NAYS—45

Baldwin
Bennet
Blumenthal
Booker
Brown
Cantwell
Cardin
Carper
Casey
Coons
Cortez Masto
Duckworth
Durbin
Feinstein
Harris

Hassan
Heinrich
Hirono
Jones
Kaine
King
Klobuchar
Leahy
Manchin
Markey
Menendez
Merkley
Murphy
Murray
Peters

Reed
Rosen
Schatz
Schumer
Shaheen
Sinema
Smith
Stabenow
Tester
Udall
Van Hollen
Warner
Warren
Whitehouse
Wyden

NOT VOTING—2

Gillibrand

Sanders

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 actions.

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 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 T. Kent Wetherell II, of Florida, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Florida.

Mitch McConnell, Kevin Cramer, Mike Crapo, Marco Rubio, John Kennedy, Thom Tillis, James M. Inhofe, Rob Portman, Johnny Isakson, John Thune, John Boozman, Cory Gardner, Steve Daines, Richard C. Shelby, Pat Roberts, Lindsey Graham, John Hoeven.

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 T. Kent Wetherell II, of Florida, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Florida, 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 legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) are necessarily absent.

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 82, nays 16, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 192 Ex.]

YEAS—82

Alexander	Feinstein	Perdue
Barrasso	Fischer	Peters
Bennet	Gardner	Portman
Blackburn	Graham	Reed
Blunt	Grassley	Risch
Boozman	Hassan	Roberts
Braun	Hawley	Romney
Brown	Heinrich	Rosen
Burr	Hoeven	Rounds
Cantwell	Hyde-Smith	Rubio
Capito	Inhofe	Sasse
Cardin	Isakson	Scott (FL)
Carper	Johnson	Scott (SC)
Casey	Jones	Shaheen
Cassidy	Kaine	Shelby
Collins	Kennedy	Sinema
Coons	King	Sullivan
Cornyn	Lankford	Tester
Cortez Masto	Leahy	Thune
Cotton	Lee	Tillis
Cramer	Manchin	Toomey
Crapo	McConnell	Udall
Cruz	McSally	Warner
Daines	Moran	Whitehouse
Duckworth	Murkowski	Wicker
Durbin	Murphy	Young
Enzi	Murray	
Ernst	Paul	

NAYS—16

Baldwin	Markey	Stabenow
Blumenthal	Menendez	Van Hollen
Booker	Merkley	Warren
Harris	Schatz	Wyden
Hirono	Schumer	
Klobuchar	Smith	

NOT VOTING—2

Gillibrand

Sanders

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 82, the nays are 16.

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 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 Damon Ray Leichty, of Indiana, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Indiana.

Mitch McConnell, Roy Blunt, John Barrasso, Pat Roberts, Mike Crapo, John Cornyn, John Thune, Kevin Cramer, Roger F. Wicker, John Boozman, John Hoeven, Thom Tillis, Johnny Isakson, Tim Scott, Mike Braun, Richard Burr, Lindsey Graham.

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 Damon Ray Leichty, of Indiana, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Indiana, 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 bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) are necessarily absent.

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 87, nays 11, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 193 Ex.]

YEAS—87

Alexander	Feinstein	Perdue
Baldwin	Fischer	Peters
Barrasso	Gardner	Portman
Bennet	Graham	Reed
Blackburn	Grassley	Risch
Blunt	Hassan	Roberts
Boozman	Hawley	Romney
Braun	Heinrich	Rosen
Brown	Hoeven	Rounds
Burr	Hyde-Smith	Rubio
Cantwell	Inhofe	Sasse
Capito	Isakson	Schumer
Cardin	Johnson	Scott (FL)
Carper	Jones	Scott (SC)
Casey	Kaine	Shaheen
Cassidy	Kennedy	Shelby
Collins	King	Sinema
Coons	Lankford	Sullivan
Cornyn	Leahy	Tester
Cortez Masto	Lee	Thune
Cotton	Manchin	Tillis
Cramer	McConnell	Toomey
Crapo	McSally	Udall
Cruz	Menendez	Van Hollen
Daines	Merkley	Warner
Duckworth	Moran	Whitehouse
Durbin	Murkowski	Wicker
Enzi	Murphy	Wyden
Ernst	Paul	Young

NAYS—11

Blumenthal	Klobuchar	Smith
Booker	Markey	Stabenow
Harris	Murray	Warren
Hirono	Schatz	

NOT VOTING—2

Gillibrand	Sanders
------------	---------

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 87, the nays are 11.

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 J. Nicholas Ranjan, of Pennsylvania, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Pennsylvania.

Mitch McConnell, Roy Blunt, John Barasso, Pat Roberts, Mike Crapo, John Cornyn, John Thune, Kevin Cramer, Roger F. Wicker, John Boozman, John Hoeven, Thom Tillis, Johnny Isakson, Tim Scott, Mike Braun, Richard Burr, Lindsey Graham.

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 J. Nicholas Ranjan, of Pennsylvania, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Pennsylvania, 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. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLI-

BRAND) and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), are necessarily absent.

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 83, nays 15, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 194 Ex.]

YEAS—83

Alexander	Feinstein	Peters
Baldwin	Fischer	Portman
Barrasso	Gardner	Reed
Blackburn	Graham	Risch
Blunt	Grassley	Roberts
Booker	Hassan	Romney
Boozman	Hawley	Rosen
Braun	Hoeven	Rounds
Brown	Hyde-Smith	Rubio
Burr	Inhofe	Sasse
Capito	Isakson	Schatz
Cardin	Johnson	Schumer
Carper	Jones	Scott (FL)
Casey	Kaine	Scott (SC)
Cassidy	Kennedy	Shaheen
Collins	King	Shelby
Coons	Lankford	Sinema
Cornyn	Leahy	Sullivan
Cortez Masto	Lee	Tester
Cotton	Manchin	Thune
Cramer	McConnell	Tillis
Crapo	McSally	Toomey
Cruz	Menendez	Van Hollen
Daines	Moran	Warner
Duckworth	Murkowski	Whitehouse
Durbin	Murphy	Wicker
Enzi	Paul	Wyden
Ernst	Perdue	Young

NAYS—15

Bennet	Hirono	Smith
Blumenthal	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Cantwell	Markey	Udall
Harris	Merkley	Warren
Heinrich	Murray	Wyden

NOT VOTING—2

Gillibrand	Sanders
------------	---------

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 83, the nays are 15.

The motion is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of J. Nicholas Ranjan, of Pennsylvania, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Pennsylvania.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that at 11 a.m. on Wednesday, July 10, the Senate vote on confirmation of the following nominations in the order listed: Executive Calendar Nos. 47, 52, and 51; 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. I further ask that at 4:30 p.m., the Senate vote on the pending cloture motions on the King and Pallasch nominations and that if cloture is invoked, the confirmation votes occur at a time to be determined by the majority leader, in consultation with the Democratic leader, on Thursday, July 11. Finally, I ask unanimous consent that the cloture motion with respect to the Wright nomination ripen following disposition of the Pallasch nomination.

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. THUNE. Madam 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. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRIBUTE TO MARY BALLARD

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, it is always a privilege to honor the men and women of America's Greatest Generation. They defended our national values both at home and abroad, and we owe each one of them a tremendous debt of gratitude for their service and sacrifice. Today, I would like to recognize one of these intrepid Americans from my home State of Kentucky. Mary Somers Ballard volunteered to serve in the U.S. Army Nurse Corps during World War II, providing healing care to wounded soldiers across the European theatre. This month, Mary will enjoy her 100th birthday at a celebration with friends and family, and I would like to add my voice to the chorus of those praising her lifetime of achievement.

When war broke out, Mary lived in Boston working as a nurse and attending school. Hearing stories from the front, she was called to leave her studies and put her talents to work for the war effort. At the age of 23, she joined the Army's 811th Air Evacuation Unit and sailed from New York City for Europe. Mary was deployed at a hospital in Manchester, England, where she cared for wounded soldiers flown back from France and Germany. In the aftermath of the invasion of Normandy, Mary traveled to the continent to support the Battle of the Bulge, one of Hitler's last-ditch efforts to stop the Allied advance. After the liberation of Paris, Mary was sent to the city to care for troops there. In her many posts, Mary delivered lifesaving care to many Allied soldiers, often in challenging surroundings.

More than 59,000 Americans joined the Army Nurse Corps during the Second World War, many serving under enemy fire. Their service supported the recovery of countless wounded soldiers at evacuation hospitals like Mary's.

After the war, Mary was stationed in Indiana where she met Al Ballard, a young surgical resident. The couple married and moved to Al's native Kentucky, where Mary has lived ever since. Together, they raised eight children and, like so many other members of the Greatest Generation, continued to contribute to their community and our country.

Through the years, Mary has been honored for her brave service. To celebrate her 95th birthday, for example, she threw out the first pitch at a Lexington Legends minor league baseball

game. I am glad to join her family and friends in marking Mary's 100th birthday. With her lifesaving work in the Army and a longtime commitment to Kentucky, Mary has made a lasting impression on the lives of countless many. With all of them, I would like to wish her a happy birthday and thank her for her remarkable service to the United States. I urge my Senate colleagues to join me in honoring this Kentucky hero.

VOTE EXPLANATION

Ms. HARRIS. Madam President, I was necessarily absent but, had I been present, would have voted no on roll-call vote No. 190, the motion to invoke cloture on Daniel Aaron Bress, of California, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO MYKAYLAN BURNER

• Mr. ROUNDS. Madam President, today I recognize Mykaylan Burner, an intern in my Washington, DC, office, for all the hard work she has done on behalf of myself, my staff, and the State of South Dakota.

Mykaylan is a graduate of Dakota Valley High School in North Sioux City, SD. Currently, she is attending South Dakota State University in Brookings, SD, where she studies political science and Spanish. Mykaylan is a dedicated and diligent worker who has been devoted to getting the most out of her internship experience and has been a true asset to the office.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Mykaylan for all of the fine work she has done and wish her continued success in the years to come.●

RECOGNIZING CAPITAL SHOE FIXERY

• Mr. RUBIO. Madam President, as chairman of the Senate Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship, it is my honor to recognize a small business that exemplifies a rigorous work ethic, attention to detail, and dedication to tradition. This week, it is my privilege to name Capital Shoe Fixery of Tallahassee, FL, as the Senate Small Business of the Week.

Known for their expertise in shoe maintenance, Capital Shoe Fixery has become a local staple, servicing the members of their community since 1938. Having celebrated their 81st anniversary, the small business has become a landmark in the State's capitol and remains a true Main Street favorite. Originally owned by Elton and June Henley, Nick Camechis's father, John, bought the business in 1966. After school, Nick spent his days helping his father around the store and learning the trade. Following the precedent of

hard work and tradition, Nick took over the business in 1995. To this day, Nick expands on his father's longstanding tradition of fairly priced, high-quality craftsmanship. Recently turning 65, this shoe cobbler has no current plans to retire, working 70 hour workweeks with no sick days.

Today, Capital Shoe Fixery remains family-oriented and affordable, providing only the highest quality of work to their customers. When customers arrive, they are greeted by Nick's dog Tuck, who also never misses a day of work. Capital Shoe's clientele ranges from politicians, college students, dancers, and customers from all walks of life. Capital Shoe Fixery will take in approximately 60 to 70 shoes a day during a typical legislative session. Furthermore, Nick is known for his honesty with customers and will decline new business if he feels that the damaged shoes are irreparable.

This outstanding quality of service and honesty by Capital Shoe Fixery has not gone unnoticed. In addition to their excellent reviews, in 2016, Capital Shoe Fixery was featured in Tallahassee Family Magazine, where the family-owned business was commended for their work ethic and attention to detail. The article truly cemented Capital Shoe Fixery as a Main Street staple, highlighting its unique traits that allow for remarkable customer experiences.

Capital Shoe Fixery has remained true to their original values by focusing on quality service with an expert investment of time, care, and honesty to prioritize the customer. In addition, it is a reminder of the extensive amount of time and care required to achieve success and longevity in business. Nick's dedication is a quintessential example of how hard work can lead to exceptional success. It is with great pleasure that I extend my congratulations to Nick and Capital Shoe Fixery. I wish you well as you continue serving the people of Tallahassee, and I look forward to watching your continued success.●

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bills were read the first time:

H.R. 2740. An act 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.R. 3055. An act making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, 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-1860. A communication from the Acting Principal Deputy Director, Defense Pricing

and Contracting, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Repeal of Transportation Related DFARS Provisions and Clauses" ((RIN0750-AK63)) (DFARS Case 2019-D020)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 2, 2019; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1861. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment and Revocation of Air Traffic Service (ATS) Routes in the Vicinity of Manistique, MI" ((RIN2120-AA66)) (Docket No. FAA-2018-0220)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 2, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petitions and memorials were laid before the Senate and were referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM-102. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of California urging the United States Congress to block the President's national emergency declaration by overriding the President's veto of House Joint Resolution 46 and consider terminating the declaration of a national emergency within six months or at the earliest possible time pursuant to the National Emergencies Act; to the Committee on Armed Services.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 2

Whereas, On February 15, 2019, United States President Donald J. Trump declared an undefined national emergency; and

Whereas, The President intends to cut \$7.5 billion in the United States Department of Defense's funding targeted at the general welfare of our military, supporting infrastructure construction, defending national security threats, and limiting the flow of illegal drugs into the United States; and

Whereas, Appropriating funds intended for military construction projects and counterdrug activities will come at the expense of troop readiness and departmentwide efforts to address the military's aging infrastructure and

Whereas, Funds would otherwise be used to improve potable water distribution, update maintenance and storage facilities for military vehicles, build new combat training facilities, construct a shooting range complex, and build a close combat training facility, located at the Navy SEAL Campus in Coronado, California; and

Whereas, Dollars would also otherwise be used for renovating the Defense Distribution Depot located in Tracy, California; and

Whereas, The President is proposing to revert money already appropriated for updating runways and landing pads, as well as increased airfield security, at the Naval Air Station in Lemoore, California; and

WHEREAS, Funds would otherwise be used to construct a Navy SEAL reserve training facility in San Diego, California; and

Whereas, Money would otherwise be used for military family housing projects to remove lead paint and update hazardous living conditions in service members' homes; and

Whereas, The funds would otherwise be used to fund a C-130 flight simulator facility at the Channel Islands Air National Guard Station in Oxnard, California, which would train pilots to fly planes outfitted with Modular Airborne Fire Fighting Systems that are used to combat wildfires in California; and

Whereas, The national emergency declaration diverts attention from current emergencies that pose real dangers to the health and welfare of California's environment at our border, such as the continued pollution at the Tijuana River Valley and the New River in Calexico; and

Whereas, Dollars that would otherwise be used to update hospitals that treat wounded soldiers will be misused, placing even greater constraints on the moneys available for this purpose; and

Whereas, The President has also stated that he expects to use this national emergency declaration to revert and repurpose funds already approved by the United States Congress to limit the flow of drugs into the United States; and

Whereas, These funds were earmarked to combat the drug cartels in West Africa, Mexico, and Colombia, and nations acting as drug cartels, such as North Korea; and

Whereas, In recent years, a substantial amount of counternarcotics funding has been used to stem the increasing tide of fentanyl being imported from China; and

Whereas, Controlled substances are more likely to be smuggled through official ports of entry than between border crossings; and

Whereas, Cutting drug interdiction funding will not deter the passage of controlled substances through the United States border, but will hamper counterdrug efforts in areas where the funds could make a meaningful impact; and

Whereas, The United States Department of Defense has roughly \$1 billion earmarked for counternarcotic missions and drug interdiction for the 2019 fiscal year, and yet the Trump Administration has asked for \$2.5 billion from the counternarcotic fund; and

Whereas, The Pentagon will have to divert money from elsewhere beyond the appropriated funding to come up with the extra \$1.5 billion, negatively affecting our nation's ability to effectively and efficiently combat the flow of drugs into our borders; and

Whereas, This nation needs to continue to repair and strengthen our military and re-directing funds needed for this purpose will undercut our accomplishments and underfund our operations; and

Whereas, Numerous news reports indicate that the President is considering reallocating funds currently appropriated for disaster relief and aid, including \$2.4 billion appropriated to the State of California, the diversion of which will severely hurt communities already suffering as a result of natural disasters; and

Whereas, By the President's own admission in regard to the national emergency declaration, he "didn't need to do this"; and

Whereas, On February 26, 2019, the United States House of Representatives passed House Joint Resolution 46 by a vote of 245—182, pursuant to the federal National Emergencies Act, to overturn President Trump's emergency declaration and the United States Senate passed that resolution by a 59–41 vote on March 14, 2019. On the following day, the President vetoed the resolution; and

Whereas, Twenty states, including California, have filed suit to block the President's national emergency declaration; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by the Senate and the Assembly of the State of California, jointly, That the Legislature urges the houses of the United States Congress to stand in unity and block the President's national emergency declaration by overriding the President's veto of House Joint Resolution 46 and, if not possible, to consider terminating the declaration of national emergency within six months or at the earliest possible time pursuant to the National Emergencies Act; and be it further

Resolved, That the Legislature urges the President to reconsider his motives and decision and allow military, defense, and counterdrug funds to be used for the purposes for which they are needed and for which they were made available; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate transmit copies of this resolution to the President and the Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to the Majority Leader of the Senate, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States.

POM-103. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Louisiana urging the United States Congress to support the initiative calling for accurate, third-party application (app) ratings and intuitive parental controls to better protect children from harmful online and mobile device content; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION No. 36

Whereas, millions of children use online and mobile devices daily; and

Whereas, parents rely on ratings to decide whether to allow their children to have access to apps available online and on mobile devices; and

Whereas, app developers currently self-rate their apps and display the ratings in app stores; and

Whereas, this rating system can be misleading, inconsistent, and does not appropriately warn parents of the potential dangers found in applications; and

Whereas, no third-party organization holds app developers accountable to ensure ratings are accurate and adequately explain the content and advertising available to children therein; and

Whereas, popular apps often do not include or have adequate parental controls; and

Whereas, apps can be hot spots for bullying, grooming, sex-trafficking, pornography, glamorized self-harm content, and the buying and selling of illegal drugs; and

Whereas, in order to protect children from such harm, parents seek adequate parental controls as well as the information necessary to determine if apps are appropriate for their children; and

Whereas, the #fixappratings initiative calls for the creation of an independent app ratings board and rating system that is clearly understood, enforced, trustworthy, and exists to protect the innocence of minors; and

Whereas, the #fixappratings initiative also calls for the release of intuitive parental controls to ensure that parents can effectively control their children's app activity; and

Whereas, be it

Resolved, That the Legislature of Louisiana memorializes the Congress of the United States to support the #fixappratings initiative calling for the establishment of a third-party organization to assign app ratings and descriptions and the development of user-friendly parental controls; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this Resolution shall be transmitted to the secretary of the United States Senate and the clerk of the United States House of Representatives and to each member of the Louisiana delegation to the United States Congress.

POM-104. A resolution adopted by the Senate of the State of New Jersey urging the United States Congress and the President of the United States to pass legislation that would amend the Code of the Internal Revenue Service which would prevent the IRS from collecting taxes on any amount of stu-

dent loan forgiven for deceased veterans; to the Committee on Finance.

SENATE RESOLUTION No. 75

Whereas, Each member of the United States Armed Forces serves our country to protect the citizens of the United States and, in 2015, there were over one million active duty members of the Armed Forces; and

Whereas, If a service member sustains an injury or illness while on active duty, they may be discharged and return home to pursue higher educational opportunities; and

Whereas, Many service members embrace the opportunity to pursue higher education through the various tuition assistance programs and college funds offered to service members, which may be used in combination with federal and private student loans to pay for the cost of college; and

Whereas, If a service member loses his or her life as a result of an injury or illness sustained while on active duty, the federal education loans are forgiven under the Higher Education Act and private loan companies can choose to forgive the education loans; and

Whereas, When an educational loan is forgiven the Internal Revenue Code categorizes the amount of the loan as taxable gross income for a cosigner on the loan, which can include both family and friends of the deceased service member; and

Whereas, Taxing loan forgiveness as income can be burdensome to family members and friends especially during a time when they are grieving the loss of their loved one; and

Whereas, Families of veterans who lost their lives as a result of an illness or injury sustained while serving on active duty have already sacrificed so much for the United States; and

Whereas, [The federal bill H.R. 500, named the "Andrew P. Carpenter Tax Act,"] *It is altogether fitting and proper for Congress to enact legislation, similar to H.R. 500 of the 115th Congress, that would amend the Internal Revenue Code to prevent the Internal Revenue Service from collecting taxes on any amount of student loan forgiven;* and

Whereas, The [federal bill will] *legislation would help to ease the financial burden for individuals who are already grieving for the loss of their loved one; Now, therefore, be it Resolved, by the Senate of the State of New Jersey:*

1. This House respectfully urges the President and Congress of the United States to enact [H.R. 500] *legislation which amend the Internal Revenue Code to prevent the Internal Revenue Service from collecting taxes on any amount of student loan forgiven for deceased veterans.*

2. Copies of this resolution, as filed with the Secretary of State, shall be transmitted by the Secretary of the Senate to the President and Vice President of the United States, the United States Secretary of Defense, the Majority and Minority Leader of the United States Senate, the Speaker and the Minority Leader of the United States House of Representatives, and every member of Congress from New Jersey.

POM-105. A resolution adopted by the Senate of the State of Hawaii urging the United States Congress to embrace the goals of the New York Declaration on Forests and the 2030 Agenda and make sustainable development the centerpiece of national social and sustainable policies; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

SENATE RESOLUTION No. 98

Whereas, Hawaii is recognized as a global partner and local leader in sustainability, peace, climate change adaptation, and human rights due to its adoption of global

standards of social justice to improve the well-being of Hawaii's islands and the world; and

Whereas, in September 2015, the United Nations General Assembly adopted the historic Transforming Our World: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development (2030 Agenda), a comprehensive, compassionate, creative, and courageous plan of action to end poverty, protect the planet, and ensure that all people enjoy peace and prosperity; and

Whereas, the 2030 Agenda includes seventeen Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), one hundred sixty-nine Targets, and two hundred thirty Indicators upon which general agreement has been reached to measure, monitor, and mobilize; and

Whereas, the Hawaiian islands are home to forests that play a pivotal role in Hawaii's natural environment, both historically and for future generations, by providing watershed, soil, and habitat protection; and

Whereas, Hawaii's forests cover two million acres, approximately half of the entire land mass of Hawaii, and Hawaii has a strong commitment to planting, management, and natural regeneration of its forests; and

Whereas, Hawaii's forests are critically important to local culture, the people, and perpetuation of pristine environments and provide aesthetic value, enjoyment, water conservation, and improved air quality; and

Whereas, the New York Declaration on Forests (NYDF) provides a proactive and participatory human rights based approach to protect and restore forests that supports the scope and significance of the United Nations SDGs; and

Whereas, the NYDF was created and launched at the United Nations Climate Summit at United Nations Headquarters in September, 2014, receiving endorsements by two hundred entities including governments, corporations, civil society, and indigenous peoples; and

Whereas, the NYDF outlines ten global targets related to protecting and restoring forests, which, if realized, have the potential to reduce annual carbon emission by 4.5 to 8.8 billion tons of CO₂—the equivalent of the annual emissions of the United States; and

Whereas, the ten goals of the NYDF are:

- (1) Stop forest loss;
- (2) Eliminate deforestation from agricultural activities;
- (3) Reduce non-agricultural deforestation;
- (4) Support alternatives to deforestation for subsistence farming, fuel, and other basic needs;
- (5) Restore forests;
- (6) Quantify forest conservation and restoration targets for 2030 as part of the 2030 Agenda SDGs;
- (7) Reduce emissions from deforestation and forest degradation in accordance with global climate agreements;
- (8) Provide financing for forest action;
- (9) Reward countries and jurisdictions that reduce forest emissions; and
- (10) Strengthen governance, empower communities, and recognize the rights of indigenous peoples; and

Whereas, adopting the NYDF can accelerate progress with new partnerships to achieve the United Nations Paris Agreement and the United Nations 2030 Agenda; and

Whereas, the ten goals of the NYDF coincide with the seventeen SDGs and provide an agenda for grassroots and global action but it is up to individuals, communities, and states to generate the political will necessary to achieve these goals; and

Whereas, Hawaii is already participating in global efforts to empower and engage everyone, everywhere to protect the planet and end poverty, regularly attending sessions of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, the United Nations

Human Rights Council, and the United Nations High Level Political Forum; and

Whereas, in Hawaii, college, community, and capitol discussions on the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change Conference of Parties annual results and the United Nations High Level Political Forum follow-up and review of the SDGs continue to generate genuine insight into how both sets of goals are being realized in the Hawaiian Islands and what next steps are needed to continue Hawaii's forward momentum; and

Whereas, adopting the NYDF in Hawaii will allow for greater coordination and communication between Hawaii and other NYDF partners to share promising practices and support further improvements for Hawaii's forests; and

Whereas, adopting the NYDF will link Hawaii's forest practitioners to a global network with relevant expertise and capacity to support the implementation of the forest elements of commitments under the Paris Agreement that; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the Thirtieth Legislature of the State of Hawaii, Regular Session of 2019, that this body engages, endorses, accepts, and adopts the New York Declaration on Forests; and, be it further

Resolved that the Legislature urges federal leaders and the nation to embrace the goals of the NYDF and the 2030 Agenda and make sustainable development the centerpiece of national social and sustainable policies; and be it further

Resolved that certified copies of this Resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, Vice President of the United States, Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, Minority Leader of the United States House of Representatives, Majority Leader of the United States Senate, Minority Leader of the United States Senate, members of Hawaii's congressional delegation, United Nations Secretary General, United Nations General Assembly President, United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, NYDF Platform Secretariat, Executive Secretary of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, United Nations High Level Political Forum, and mayors of each county.

POM-106. A resolution adopted by the Senate of the State of Hawaii urging the United States Congress to embrace the Aarhus Convention and make protection of the environment and decision-making on environmental policies the centerpiece of national debate and practice; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

SENATE RESOLUTION No. 99

Whereas, Hawai'i is recognized as a global partner and local leader in promoting human rights to create a culture of democracy, rule of law, and protection of the planet through its adoption of global and regional standards to guide decisionmaking processes; and

Whereas, Hawai'i is guided by traditional Hawaiian values and emerging international human rights visions to generate good governance and ensure participation in policymaking and protection of our islands and the planet; and

Whereas, in September 2015, the United Nations General Assembly adopted the historic 2030 Development Agenda entitled "Transforming Our World: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development", a comprehensive, compassionate, creative, and courageous plan of action to end poverty, protect the planet, and ensure that all people enjoy peace and prosperity; and

Whereas, in December 2015, the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change Conference of Parties agreed to the

Paris Agreement, calling for the first time to limit future increases in the global average temperature to 1.5 degrees Celsius; and

Whereas, the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe Convention on Access to Information, Public Participation in Decision-Making and Access to Justice in Environmental Matters (Aarhus Convention) is an important instrument for achieving the goals of the Paris Agreement and the 2030 Agenda; and

Whereas, the Aarhus Convention consists of numerous articles covering ideas and coordinating implementation including the following:

- (1) Access to Environmental Information;
 - (2) Collection and Dissemination of Environmental Information;
 - (3) Public Participation in Decisions on Specific Activities;
 - (4) Public Participation Concerning Plans, Programmes and Policies Relating to the Environment;
 - (5) Public Participation During the Preparation of Executive Regulations and/or Generally Applicable Legally Binding Normative Instruments; and
 - (6) Access to Justice; and
- Whereas, the parties to the Aarhus Convention:

- (1) Aimed to further accountability of and transparency in decision-making and to strengthen public support for decisions on the environment;
- (2) Recognized that that the public needs to be aware of procedures for participation in environmental decision-making, have free access to the political process, and know how to exercise that access;
- (3) Recognized the importance of respective roles for individual citizens, non-governmental organizations, and the private sector in environmental protection; and
- (4) Desired to promote environmental education to further the understanding of the environment and sustainable development and to encourage widespread public awareness of and participation in decisions affecting the environment and sustainable development; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the Thirtieth Legislature of the State of Hawaii, Regular Session of 2019, that this body engages, endorses, accepts, and adopts the Aarhus Convention; and be it further

Resolved that the Congress of the United States is requested to embrace the Aarhus Convention and make protection of the environment and decision-making on environmental policies the centerpiece of national debate and practice; and be it further

Resolved that certified copies of this Resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, Vice President of the United States, Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, President Pro Tempore of the United States Senate, Majority Leader of the United States House of Representatives, Minority Leader of the United States House of Representatives, Majority Leader of the United States Senate, Minority Leader of the United States Senate, Hawai'i's congressional delegation, Governor, mayor of each county, Secretary General of the United Nations, United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, and Chairs of Hawai'i's Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation Commission.

POM-107. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Louisiana urging the United States Congress to take such actions as are necessary to recognize the historical significance of Juneteenth Independence Day to the United States and observe Juneteenth nationally as a holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION No. 66

Whereas, news of the end of slavery did not reach frontier areas of the United States,

and in particular the southwestern states, for more than two and a half years after President Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation, which was issued on January 1, 1863, and months after the conclusion of the Civil War; and

Whereas, Juneteenth is an annual observance and celebration of the date Union soldiers enforced the Emancipation Proclamation freeing all remaining slaves in Galveston, Texas, on June 19, 1865; and

Whereas, since 1865, the day has been celebrated as the day African-Americans received the news of the signing of the Emancipation Proclamation; and

Whereas, Juneteenth commemorates the strength and resolve of African-Americans throughout our history, and is an opportunity to highlight the value of African-American culture, art, history, and achievement; and

Whereas, the celebration of the end of slavery is an important and enriching part of the history and heritage of the United States; and

Whereas, for more than one hundred fifty years, Juneteenth Independence Day celebrations have been held to honor African-American freedom while encouraging self-development and respect for all cultures; and

Whereas, forty-six states and the District of Columbia have designated Juneteenth Independence Day as a special day of observance in recognition of the emancipation of all slaves in the United States; and

Whereas, in 1997, the 105th United States Congress officially recognized Juneteenth as the observance of Independence Day of Americans of African descent; and

Whereas, Juneteenth reflects our belief in liberty and equality for every citizen, as everyone can benefit from a greater understanding and appreciation of the experiences of others; Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Legislature of Louisiana does hereby memorialize the United States Congress to take such actions as are necessary to recognize the historical significance of Juneteenth Independence Day to the United States and observe Juneteenth nationally as a holiday; and be it further

Resolved, that a copy of this Resolution be transmitted to the presiding officers of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States of America and to each member of the Louisiana congressional delegation.

POM-108. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Louisiana urging the United States Congress to take such actions as are necessary to authorize the garnishment of veterans' disability benefits to fulfill child support obligations; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 7

Whereas, Civil Code Article 224 provides that parents are obligated to support, maintain, and educate their child, and the obligation to educate a child continues after minority as provided by law; and

Whereas, 5 CFR Part 581, Subpart A provides which moneys received by a civilian employee for services rendered to a governmental entity are subject to garnishment for the purpose of enforcing the legal obligations of obligors to provide child support; and

Whereas, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 659, the United States consents to the withholding and garnishing of income of an individual for the enforcement of the individual's child support and alimony obligations; and

Whereas, 42 U.S.C. 659 further provides that the federal government will allow under certain circumstances the garnishment of service-connected disability compensation paid

by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to former members of the armed forces for the purpose of enforcing child support and alimony obligations; and

Whereas, in *Rose v. Rose*, 481 US 619 (1987), the Supreme Court held that not only could a state consider the amount of disability benefits received by a veteran in setting the amount of child support, but also, once a child support obligation had been created, the veteran's disability benefits could be used to satisfy that obligation; and

Whereas, in the same case, Justice Marshall, quoting the legislative record, describes the purpose of veterans' disability benefits as compensation for impaired earning capacity and "to provide reasonable and adequate compensation for disabled veterans and their families"; and

Whereas, as of February 2019, the current total for child support arrears in Louisiana is \$1,923,958,949.00 and less than one percent of that amount has been collected; and

Whereas, adequate child support is vital to the well-being of children and families in our state; Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Legislature of Louisiana does hereby memorialize the United States Congress to take such actions as are necessary to authorize the garnishment of veterans' disability benefits to fulfill child support obligations; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this Resolution be transmitted to the presiding officers of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States of America and to each member of the Louisiana congressional delegation.

POM-109. A resolution adopted by the Mayor and Council of the City of Cincinnati, Ohio, expressing its support for H.R. 5, known as the Equality Act, which will ensure that federal civil rights laws are fully inclusive of protections for all persons, regardless of sexual orientation or gender identity; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. HOEVEN, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, without amendment:

S. 279. A bill to allow tribal grant schools to participate in the Federal Employee Health Benefits Program (Rept. No. 116-54).

By Mr. RISCH, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute and with an amended preamble:

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. 198. A resolution condemning Brunei's dramatic human rights backsliding.

By Mr. ALEXANDER, from the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions, without amendment:

S. 1173. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize the Emergency Medical Services for Children program.

By Mr. ALEXANDER, from the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 1199. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to revise and extend the poison center network program.

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. ROUNDS:

S. 2058. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to improve policy and data collection in connection with personnel tempo of the Armed Forces and the United States Special Operations Command, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. TILLIS (for himself, Mr. GRAMM, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Ms. ERNST, and Mr. CRUZ):

S. 2059. A bill to provide a civil remedy for individuals harmed by sanctuary jurisdiction policies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. WARREN (for herself and Mr. DAINES):

S. 2060. A bill to require policies and programs to prevent and treat gambling disorder among members of the Armed Forces and their dependents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. TESTER (for himself, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. MURPHY):

S. 2061. A bill to amend the United States Housing Act of 1937 and title 38, United States Code, to expand eligibility for the HUD-VASH program, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to submit annual reports to the Committees on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate and House of Representatives regarding homeless veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. MANCHIN:

S. 2062. A bill to prohibit the use of funds for the 2026 World Cup unless the United States Soccer Federation provides equitable pay the members of the United States Women's National Team and the United States Men's National Team; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. YOUNG:

S. 2063. A bill to amend title XI of the Social Security Act with respect to organ procurement organizations; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. PORTMAN:

S. 2064. A bill to direct the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts to consolidate the Case Management/Electronic Case Files system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PORTMAN (for himself, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. ROUNDS, Ms. ERNST, and Mr. PETERS):

S. 2065. A bill to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to publish an annual report on the use of deepfake technology, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. RISCH (for himself, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. RUBIO, and Mr. COONS):

S. 2066. A bill to review United States Saudi Arabia Policy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. WICKER:

S. Res. 272. A resolution congratulating the United States Women's National Soccer Team on winning the 2019 FIFA Women's World Cup; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. MERKLEY (for himself, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. SCHATZ, Ms. BALDWIN,

Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. BROWN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. WARREN, Mr. MARKEY, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. Res. 273. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate with respect to health care rights; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 9

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 9, a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to clarify the Food and Drug Administration's jurisdiction over certain tobacco products, and to protect jobs and small businesses involved in the sale, manufacturing and distribution of traditional and premium cigars.

S. 153

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the names of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) and the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) were added as cosponsors of S. 153, a bill to promote veteran involvement in STEM education, computer science, and scientific research, and for other purposes.

S. 182

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 182, a bill to prohibit discrimination against the unborn on the basis of sex, and for other purposes.

S. 239

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 239, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in recognition of Christa McAuliffe.

S. 296

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 296, a bill to amend XVIII of the Social Security Act to ensure more timely access to home health services for Medicare beneficiaries under the Medicare program.

S. 348

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN), the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH), the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW), the Senator from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) and the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) were added as cosponsors of S. 348, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the distribution of additional residency positions, and for other purposes.

S. 374

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a co-

sponsor of S. 374, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to expand health care and benefits from the Department of Veterans Affairs for military sexual trauma, and for other purposes.

S. 634

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 634, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish tax credits to encourage individual and corporate taxpayers to contribute to scholarships for students through eligible scholarship-granting organizations and eligible workforce training organizations, and for other purposes.

S. 750

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 750, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend the new markets tax credit, and for other purposes.

S. 803

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 803, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to restore incentives for investments in qualified improvement property.

S. 867

At the request of Ms. HASSAN, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 867, a bill to protect students of institutions of higher education and the taxpayer investment in institutions of higher education by improving oversight and accountability of institutions of higher education, particularly for-profit colleges, improving protections for students and borrowers, and ensuring the integrity of postsecondary education programs, and for other purposes.

S. 872

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 872, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to redesign \$20 Federal reserve notes so as to include a likeness of Harriet Tubman, and for other purposes.

S. 901

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 901, a bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to support individuals with younger onset Alzheimer's disease.

S. 980

At the request of Mr. BURR, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 980, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the provision of services for homeless veterans, and for other purposes.

S. 983

At the request of Mr. COONS, the name of the Senator from New Mexico

(Mr. HEINRICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 983, a bill to amend the Energy Conservation and Production Act to reauthorize the weatherization assistance program, and for other purposes.

S. 1038

At the request of Mrs. FISCHER, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1038, a bill to strengthen highway funding in the near term, to offer States additional financing tools, and for other purposes.

S. 1067

At the request of Ms. HARRIS, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1067, a bill to provide for research to better understand the causes and consequences of sexual harassment affecting individuals in the scientific, technical, engineering, and mathematics workforce and to examine policies to reduce the prevalence and negative impact of such harassment, and for other purposes.

S. 1081

At the request of Mr. MANCHIN, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1081, a bill to amend title 54, United States Code, to provide permanent, dedicated funding for the Land and Water Conservation Fund, and for other purposes.

S. 1088

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the names of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) and the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1088, a bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to require the President to set a minimum annual goal for the number of refugees to be admitted, and for other purposes.

S. 1102

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1102, a bill to promote security and energy partnerships in the Eastern Mediterranean, and for other purposes.

S. 1107

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1107, a bill to require a review of women and lung cancer, and for other purposes.

S. 1170

At the request of Mr. ENZI, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1170, a bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to establish additional criteria for determining when employers may join together in a group or association of employers that will be treated as an employer under section 3(5) of such Act for purposes of sponsoring a group health plan, and for other purposes.

S. 1263

At the request of Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, the name of the Senator from New

Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) 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. 1273

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1273, a bill to amend title 17, United States Code, to establish an alternative dispute resolution program for copyright small claims, and for other purposes.

S. 1365

At the request of Ms. WARREN, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1365, a bill to provide emergency assistance to States, territories, Tribal nations, and local areas affected by the opioid epidemic and to make financial assistance available to States, territories, Tribal nations, local areas, and public or private nonprofit entities to provide for the development, organization, coordination, and operation of more effective and cost efficient systems for the delivery of essential services to individuals with substance use disorder and their families.

S. 1506

At the request of Mr. ROUNDS, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1506, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to permit certain individuals complying with State law to possess firearms.

S. 1522

At the request of Mrs. CAPITO, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1522, a bill to improve broadband data collection, mapping, and validation to support the effective deployment of broadband services to all areas of the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 1539

At the request of Mr. PETERS, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1539, a bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to provide funding to secure nonprofit facilities from terrorist attacks, and for other purposes.

S. 1583

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1583, a bill to amend the Lead-Based Paint Poisoning Prevention Act to provide for additional procedures for families with children under the age of 6, and for other purposes.

S. 1625

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the names of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND), the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) and the Senator from Alabama (Mr. JONES) were added as cosponsors of S. 1625, a bill to

promote the deployment of commercial fifth-generation mobile networks and the sharing of information with communications providers in the United States regarding security risks to the networks of those providers, and for other purposes.

S. 1644

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1644, a bill to ensure that State and local law enforcement may cooperate with Federal officials to protect our communities from violent criminals and suspected terrorists who are illegally present in the United States.

S. 1682

At the request of Mr. DAINES, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1682, a bill to require the Director of the Office of Personnel Management to create a classification that more accurately reflects the vital role of wildland firefighters.

S. 1683

At the request of Mr. DAINES, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1683, a bill to correct problems pertaining to human resources for career and volunteer personnel engaged in wildland fire and structure fire.

S. 1728

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1728, a bill to require the United States Postal Service to sell the Alzheimer's semipostal stamp for 6 additional years.

S. 1730

At the request of Ms. HARRIS, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1730, a bill to direct the Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to make grants to State and local governments and nongovernmental organizations for purposes of carrying out climate-resilient living shoreline projects that protect coastal communities by supporting ecosystem functions and habitats with the use of natural materials and systems, and for other purposes.

S. 1792

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1792, a bill to require the Secretary of Labor to maintain a publicly available list of all employers that relocate a call center or contract call center work overseas, to make such companies ineligible for Federal grants or guaranteed loans, and to require disclosure of the physical location of business agents engaging in customer service communications, and for other purposes.

S. 1840

At the request of Mrs. FISCHER, the name of the Senator from South Da-

kota (Mr. ROUNDS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1840, a bill to establish certain requirements for the small refineries exemption of the renewable fuels provisions under the Clean Air Act, and for other purposes.

S. 1863

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1863, a bill to require the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study of the sites associated with the life and legacy of the noted American philanthropist and business executive Julius Rosenwald, with a special focus on the Rosenwald Schools, and for other purposes.

S. 1979

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1979, a bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to provide for the minimum size of crews of freight trains, and for other purposes.

S. 2003

At the request of Mr. MANCHIN, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2003, a bill to require the Federal Communications Commission to designate a 3-digit dialing code for veterans in crisis.

S. 2043

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the names of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 2043, a bill to provide incentives for hate crime reporting, provide grants for State-run hate crime hotlines, and establish alternative sentencing for individuals convicted under the Matthew Shephard and James Byrd, Jr. Hate Crimes Prevention Act.

S.J. RES. 3

At the request of Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 3, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to balancing the budget.

S. CON. RES. 9

At the request of Mr. ROBERTS, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 9, a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that tax-exempt fraternal benefit societies have historically provided and continue to provide critical benefits to the people and communities of the United States.

S. RES. 80

At the request of Mr. COONS, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 80, a resolution establishing the John S. McCain III Human Rights Commission.

S. RES. 98

At the request of Mrs. BLACKBURN, the name of the Senator from Iowa

(Ms. ERNST) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 98, a resolution establishing the Congressional Gold Star Family Fellowship Program for the placement in offices of Senators of children, spouses, and siblings of members of the Armed Forces who are hostile casualties or who have died from a training-related injury.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. YOUNG:

S. 2063. A bill to amend title XI of the Social Security Act with respect to organ procurement organizations; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss an issue that is very important to me and to the 1,300 Hoosiers currently in need of an organ transplant. That issue is the lack of organs for patients in need and our broken organ donation system.

For more than 30 years, our Nation's organ donation system has operated in complete darkness. Groups known as organ procurement organizations, or OPOs, are responsible for getting organs from the donors to the patients who actually need them, but questions surround the effectiveness, transparency, and accountability of these organizations.

OPOs are the main link between donor hospitals and organ recipients, and their performance can be a limiting factor for all stakeholders in the organ donation system.

In the last 20 years, no OPO has been decertified despite serious issues of underperformance. For example, CMS recently recertified the New York City OPO despite persistent underperformance for nearly a decade. This problem exists throughout the country.

Currently, OPO performance is measured by data that is self-reported, unaudited, and fraught with errors. Many of these errors have been documented by Lenny Bernstein and Kimberly Kindy at the Washington Post.

That is why today I introduced legislation that would require organ procurement organizations to be held to metrics that are objective, verifiable, and not subject to self-interpretation. This way, there can be meaningful transparency, evaluation, and accountability. Updating these metrics will also enable geographic-level donation rates to be evaluated and improved. This is desperately needed for the more than 113,000 Americans currently waiting for a lifesaving transplant. The legislation I introduced today is supported by the American Society of Nephrology, Dialysis Patient Citizens, and the nonprofit group ORGANIZE. Additionally, in April of this year, I wrote to CMS Administrator Seema Verma urging CMS to update OPO metrics to be objective and verifiable.

I am hopeful that we will soon see action from the White House and the Department of Health and Human Services. You see, this issue is very per-

sonal to me. My friend Dave "Gunny" McFarland from Jeffersonville, IN, died because his heart transplant never came. We served together in the U.S. Marine Corps, and over the years, I have gotten to know his widow, Jennifer McFarland Kern. Jen has made it her mission to raise awareness about the organ transplant process and to help prevent others from facing a similar situation.

Because the system is so complex, most people don't know how it works or if patients are actually being protected. It is time to change that. Today's legislation is the first in a series of bills I am working on to reform our organ donation system once and for all and help save precious lives. I will not stop until we increase the availability of organs for patients in need.

Semper fidelis.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 272—CONGRATULATING THE UNITED STATES WOMEN'S NATIONAL SOCCER TEAM ON WINNING THE 2019 FIFA WOMEN'S WORLD CUP

Mr. WICKER submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation:

S. RES. 272

Whereas, on July 7, 2019, the United States Women's National Soccer Team won the 2019 FIFA Women's World Cup by defeating the Netherlands Women's National Football Team;

Whereas, that victory marks the first time a country has won 4 Women's World Cup titles;

Whereas, the United States Women's National Soccer Team began its historic run with an overwhelming 13-0 victory, the largest ever winning margin in the history of World Cup soccer;

Whereas, over the course of the month-long tournament, the United States Women's National Soccer Team scored 26 goals, breaking the record the team set in 1991 of 25 goals; and

Whereas the players of the United States Women's National Soccer Team presented a shining example of sportsmanship, camaraderie, and skill to all people of the United States and to the world: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) congratulates the United States Women's National Soccer Team for winning an unprecedented 4 Women's World Cup titles and for inspiring a new generation of youth in the United States to strive for physical greatness and athletic achievement; and

(2) directs the Secretary of the Senate to transmit an enrolled copy of this resolution to—

(A) Carlos Cordeiro, President of the United States Soccer Federation; and

(B) Jill Ellis, Head Coach of the United States Women's National Soccer Team.

SENATE RESOLUTION 273—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE WITH RESPECT TO HEALTH CARE RIGHTS

Mr. MERKLEY (for himself, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. SCHATZ, Ms. BALDWIN,

Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. BROWN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. WARREN, Mr. MARKEY, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:

S. RES. 273

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that all people of the United States have the right—

(1) to affordable health insurance coverage, including—

(A) the right of individuals with pre-existing conditions to secure health insurance with the same terms, benefits, and price as individuals who do not have pre-existing conditions;

(B) the right to a comprehensive set of essential health benefits in the individual and small group markets;

(C) the right to stay on a parent's policy until age 26 for young adults who meet certain requirements;

(D) the right to keep health coverage after getting sick, even if the individual made an honest mistake on his or her insurance application;

(E) the right to use an individual's own resources to purchase and pay for treatment or services; and

(F) the right to a cap on the yearly deductibles and other out-of-pocket costs an individual is required to pay for covered services under a health insurance plan;

(2) to coverage and access to health care services, including—

(A) the right to health insurance coverage regardless of an individual's pre-existing medical conditions or health status;

(B) the right to certain preventive screenings without paying out-of-pocket fees or copayments;

(C) the right to health insurance that provides value relative to the premium cost;

(D) the right to be held harmless from surprise medical bills;

(E) the right to coverage of mental health and substance abuse services with no annual or lifetime limits (including behavioral health treatment, mental and behavioral health inpatient services, substance use disorder treatment);

(F) the right to mental health and substance abuse benefits without financial, treatment, or care management limitations that only apply to such benefits;

(G) the right to access all smoking cessation medications that are approved by the Food and Drug Administration;

(H) the right to choose a provider, and to receive an accurate list of all participating providers;

(I) the right to access doctors, specialists, and hospitals;

(J) the right to emergency medical services without—

(i) preauthorization for emergency services;

(ii) extra administrative hurdles for out-of-network emergency services; or

(iii) higher cost-sharing for out-of-network emergency services than in-network emergency services;

(K) the right to affordable medications;

(L) the right to physical, mental, and oral care;

(M) the right to a treatment plan from provider for a complex or serious medical condition;

(N) the right to go directly to a women's health care specialist (including obstetricians and gynecologists) without a referral for routine and preventive health care services;

(O) the right to a full scope of reproductive health services, including contraceptive care, pregnancy-related care, prenatal care, miscarriage management, family planning services, abortion care, labor and delivery services, and postnatal care;

(P) the right to breastfeeding support, counseling, and equipment (including manual and electric pumping equipment);

(Q) the right to prescription medications and medical and surgical services related to gender transition;

(R) the right to try investigational drugs;

(S) the right to a second medical opinion;

(T) the right to home care services;

(U) the right to a full scope of hospice and palliative care, and end-of-life options; and

(V) the right of pediatric patients to a full scope of services offered to adult patients;

(3) to health information and records privacy;

(4) to explanations of coverage decisions, including—

(A) the right to an explanation and appeal if a plan denies payment for a medical treatment or service;

(B) the right to an internal appeal of payment decisions of private health plans if the health plan refuses to make a payment;

(C) the right to a review by an outside review, by an independent organization; and

(D) the right to complain, through grievance processes;

(5) to transparency, including—

(A) the right to an easy-to-understand summary of benefits and coverage;

(B) the right to at least 30 days' notice if an insurer cancels coverage;

(C) the right to clear justification and explanation for premium increases that are unreasonable;

(D) the right to know how an enrollee's plan pays its providers;

(E) the right to give informed consent and understanding about medical conditions, risks and benefits of treatment, and appropriate alternatives;

(F) the right to know how drug companies set drug prices; and

(G) the right to know the amount of money pharmacy benefit managers keep and the amount of savings from pharmacy benefits managers that reach patients and consumers;

(6) to protection from discrimination, including on the basis of race, color, national origin, sex (including sexual orientation and gender identity), age, disability, or documentation status; and

(7) to culturally appropriate care, including health care services in a language that the patient understands and that is culturally sensitive.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 906. Mr. GRASSLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 386, to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to eliminate the per-country numerical limitation for employment-based immigrants, to increase the per-country numerical limitation for family-sponsored immigrants, and for other purposes; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SA 907. Mr. THUNE (for Mrs. SHAHEEN) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 239, to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in recognition of Christa McAuliffe.

SA 908. Mr. THUNE (for Mr. CRUZ (for himself and Mr. DURBIN)) proposed an amendment to the resolution S. Res. 188, 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.

SA 909. Mr. THUNE (for Mr. CRUZ (for himself and Mr. DURBIN)) proposed an amendment to the resolution S. Res. 188, *supra*.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 906. Mr. GRASSLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 386, to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to eliminate the per-country numerical limitation for employment-based immigrants, to increase the per-country numerical limitation for family-sponsored immigrants, and for other purposes; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

SEC. 3. POSTING AVAILABLE POSITIONS THROUGH THE DEPARTMENT OF LABOR.

(a) DEPARTMENT OF LABOR WEBSITE.—Section 212(n)(6) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(n)(6)) is added, to read as follows:

“(6) For purposes of complying with paragraph (1)(C)—

“(A) Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of the Fairness for High-Skilled Immigrants Act of 2019, the Secretary of Labor shall establish a searchable internet website for posting positions in accordance with paragraph (1)(C) that is available to the public without charge, except that the Secretary may delay the launch of such website for a single period identified by the Secretary by notice in the Federal Register that shall not exceed 30 days.

“(B) The Secretary may work with private companies or nonprofit organizations to develop and operate the Internet website described in subparagraph (A).

“(C) The Secretary shall promulgate rules, after notice and a period for comment, to carry out this paragraph.”.

(b) PUBLICATION REQUIREMENT.—The Secretary of Labor shall submit to Congress, and publish in the Federal Register and in other appropriate media, a notice of the date on which the Internet website required under section 212(n)(6) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as established by subsection (a), will be operational.

(c) APPLICATION.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply to any application filed on or after the date that is 90 days after the date described in subsection (b).

(d) INTERNET POSTING REQUIREMENT.—Section 212(n)(1)(C) of such Act is amended—

(1) by redesignating clause (ii) as subclause (II);

(2) by striking “(i) has provided” and inserting the following:

“(ii)(I) has provided”; and

(3) by inserting before clause (ii), as redesignated by paragraph (2), the following:

“(i) except in the case of an employer filing a petition on behalf of an H-1B nonimmigrant who has already been counted against the numerical limitations and is not eligible for a full 6-year period, as described in section 214(g)(7), or on behalf of an H-1B nonimmigrant authorized to accept employment under section 214(n), has posted on the internet website described in paragraph (6), for at least 30 calendar days, a description of each position for which a nonimmigrant is sought, that includes—

“(I) the occupational classification, and if different the employer's job title for the position, in which the nonimmigrant(s) will be employed;

“(II) the education, training, or experience qualifications for the position; and

“(III) the salary or wage range and employee benefits offered;

“(IV) the location(s) at which the nonimmigrant(s) will be employed; and

“(V) the process for applying for a position; and”.

SEC. 4. H-1B EMPLOYER APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS.

(a) WAGE DETERMINATION INFORMATION.—Section 212(n)(1)(D) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(n)(1)(D)) is amended by inserting “the prevailing wage determination methodology used under subparagraph (A)(i)(II),” after “shall contain”.

(b) NEW APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS.—Section 212(n)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(n)(1)) is amended by inserting after subparagraph (G)(ii) the following:

“(H)(i) The employer, or a person or entity acting on the employer's behalf, has not advertised any available position specified in the application in an advertisement that states or indicates that—

“(I) such position is only available to an individual who is or will be an H-1B nonimmigrant; or

“(II) an individual who is or will be an H-1B nonimmigrant shall receive priority or a preference in the hiring process for such position.

“(ii) The employer has not primarily recruited individuals who are or who will be H-1B nonimmigrants to fill such position.

“(I) If the employer, in a previous period specified by the Secretary, employed one or more H-1B nonimmigrants, the employer shall submit to the Secretary the Internal Revenue Service Form W-2 Wage and Tax Statements filed by the employer with respect to the H-1B nonimmigrants for such period.”.

(c) LABOR CONDITION APPLICATION FEE.—Section 212(n) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(n)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(6)(A) The Secretary of Labor shall promulgate a regulation that requires applicants under this subsection to pay an administrative fee to cover the average paperwork processing costs and other administrative costs.

“(B)(i) Fees collected under this paragraph shall be deposited as offsetting receipts within the general fund of the Treasury in a separate account, which shall be known as the ‘H-1B Administration, Oversight, Investigation, and Enforcement Account’ and shall remain available until expended.

“(ii) The Secretary of the Treasury shall refund amounts in such account to the Secretary of Labor for salaries and related expenses associated with the administration, oversight, investigation, and enforcement of the H-1B nonimmigrant visa program.”.

(d) ELIMINATION OF B-1 IN LIEU OF H-1.—Section 214(g) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1184(g)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(12)(A) Unless otherwise authorized by law, an alien normally classifiable under section 101(a)(15)(H)(i) who seeks admission to the United States to provide services in a specialty occupation described in paragraph (1) or (3) of subsection (i) may not be issued a visa or admitted under section 101(a)(15)(B) for such purpose.

“(B) Nothing in this paragraph may be construed to authorize the admission of an alien under section 101(a)(15)(B) who is coming to the United States for the purpose of performing skilled or unskilled labor if such admission is not otherwise authorized by law.”.

SEC. 5. INVESTIGATION AND DISPOSITION OF COMPLAINTS AGAINST H-1B EMPLOYERS.

(a) INVESTIGATION, WORKING CONDITIONS, AND PENALTIES.—Section 212(n)(2)(C) of the

Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(n)(2)(C)) is amended by striking clause (iv) and inserting the following:

“(iv)(I) An employer that has filed an application under this subsection violates this clause by taking, failing to take, or threatening to take or fail to take a personnel action, or intimidating, threatening, restraining, coercing, blacklisting, discharging, or discriminating in any other manner against an employee because the employee—

“(aa) disclosed information that the employee reasonably believes evidences a violation of this subsection or any rule or regulation pertaining to this subsection; or

“(bb) cooperated or sought to cooperate with the requirements under this subsection or any rule or regulation pertaining to this subsection.

“(II) An employer that violates this clause shall be liable to the employee harmed by such violation for lost wages and benefits.

“(III) In this clause, the term ‘employee’ includes—

“(aa) a current employee;

“(bb) a former employee; and

“(cc) an applicant for employment.”.

(b) **INFORMATION SHARING.**—Section 212(n)(2)(H) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(n)(2)(H)) is amended to read as follows:

“(H)(i) The Director of U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services shall provide the Secretary of Labor with any information contained in the materials submitted by employers of H-1B nonimmigrants as part of the petition adjudication process that indicates that the employer is not complying with visa program requirements for H-1B nonimmigrants.

“(ii) The Secretary may initiate and conduct an investigation and hearing under this paragraph after receiving information of noncompliance under this subparagraph.”.

SEC. 6. LABOR CONDITION APPLICATIONS.

(a) **APPLICATION REVIEW REQUIREMENTS.**—Section 212(n)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(n)(1)) is amended, in the undesignated matter following subparagraph (I), as added by section 4(b)—

(1) in the fourth sentence, by inserting “, and through the internet website of the Department of Labor, without charge.” after “Washington, D.C.”;

(2) in the fifth sentence, by striking “only for completeness” and inserting “for completeness, clear indicators of fraud or misrepresentation of material fact.”;

(3) in the sixth sentence, by striking “or obviously inaccurate” and inserting “, presents clear indicators of fraud or misrepresentation of material fact, or is obviously inaccurate”; and

(4) by adding at the end the following: “If the Secretary’s review of an application identifies clear indicators of fraud or misrepresentation of material fact, the Secretary may conduct an investigation and hearing in accordance with paragraph (2).”.

(b) **ENSURING PREVAILING WAGES ARE FOR AREA OF EMPLOYMENT AND ACTUAL WAGES ARE FOR SIMILARLY EMPLOYED.**—Section 212(n)(1)(A) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(n)(1)(A)) is amended—

(1) in clause (i), in the undesignated matter following subclause (II), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in clause (ii), by striking the period at the end and inserting “, and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(iii) will ensure that—

“(I) the actual wages or range identified in clause (i) relate solely to employees having substantially the same duties and responsibilities as the H-1B nonimmigrant in the geographical area of intended employment, considering experience, qualifications, edu-

cation, job responsibility and function, specialized knowledge, and other legitimate business factors, except in a geographical area there are no such employees, and

“(II) the prevailing wages identified in clause (ii) reflect the best available information for the geographical area within normal commuting distance of the actual address of employment at which the H-1B nonimmigrant is or will be employed.”.

(c) **PROCEDURES FOR INVESTIGATION AND DISPOSITION.**—Section 212(n)(2)(A) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(n)(2)(A)) is amended—

(1) by striking “(2)(A) Subject” and inserting “(2)(A)(i) Subject”;

(2) by striking the fourth sentence; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(ii)(I) Upon receipt of a complaint under clause (i), the Secretary may initiate an investigation to determine whether such a failure or misrepresentation has occurred.

“(II) The Secretary may conduct—

“(aa) surveys of the degree to which employers comply with the requirements under this subsection; and

“(bb) subject to subclause (IV), annual compliance audits of any employer that employs H-1B nonimmigrants during the applicable calendar year.

“(III) Subject to subclause (IV), the Secretary shall—

“(aa) conduct annual compliance audits of each employer that employs more than 100 full-time equivalent employees who are employed in the United States if more than 15 percent of such full-time employees are H-1B nonimmigrants; and

“(bb) make available to the public an executive summary or report describing the general findings of the audits conducted under this subclause.

“(IV) In the case of an employer subject to an annual compliance audit in which there was no finding of a willful failure to meet a condition under subparagraph (C)(ii), no further annual compliance audit shall be conducted with respect to such employer for a period of not less than 4 years, absent evidence of misrepresentation or fraud.”.

(d) **PENALTIES FOR VIOLATIONS.**—Section 212(n)(2)(C) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(n)(2)(C)) is amended—

(1) in clause (i)—

(A) in the matter preceding subclause (I), by striking “a condition of paragraph (1)(B), (1)(E), or (1)(F)” and inserting “a condition of paragraph (1)(B), (1)(E), (1)(F), (1)(H), or (1)(I)”;

(B) in subclause (I), by striking “\$1,000” and inserting “\$3,000”;

(2) in clause (ii)(I), by striking “\$5,000” and inserting “\$15,000”;

(3) in clause (iii)(I), by striking “\$35,000” and inserting “\$100,000”; and

(4) in clause (vi)(III), by striking “\$1,000” and inserting “\$3,000”.

(e) **INITIATION OF INVESTIGATIONS.**—Section 212(n)(2)(G) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(n)(2)(G)) is amended—

(1) in clause (i), by striking “In the case of an investigation” in the second sentence and all that follows through the period at the end of the clause;

(2) in clause (ii), in the first sentence, by striking “and whose identity” and all that follows through “failure or failures.” and inserting “the Secretary of Labor may conduct an investigation into the employer’s compliance with the requirements under this subsection.”;

(3) in clause (iii), by striking the second sentence;

(4) by striking clauses (iv) and (v);

(5) by redesignating clauses (vi), (vii), and (viii) as clauses (iv), (v), and (vi), respectively;

(6) in clause (iv), as so redesignated—

(A) by striking “clause (viii)” and inserting “clause (vi)”;

(B) by striking “meet a condition described in clause (ii)” and inserting “comply with the requirements under this subsection”;

(7) by amending clause (v), as so redesignated, to read as follows:

“(v)(I) The Secretary of Labor shall provide notice to an employer of the intent to conduct an investigation under clause (i) or (ii).

“(II) The notice shall be provided in such a manner, and shall contain sufficient detail, to permit the employer to respond to the allegations before an investigation is commenced.

“(III) The Secretary is not required to comply with this clause if the Secretary determines that such compliance would interfere with an effort by the Secretary to investigate or secure compliance by the employer with the requirements of this subsection.

“(IV) A determination by the Secretary under this clause shall not be subject to judicial review.”;

(8) in clause (vi), as so redesignated, by striking “An investigation” in the first sentence and all that follows through “the determination.” in the second sentence and inserting “If the Secretary of Labor, after an investigation under clause (i) or (ii), determines that a reasonable basis exists to make a finding that the employer has failed to comply with the requirements under this subsection, the Secretary shall provide interested parties with notice of such determination and an opportunity for a hearing in accordance with section 556 of title 5, United States Code, not later than 60 days after the date of such determination.”; and

(9) by adding at the end the following:

“(vii) If the Secretary of Labor, after a hearing, finds that the employer has violated a requirement under this subsection, the Secretary may impose a penalty pursuant to subparagraph (C).”.

SA 907. Mr. THUNE (for Mrs. SHAHEEN) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 239, to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in recognition of Christa McAuliffe; as follows:

On page 4, line 13, strike “2020” and insert “2021”.

On page 5, line 6, strike “2020” and insert “2021”.

On page 5, line 7, strike “2020” and insert “2021”.

SA 908. Mr. THUNE (for Mr. CRUZ (for himself and Mr. DURBIN)) proposed an amendment to the resolution S. Res. 188, 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; as follows:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

That the Senate—

(1) supports the African Union Peace and Security Council’s initial 2-week deadline urging a swift transfer of power by the military to a civilian-led political authority in Sudan that—

(A) has a civilian character and composition reflecting the will of the Declaration of Freedom and Change Forces leading negotiations on behalf of citizens; and

(B) immediately begins a transparent process leading to credible elections and security sector reforms;

(2) calls on the ruling authorities in Sudan—

(A) to respect the right to freedom of association and expression;

(B) to protect the rights of opposition political parties, journalists, human rights defenders, religious minorities, nongovernmental organizations, and civic movements to operate without interference;

(C) to lift the bureaucratic restrictions on, and facilitate access for, humanitarian relief operations;

(D) to introduce strong measures to create transparency and address the structural corruption and kleptocracy of the state;

(E) to pursue accountability for serious crimes and human rights abuses by former President al-Bashir's regime and permit international human rights monitors to deploy in Sudan to examine the allegations of atrocities committed against protesters and civilians during 2019;

(F) to release remaining political prisoners and refrain from arbitrary arrest, detention, and torture; and

(G) to immediately restore Internet access and avoid further denial of access to suppress the fundamental human right of freedom of expression and association by Sudanese citizens;

(3) urges the United States Government to lead in efforts that advance a peaceful transfer of power and a civilian-led transition period focused on creating the conditions under which timely democratic elections can be held that will meet international standards and be overseen by credible domestic and international electoral observers, and for the peaceful resolution of Sudan's conflicts;

(4) encourages the African Union and its member states to continue supporting the Sudanese people's aspirations for democracy, justice, and peace;

(5) expresses concern that the participation in the transitional government of individuals who have been implicated in possible war crimes would undermine efforts to restore peace and democracy and pursue justice and accountability in Sudan;

(6) emphasizes that until a transition to a credible civilian-led government that reflects the aspirations of the Sudanese people is established, the process to consider removing Sudan from the State Sponsor of Terrorism List, lifting any other remaining sanctions on Sudan, or normalizing relations with the Government of Sudan will continue to be suspended; and

(7) stands in solidarity with the people of Sudan and their aspirations for a democratic, participatory government.

SA 909. Mr. THUNE (for Mr. CRUZ (for himself and Mr. DURBIN)) proposed an amendment to the resolution S. Res. 188, 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; as follows:

Strike the preamble and insert the following:

Whereas the nation of Sudan has endured corrupt and brutal dictatorships for most of its post-independence period since 1956;

Whereas President Omar al-Bashir came to power through a military coup in 1989, and for the next 3 decades his government was responsible for horrendous crimes in Sudan, especially in Darfur, South Kordofan, Blue Nile, and in what is now the Republic of South Sudan;

Whereas the United States Government designated Sudan as a State Sponsor of Terrorism on August 12, 1993, for its support to international terrorist organizations and extremists, including elements of what would later be known as al Qaeda;

Whereas more than 2 decades of civil war between President al-Bashir's government and insurgents in southern Sudan resulted in

more than 2,000,000 deaths and led to the eventual independence of South Sudan in 2011;

Whereas in 2003, President al-Bashir's government launched a ruthless crackdown against insurgents and civilians in Darfur, which killed at least 300,000 Sudanese and displaced 2,500,000 more people, prompting Congress and the Administration of President George W. Bush, in 2004, to describe the Government of Sudan's actions in Darfur as genocide;

Whereas in 2011, when conflict resumed in South Kordofan and Blue Nile states, President al-Bashir's government conducted indiscriminate bombings, raided villages, raped and killed civilians, and waged a campaign of forced starvation in the Nuba Mountains region of South Kordofan that displaced as many as 2,000,000 people;

Whereas, while the fighting between government forces and insurgents in Darfur has subsided since 2016, violent attacks against civilians continue and humanitarian access remains restricted in some opposition stronghold areas of Darfur, South Kordofan, and Blue Nile;

Whereas President al-Bashir remains the subject of 2 outstanding arrest warrants from the International Criminal Court based on charges that include 5 counts of crimes against humanity, 2 counts of war crimes, and 3 counts of genocide;

Whereas Sudan's economic crisis risks bringing the national economy to total collapse, further increasing the possibility of state failure and broader regional destabilization that could threaten a wide array of United States' interests in East and North Africa and the Red Sea regions;

Whereas the people of Sudan have engaged since December 2018 in a wave of peaceful protests throughout the country, demanding an end to President al-Bashir's brutal regime and pressing for a citizen-centered democratic transition;

Whereas women have played a prominent role in the protest movement and have helped to bring about the ouster of former President al-Bashir;

Whereas President al-Bashir's government unlawfully detained and tortured hundreds of Sudanese during the protests, including political leaders, journalists, doctors, unionists, and youth and women leaders, in gross violation of international civil and human rights, some of whom remain in detention;

Whereas on February 22, 2019, President al-Bashir declared a year-long nationwide state of emergency and curfew, dissolved his government, replaced state governors with senior security officers, and expanded the powers of Sudan's security forces;

Whereas when protesters in early April 2019 challenged President al-Bashir's decrees and gathered in the tens of thousands in front of Sudan's military headquarters in Khartoum to call for an end to the al-Bashir regime, some elements of the security forces tried to disperse the crowds with violence, leading to clashes between internal security forces and the military as some soldiers sought to protect the protesters;

Whereas on April 11, 2019, after 5 days of mass protests in front of their headquarters, Sudan's military removed President al-Bashir from office, and the country's First Vice President and Minister of Defense, Lt. General Awad Ibn Auf—

(1) announced that he would lead a Transitional Military Council that would rule the country for a 2-year period;

(2) suspended the Constitution;

(3) the dissolved the National Assembly; and

(4) imposed a 3-month State of Emergency and nightly curfew;

Whereas Lt. General Abdel-Fattah al-Burhan, former general inspector of the Sudanese Armed Forces, who replaced Lt. General Ibn Auf on April 12, 2019, as the chairman of the Transitional Military Council, said, on April 21, 2019, that the council was "ready to hand over power tomorrow to a civilian government agreed by political forces";

Whereas the Rapid Support Forces, paramilitary forces led by Lt. General Mohammed Hamdan Dagolo (also known as "Hemmeti"), a former Janjaweed leader who currently serves as the deputy chairman of the Transitional Military Council—

(1) have been implicated by the United Nations Panel of Experts in widespread violations of international humanitarian law that human rights groups suggest may amount to war crimes; and

(2) have been accused of killing protesters during the recent uprising;

Whereas, the African Union Peace and Security Council convened on April 30, 2019, and reiterated its conviction that "a military-led transition in Sudan will be totally unacceptable and contrary to the will and legitimate aspirations" of the Sudanese people, expressed "deep regret" that the military had not stepped aside, and, noting negotiations were underway, demanded that the military hand over power to a civilian-led transitional authority within 60 days;

Whereas on June 3, 2019, the Rapid Support Forces led a brutal attack on peaceful protesters, with the aim of eradicating a large sit-in site in front of Sudan's military headquarters in Khartoum, which resulted in more than 100 deaths, hundreds of injuries, several cases of rape, indiscriminate beatings and shooting of unarmed protesters, and other human rights abuses;

Whereas, the Khartoum massacre on June 3, 2019, was followed by a nationwide crackdown led by the Rapid Support Forces against peaceful protesters and civilians that included—

(1) violent attacks on citizens in Khartoum and other major cities;

(2) the brutal detention of protesters and opposition leaders like Yasir Arman, with many disappearances of those detained;

(3) the targeting of hospitals and medical workers caring for the injured; and

(4) the overt attempts by Sudanese authorities to cover-up the scale of their atrocities by dumping bodies in the Nile river and shutting off access to the Internet; and

Whereas, the international community has widely condemned the actions of the Rapid Support Forces, with the African Union's Peace and Security Council voting on June 6, 2019, to suspend Sudan from all African Union activities until a civilian government is formed, and United Nations' experts appointed by the United Nations Human Rights Council, on June 12, 2019, calling for an independent investigation into the violence against protesters in Sudan: Now, therefore, be it

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I have 5 requests for committees to meet during today's session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today's session of the Senate:

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session

of the Senate on Tuesday, July 9, 2019, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, July 9, 2019, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON EMERGING THREATS AND CAPABILITIES

The Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities of the Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, July 9, 2019, at 3 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON AVIATION AND SPACE

The Subcommittee on Aviation and Space of the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, July 9, 2019, at 3 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ENERGY

The Subcommittee on Energy of the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, July 9, 2019, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

ENCOURAGING A SWIFT TRANSFER OF POWER BY THE MILITARY TO A CIVILIAN-LED POLITICAL AUTHORITY IN THE REPUBLIC OF THE SUDAN

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 106, S. Res. 188.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 188) 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.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with an amendment to strike all after the resolving clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

Whereas the nation of Sudan has endured corrupt and brutal dictatorships for most of its post-independence period since 1956;

Whereas President Omar al-Bashir came to power through a military coup in 1989, and for the next three decades his government was responsible for horrendous crimes in Sudan, especially in Darfur, South Kordofan, Blue Nile, and in what is now the Republic of South Sudan;

Whereas the United States Government designated Sudan a State Sponsor of Terrorism on August 12, 1993, for its support to international terrorist organizations and extremists, including elements of what would later be known as al Qaeda;

Whereas more than two decades of civil war between President al-Bashir's government and insurgents in southern Sudan resulted in more than 2,000,000 deaths and led to the eventual independence of South Sudan in 2011;

Whereas in 2003, President al-Bashir's government launched a ruthless crackdown against insurgents and civilians in Darfur that killed at

least 300,000 Sudanese and displaced 2,500,000 more, resulting in Congress and the Administration of President George W. Bush in 2004 describing as genocide the Government of Sudan's actions in Darfur;

Whereas in 2011, when conflict resumed in South Kordofan and Blue Nile states, President al-Bashir's government conducted indiscriminate bombings and raided villages, raping and killing civilians, and waged a campaign of forced starvation in the Nuba Mountains region of South Kordofan that displaced as many as 2,000,000 people;

Whereas, while the fighting between government forces and insurgents in Darfur has subsided since 2016, violent attacks against civilians continue and humanitarian access remains restricted in some opposition stronghold areas of Darfur, South Kordofan, and Blue Nile;

Whereas President al-Bashir remains the subject of two outstanding arrest warrants from the International Criminal Court based on charges including five counts of crimes against humanity, two counts of war crimes, and three counts of genocide;

Whereas Sudan's economic crisis risks bringing the national economy to total collapse, further increasing the possibility of state failure and broader regional destabilization that could threaten a wide array of United States interests in East and North Africa and the Red Sea regions;

Whereas the people of Sudan have engaged since December 2018 in a wave of peaceful protests throughout the country demanding an end to President al-Bashir's brutal regime and pressing for a citizen-centered democratic transition;

Whereas women have played a prominent role in the protest movement, helping bring about the ouster of former President al-Bashir;

Whereas President al-Bashir's government unlawfully detained and tortured hundreds of Sudanese during the protests, including political leaders, journalists, doctors, unionists, and youth and women leaders, in gross violation of international civil and human rights, and some of them remain in detention;

Whereas on February 22, 2019, President al-Bashir declared a year-long nationwide state of emergency and curfew, dissolved his government, replaced state governors with senior security officers, and expanded the powers of Sudan's security forces;

Whereas when protesters in early April challenged President al-Bashir's decrees and gathered in the tens of thousands in front of Sudan's military headquarters in Khartoum to call for an end to the regime, some elements of the security forces tried to disperse the crowds with violence, leading to clashes between internal security forces and the military as some soldiers sought to protect the protesters;

Whereas on April 11, 2019, after five days of mass protests in front of their headquarters, Sudan's military removed President al-Bashir from office and the country's First Vice President and Minister of Defense, Lt. General Awad Ibn Auf, announced he would lead a Transitional Military Council that would rule the country for a two-year period, suspended the Constitution, dissolved the National Assembly, and imposed a three-month State of Emergency and nightly curfew;

Whereas Lt. General Abdel-Fattah al-Burhan, former general inspector of the Sudanese Armed Forces, who replaced Lt. General Ibn Auf on April 12, 2019, as the chairman of the Transitional Military Council, said on April 21, 2019, that the council was "ready to hand over power tomorrow to a civilian government agreed by political forces";

Whereas the Rapid Support Forces, paramilitary forces led by Lt. General Mohammed Hamdan Dagolo, also known as "Hemmeti", a former Janjaweed leader who currently serves as the deputy chairman of the Transitional Military Council, have been implicated by the United Nations Panel of Experts in widespread

violations of international humanitarian law that human rights groups suggest may amount to war crimes, and have also been accused of killing protesters during the recent uprising; and

Whereas, the African Union Peace and Security Council convened on April 30, 2019, and reiterated its conviction that "a military-led transition in Sudan will be totally unacceptable and contrary to the will and legitimate aspirations" of the Sudanese people, expressed "deep regret" that the military had not stepped aside, and, noting negotiations were underway, demanded that the military hand over power to a civilian-led transitional authority within 60 days: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the African Union Peace and Security Council's initial two-week deadline urging a swift transfer of power by the military to a civilian-led political authority in Sudan that—

(A) has a civilian character and composition reflecting the will of the Declaration of Freedom and Change Forces leading negotiations on behalf of citizens; and

(B) immediately begins a transparent process leading to credible elections and security sector reforms;

(2) calls on the ruling authorities in Sudan to—

(A) respect the right to freedom of association and expression;

(B) protect the rights of opposition political parties, journalists, human rights defenders, religious minorities, nongovernmental organizations, and civic movements to operate without interference;

(C) lift the bureaucratic restrictions on and facilitate access for humanitarian relief operations;

(D) introduce strong measures to create transparency and address the structural corruption and kleptocracy of the state;

(E) pursue accountability for serious crimes and human rights abuses by former President al-Bashir's regime and elements of the security forces under the control of the Transitional Military Council; and

(F) release remaining political prisoners and refrain from arbitrary arrest, detention, and torture;

(3) urges the United States Government to support efforts to advance a peaceful transfer of power and a civilian-led transition period that creates the conditions under which timely democratic elections can be held that will meet international standards and be overseen by credible domestic and international electoral observers, and for the peaceful resolution of Sudan's conflicts;

(4) encourages the African Union and its member states to continue supporting the Sudanese people's aspirations for democracy, justice, and peace;

(5) expresses concern that the participation in the transitional government of individuals who have been implicated in possible war crimes would undermine efforts to restore peace and democracy and pursue justice and accountability in Sudan;

(6) emphasizes that until a transition to a credible civilian-led government that reflects the aspirations of the Sudanese people is established, the process to consider removing Sudan from the State Sponsor of Terrorism List, lifting any other remaining sanctions on Sudan, or normalizing relations with the Government of Sudan will continue to be suspended; and

(7) stands in solidarity with the people of Sudan and their aspirations for a democratic, participatory government.

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee-reported amendment to the resolution be withdrawn; that the Cruz substitute amendment to the resolution at the desk be considered and

agreed to; that the resolution, as amended, be agreed to; that the committee-reported amendment to the preamble be withdrawn; that the Cruz amendment to the preamble at the desk be considered and agreed to; and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The committee-reported amendment to the resolution, in the nature of a substitute, was withdrawn.

The amendment (No. 908), in the nature of a substitute, was agreed to as follows:

(Purpose: In the nature of a substitute)

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

That the Senate—

(1) supports the African Union Peace and Security Council's initial 2-week deadline urging a swift transfer of power by the military to a civilian-led political authority in Sudan that—

(A) has a civilian character and composition reflecting the will of the Declaration of Freedom and Change Forces leading negotiations on behalf of citizens; and

(B) immediately begins a transparent process leading to credible elections and security sector reforms;

(2) calls on the ruling authorities in Sudan—

(A) to respect the right to freedom of association and expression;

(B) to protect the rights of opposition political parties, journalists, human rights defenders, religious minorities, nongovernmental organizations, and civic movements to operate without interference;

(C) to lift the bureaucratic restrictions on, and facilitate access for, humanitarian relief operations;

(D) to introduce strong measures to create transparency and address the structural corruption and kleptocracy of the state;

(E) to pursue accountability for serious crimes and human rights abuses by former President al-Bashir's regime and permit international human rights monitors to deploy in Sudan to examine the allegations of atrocities committed against protesters and civilians during 2019;

(F) to release remaining political prisoners and refrain from arbitrary arrest, detention, and torture; and

(G) to immediately restore Internet access and avoid further denial of access to suppress the fundamental human right of freedom of expression and association by Sudanese citizens;

(3) urges the United States Government to lead in efforts that advance a peaceful transfer of power and a civilian-led transition period focused on creating the conditions under which timely democratic elections can be held that will meet international standards and be overseen by credible domestic and international electoral observers, and for the peaceful resolution of Sudan's conflicts;

(4) encourages the African Union and its member states to continue supporting the Sudanese people's aspirations for democracy, justice, and peace;

(5) expresses concern that the participation in the transitional government of individuals who have been implicated in possible war crimes would undermine efforts to restore peace and democracy and pursue justice and accountability in Sudan;

(6) emphasizes that until a transition to a credible civilian-led government that reflects the aspirations of the Sudanese people is established, the process to consider remov-

ing Sudan from the State Sponsor of Terrorism List, lifting any other remaining sanctions on Sudan, or normalizing relations with the Government of Sudan will continue to be suspended; and

(7) stands in solidarity with the people of Sudan and their aspirations for a democratic, participatory government.

The resolution (S. Res. 188), as amended, was agreed to.

The committee-reported amendment to the preamble was withdrawn.

The amendment (No. 909) to the preamble was agreed to as follows:

(Purpose: To amend the preamble)

Strike the preamble and insert the following:

Whereas the nation of Sudan has endured corrupt and brutal dictatorships for most of its post-independence period since 1956;

Whereas President Omar al-Bashir came to power through a military coup in 1989, and for the next 3 decades his government was responsible for horrendous crimes in Sudan, especially in Darfur, South Kordofan, Blue Nile, and in what is now the Republic of South Sudan;

Whereas the United States Government designated Sudan as a State Sponsor of Terrorism on August 12, 1993, for its support to international terrorist organizations and extremists, including elements of what would later be known as al Qaeda;

Whereas more than 2 decades of civil war between President al-Bashir's government and insurgents in southern Sudan resulted in more than 2,000,000 deaths and led to the eventual independence of South Sudan in 2011;

Whereas in 2003, President al-Bashir's government launched a ruthless crackdown against insurgents and civilians in Darfur, which killed at least 300,000 Sudanese and displaced 2,500,000 more people, prompting Congress and the Administration of President George W. Bush, in 2004, to describe the Government of Sudan's actions in Darfur as genocide;

Whereas in 2011, when conflict resumed in South Kordofan and Blue Nile states, President al-Bashir's government conducted indiscriminate bombings, raided villages, raped and killed civilians, and waged a campaign of forced starvation in the Nuba Mountains region of South Kordofan that displaced as many as 2,000,000 people;

Whereas, while the fighting between government forces and insurgents in Darfur has subsided since 2016, violent attacks against civilians continue and humanitarian access remains restricted in some opposition stronghold areas of Darfur, South Kordofan, and Blue Nile;

Whereas President al-Bashir remains the subject of 2 outstanding arrest warrants from the International Criminal Court based on charges that include 5 counts of crimes against humanity, 2 counts of war crimes, and 3 counts of genocide;

Whereas Sudan's economic crisis risks bringing the national economy to total collapse, further increasing the possibility of state failure and broader regional destabilization that could threaten a wide array of United States' interests in East and North Africa and the Red Sea regions;

Whereas the people of Sudan have engaged since December 2018 in a wave of peaceful protests throughout the country, demanding an end to President al-Bashir's brutal regime and pressing for a citizen-centered democratic transition;

Whereas women have played a prominent role in the protest movement and have helped to bring about the ouster of former President al-Bashir;

Whereas President al-Bashir's government unlawfully detained and tortured hundreds of Sudanese during the protests, including political leaders, journalists, doctors, unionists, and youth and women leaders, in gross violation of international civil and human rights, some of whom remain in detention;

Whereas on February 22, 2019, President al-Bashir declared a year-long nationwide state of emergency and curfew, dissolved his government, replaced state governors with senior security officers, and expanded the powers of Sudan's security forces;

Whereas when protesters in early April 2019 challenged President al-Bashir's decrees and gathered in the tens of thousands in front of Sudan's military headquarters in Khartoum to call for an end to the al-Bashir regime, some elements of the security forces tried to disperse the crowds with violence, leading to clashes between internal security forces and the military as some soldiers sought to protect the protesters;

Whereas on April 11, 2019, after 5 days of mass protests in front of their headquarters, Sudan's military removed President al-Bashir from office, and the country's First Vice President and Minister of Defense, Lt. General Awad Ibn Auf—

(1) announced that he would lead a Transitional Military Council that would rule the country for a 2-year period;

(2) suspended the Constitution;

(3) the dissolved the National Assembly;

and

(4) imposed a 3-month State of Emergency and nightly curfew;

Whereas Lt. General Abdel-Fattah al-Burhan, former general inspector of the Sudanese Armed Forces, who replaced Lt. General Ibn Auf on April 12, 2019, as the chairman of the Transitional Military Council, said, on April 21, 2019, that the council was "ready to hand over power tomorrow to a civilian government agreed by political forces";

Whereas the Rapid Support Forces, paramilitary forces led by Lt. General Mohamed Hamdan Dagolo (also known as "Hemmeti"), a former Janjaweed leader who currently serves as the deputy chairman of the Transitional Military Council—

(1) have been implicated by the United Nations Panel of Experts in widespread violations of international humanitarian law that human rights groups suggest may amount to war crimes; and

(2) have been accused of killing protesters during the recent uprising;

Whereas, the African Union Peace and Security Council convened on April 30, 2019, and reiterated its conviction that "a military-led transition in Sudan will be totally unacceptable and contrary to the will and legitimate aspirations" of the Sudanese people, expressed "deep regret" that the military had not stepped aside, and, noting negotiations were underway, demanded that the military hand over power to a civilian-led transitional authority within 60 days;

Whereas on June 3, 2019, the Rapid Support Forces led a brutal attack on peaceful protesters, with the aim of eradicating a large sit-in site in front of Sudan's military headquarters in Khartoum, which resulted in more than 100 deaths, hundreds of injuries, several cases of rape, indiscriminate beatings and shooting of unarmed protesters, and other human rights abuses;

Whereas, the Khartoum massacre on June 3, 2019, was followed by a nationwide crackdown led by the Rapid Support Forces against peaceful protesters and civilians that included—

(1) violent attacks on citizens in Khartoum and other major cities;

(2) the brutal detention of protesters and opposition leaders like Yasir Arman, with many disappearances of those detained;

(3) the targeting of hospitals and medical workers caring for the injured; and

(4) the overt attempts by Sudanese authorities to cover-up the scale of their atrocities by dumping bodies in the Nile river and shutting off access to the Internet; and

Whereas, the international community has widely condemned the actions of the Rapid Support Forces, with the African Union's Peace and Security Council voting on June 6, 2019, to suspend Sudan from all African Union activities until a civilian government is formed, and United Nations' experts appointed by the United Nations Human Rights Council, on June 12, 2019, calling for an independent investigation into the violence against protesters in Sudan: Now, therefore, be it

The preamble, as amended, was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, and the preamble, as amended, reads as follows:

S. RES. 188

Whereas the nation of Sudan has endured corrupt and brutal dictatorships for most of its post-independence period since 1956;

Whereas President Omar al-Bashir came to power through a military coup in 1989, and for the next 3 decades his government was responsible for horrendous crimes in Sudan, especially in Darfur, South Kordofan, Blue Nile, and in what is now the Republic of South Sudan;

Whereas the United States Government designated Sudan as a State Sponsor of Terrorism on August 12, 1993, for its support to international terrorist organizations and extremists, including elements of what would later be known as al Qaeda;

Whereas more than 2 decades of civil war between President al-Bashir's government and insurgents in southern Sudan resulted in more than 2,000,000 deaths and led to the eventual independence of South Sudan in 2011;

Whereas in 2003, President al-Bashir's government launched a ruthless crackdown against insurgents and civilians in Darfur, which killed at least 300,000 Sudanese and displaced 2,500,000 more people, prompting Congress and the Administration of President George W. Bush, in 2004, to describe the Government of Sudan's actions in Darfur as genocide;

Whereas in 2011, when conflict resumed in South Kordofan and Blue Nile states, President al-Bashir's government conducted indiscriminate bombings, raided villages, raped and killed civilians, and waged a campaign of forced starvation in the Nuba Mountains region of South Kordofan that displaced as many as 2,000,000 people;

Whereas, while the fighting between government forces and insurgents in Darfur has subsided since 2016, violent attacks against civilians continue and humanitarian access remains restricted in some opposition stronghold areas of Darfur, South Kordofan, and Blue Nile;

Whereas President al-Bashir remains the subject of 2 outstanding arrest warrants from the International Criminal Court based on charges that include 5 counts of crimes against humanity, 2 counts of war crimes, and 3 counts of genocide;

Whereas Sudan's economic crisis risks bringing the national economy to total collapse, further increasing the possibility of state failure and broader regional destabilization that could threaten a wide array of United States' interests in East and North Africa and the Red Sea regions;

Whereas the people of Sudan have engaged since December 2018 in a wave of peaceful protests throughout the country, demanding an end to President al-Bashir's brutal regime

and pressing for a citizen-centered democratic transition;

Whereas women have played a prominent role in the protest movement and have helped to bring about the ouster of former President al-Bashir;

Whereas President al-Bashir's government unlawfully detained and tortured hundreds of Sudanese during the protests, including political leaders, journalists, doctors, unionists, and youth and women leaders, in gross violation of international civil and human rights, some of whom remain in detention;

Whereas on February 22, 2019, President al-Bashir declared a year-long nationwide state of emergency and curfew, dissolved his government, replaced state governors with senior security officers, and expanded the powers of Sudan's security forces;

Whereas when protesters in early April 2019 challenged President al-Bashir's decrees and gathered in the tens of thousands in front of Sudan's military headquarters in Khartoum to call for an end to the al-Bashir regime, some elements of the security forces tried to disperse the crowds with violence, leading to clashes between internal security forces and the military as some soldiers sought to protect the protesters;

Whereas on April 11, 2019, after 5 days of mass protests in front of their headquarters, Sudan's military removed President al-Bashir from office, and the country's First Vice President and Minister of Defense, Lt. General Awad Ibn Auf—

(1) announced that he would lead a Transitional Military Council that would rule the country for a 2-year period;

(2) suspended the Constitution;

(3) the dissolved the National Assembly; and

(4) imposed a 3-month State of Emergency and nightly curfew;

Whereas Lt. General Abdel-Fattah al-Burhan, former general inspector of the Sudanese Armed Forces, who replaced Lt. General Ibn Auf on April 12, 2019, as the chairman of the Transitional Military Council, said, on April 21, 2019, that the council was "ready to hand over power tomorrow to a civilian government agreed by political forces";

Whereas the Rapid Support Forces, paramilitary forces led by Lt. General Mohammed Hamdan Dagolo (also known as "Hemmeti"), a former Janjaweed leader who currently serves as the deputy chairman of the Transitional Military Council—

(1) have been implicated by the United Nations Panel of Experts in widespread violations of international humanitarian law that human rights groups suggest may amount to war crimes; and

(2) have been accused of killing protesters during the recent uprising;

Whereas, the African Union Peace and Security Council convened on April 30, 2019, and reiterated its conviction that "a military-led transition in Sudan will be totally unacceptable and contrary to the will and legitimate aspirations" of the Sudanese people, expressed "deep regret" that the military had not stepped aside, and, noting negotiations were underway, demanded that the military hand over power to a civilian-led transitional authority within 60 days;

Whereas on June 3, 2019, the Rapid Support Forces led a brutal attack on peaceful protesters, with the aim of eradicating a large sit-in site in front of Sudan's military headquarters in Khartoum, which resulted in more than 100 deaths, hundreds of injuries, several cases of rape, indiscriminate beatings and shooting of unarmed protesters, and other human rights abuses;

Whereas, the Khartoum massacre on June 3, 2019, was followed by a nationwide crackdown led by the Rapid Support Forces

against peaceful protesters and civilians that included—

(1) violent attacks on citizens in Khartoum and other major cities;

(2) the brutal detention of protesters and opposition leaders like Yasir Arman, with many disappearances of those detained;

(3) the targeting of hospitals and medical workers caring for the injured; and

(4) the overt attempts by Sudanese authorities to cover-up the scale of their atrocities by dumping bodies in the Nile river and shutting off access to the Internet; and

Whereas, the international community has widely condemned the actions of the Rapid Support Forces, with the African Union's Peace and Security Council voting on June 6, 2019, to suspend Sudan from all African Union activities until a civilian government is formed, and United Nations' experts appointed by the United Nations Human Rights Council, on June 12, 2019, calling for an independent investigation into the violence against protesters in Sudan: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the African Union Peace and Security Council's initial 2-week deadline urging a swift transfer of power by the military to a civilian-led political authority in Sudan that—

(A) has a civilian character and composition reflecting the will of the Declaration of Freedom and Change Forces leading negotiations on behalf of citizens; and

(B) immediately begins a transparent process leading to credible elections and security sector reforms;

(2) calls on the ruling authorities in Sudan—

(A) to respect the right to freedom of association and expression;

(B) to protect the rights of opposition political parties, journalists, human rights defenders, religious minorities, nongovernmental organizations, and civic movements to operate without interference;

(C) to lift the bureaucratic restrictions on, and facilitate access for, humanitarian relief operations;

(D) to introduce strong measures to create transparency and address the structural corruption and kleptocracy of the state;

(E) to pursue accountability for serious crimes and human rights abuses by former President al-Bashir's regime and permit international human rights monitors to deploy in Sudan to examine the allegations of atrocities committed against protesters and civilians during 2019;

(F) to release remaining political prisoners and refrain from arbitrary arrest, detention, and torture; and

(G) to immediately restore Internet access and avoid further denial of access to suppress the fundamental human right of freedom of expression and association by Sudanese citizens;

(3) urges the United States Government to lead in efforts that advance a peaceful transfer of power and a civilian-led transition period focused on creating the conditions under which timely democratic elections can be held that will meet international standards and be overseen by credible domestic and international electoral observers, and for the peaceful resolution of Sudan's conflicts;

(4) encourages the African Union and its member states to continue supporting the Sudanese people's aspirations for democracy, justice, and peace;

(5) expresses concern that the participation in the transitional government of individuals who have been implicated in possible war crimes would undermine efforts to restore peace and democracy and pursue justice and accountability in Sudan;

(6) emphasizes that until a transition to a credible civilian-led government that reflects the aspirations of the Sudanese people is established, the process to consider removing Sudan from the State Sponsor of Terrorism List, lifting any other remaining sanctions on Sudan, or normalizing relations with the Government of Sudan will continue to be suspended; and

(7) stands in solidarity with the people of Sudan and their aspirations for a democratic, participatory government.

CHRISTA MCAULIFFE COMMEMORATIVE COIN ACT OF 2019

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs be discharged from further consideration of S. 239 and that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 239) to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in recognition of Christa McAuliffe.

There being no objection, the committee was discharged, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. THUNE. I further ask unanimous consent that the Shaheen amendment, which is at the desk, be considered and agreed to.

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

The amendment (No. 907) was agreed to, as follows:

(Purpose: To improve the bill)

On page 4, line 13, strike “2020” and insert “2021”.

On page 5, line 6, strike “2020” and insert “2021”.

On page 5, line 7, strike “2020” and insert “2021”.

Mr. THUNE. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

Mr. THUNE. I know of no further debate on the bill, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate?

If not, the bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill, as amended, was passed, as follows:

S. 239

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 “Christa McAuliffe Commemorative Coin Act of 2019”.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) Christa McAuliffe was a social studies teacher at Concord High School in Concord, New Hampshire.

(2) In 1985, Christa McAuliffe was selected to be the first participant in the Teacher in Space program of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

(3) On January 28, 1986, Christa McAuliffe and 6 other astronauts were tragically killed during the Space Shuttle Challenger disaster.

(4) In 1989, For Inspiration and Recognition of Science and Technology (in this Act referred to as “FIRST”) was founded to inspire young people’s interest and participation in science and technology.

(5) The mission of FIRST “is to inspire young people to be science and technology leaders, by engaging them in exciting mentor-based programs that build science, engineering, and technology skills, that inspire innovation, and that foster well-rounded life capabilities including self-confidence, communication, and leadership”.

(6) 2019 marks the 30th anniversary of the founding of FIRST.

(7) Each year, more than 1,000,000 children from the United States and more than 86 countries participate in a FIRST program.

(8) Studies have shown that alumni of FIRST programs are more likely to become scientists and engineers and to volunteer in their communities.

(9) FIRST is dedicated to carrying on the mission of Christa McAuliffe of inspiring students and creating a new generation of dreamers and innovators.

(10) 2016 marked the 30th anniversary of the Space Shuttle Challenger tragedy.

SEC. 3. COIN SPECIFICATIONS.

(a) DENOMINATIONS.—In commemoration of Christa McAuliffe, the Secretary of the Treasury (hereafter referred to in this Act as the “Secretary”) shall mint and issue not more than 350,000 \$1 coins, each of which shall—

- (1) weigh 26.73 grams;
- (2) have a diameter of 1.500 inches; and
- (3) contain at least 90 percent silver.

(b) LEGAL TENDER.—The coins minted under this Act shall be legal tender, as provided in section 5103 of title 31, United States Code.

(c) NUMISMATIC ITEMS.—For purposes of sections 5134 and 5136 of title 31, United States Code, all coins minted under this Act shall be considered to be numismatic items.

SEC. 4. DESIGN OF COINS.

(a) DESIGN REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The design of the coins minted under this Act shall bear—

- (A) an image of and the name of Christa McAuliffe on the obverse side; and
- (B) a design on the reverse side that depicts the legacy of Christa McAuliffe as a teacher.

(2) DESIGNATION AND INSCRIPTIONS.—On each coin minted under this Act, there shall be—

- (A) a designation of the value of the coin;
- (B) an inscription of the year “2021”; and
- (C) inscriptions of the words “Liberty”, “In God We Trust”, “United States of America”, and “E Pluribus Unum”.

(b) SELECTION.—The design for the coins minted under this Act shall be—

- (1) selected by the Secretary, after consultation with the family of Christa McAuliffe, FIRST, and the Commission of Fine Arts; and
- (2) reviewed by the Citizens Coinage Advisory Committee.

SEC. 5. ISSUANCE OF COINS.

(a) QUALITY OF COINS.—Coins minted under this Act shall be issued in uncirculated and proof qualities.

(b) MINT FACILITY.—Only 1 facility of the United States Mint may be used to strike any particular quality of the coins minted under this Act.

(c) PERIOD FOR ISSUANCE.—The Secretary may issue coins under this Act only during the period beginning on January 1, 2021, and ending on December 31, 2021.

SEC. 6. SALE OF COINS.

(a) SALE PRICE.—The coins issued under this Act shall be sold by the Secretary at a price equal to the sum of—

- (1) the face value of the coins;
- (2) the surcharge provided under section 7(a) with respect to the coins; and
- (3) the cost of designing and issuing the coins, including—
 - (A) labor;
 - (B) materials;
 - (C) dies;
 - (D) use of machinery;
 - (E) overhead expenses;
 - (F) marketing; and
 - (G) shipping.

(b) BULK SALES.—The Secretary shall make bulk sales of the coins issued under this Act at a reasonable discount.

(c) PREPAID ORDERS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall accept prepaid orders for the coins minted under this Act before the issuance of the coins.

(2) DISCOUNT.—Sale prices with respect to prepaid orders under paragraph (1) shall be at a reasonable discount.

SEC. 7. SURCHARGES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—All sales of coins issued under this Act shall include a surcharge of \$10 per coin.

(b) DISTRIBUTION.—Subject to section 5134(f) of title 31, United States Code, and section 8(2), all surcharges received by the Secretary from the sale of coins issued under this Act shall be promptly paid by the Secretary to the FIRST robotics program for the purpose of engaging and inspiring young people, through mentor-based programs, to become leaders in the fields of science, technology, engineering, and mathematics.

(c) AUDITS.—The FIRST robotics program shall be subject to the audit requirements of section 5134(f)(2) of title 31, United States Code, with respect to the amounts received under subsection (b).

SEC. 8. FINANCIAL ASSURANCES.

The Secretary shall take such actions as may be necessary to ensure that—

(1) minting and issuing coins under this Act result in no net cost to the Federal Government; and

(2) no funds, including applicable surcharges, are disbursed to any recipient designated in section 7(b) until the total cost of designing and issuing all of the coins authorized by this Act, including labor, materials, dies, use of machinery, overhead expenses, marketing, and shipping, is recovered by the United States Treasury, consistent with sections 5112(m) and 5134(f) of title 31, United States Code.

Mr. THUNE. I further ask unanimous consent that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME—H.R. 2740 AND H.R. 3055

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, I understand that there are two bills at the desk, and I ask for their first reading en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bills by title for the first time en bloc.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A 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.

A bill (H.R. 3055) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes.

Mr. THUNE. I now ask for a second reading, and I object to my own request, all en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection having been heard, the bills will receive a second reading on the next legislative day.

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, JULY 10, 2019

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9:30 a.m., Wednesday, July 10; 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 Wetherell nomination.

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

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order following the remarks of Senator CASEY.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

NOMINATIONS

Mr. CASEY. Madam President, I rise this evening to talk about judicial nominations and, in my view, the state of play, where we are. I want to highlight some of the very real impacts these nominations have on Americans across the board.

We have had a number of opportunities this year to come together and have agreement on some judicial nominations, but, frankly, this year—the last several years—this issue has been the subject of conflict and sometimes rancor and division on the Senate floor and in the committee, the committee of jurisdiction, the Judiciary Committee.

I have raised concerns about the willingness of Senate Republicans to dismantle longstanding Senate rules but also Senate norms, all in a rush to pack the bench with nominees who are often both ideological and also, in some cases—not in all but in some cases—both too ideological and often unqualified.

Early this afternoon, the Senate voted to confirm Daniel Aaron Bress to a Ninth Circuit seat in California. I

will talk about his nomination just by way of example, not by way of argument before a confirmation vote because that has passed.

I think his nomination and confirmation are another example of the decline of the Senate's once-proud traditions relating to judicial nominations.

He was opposed by both of his home State Senators. Both Senator FEINSTEIN and Senator HARRIS did not return a blue slip for Daniel Aaron Bress.

The blue slip, as many people know, is literally a single piece of paper where Senators sign their name and then check off whether they support or oppose, as a way to have consensus between Senators from their home State, and it has always been accorded respect and deference in this Chamber, but that has all changed now.

In this case, you had a California nomination—I will get to that part of it in a moment—where, as I said, both Senators did not return blue slips. In this case, in particular, I think it is particularly offensive because Senator FEINSTEIN is the ranking member of the committee.

For those who don't pay attention to all this terminology, "ranking member" is the top person in one party who is not the chairman or chairwoman, as the case may be.

So as the top Democrat, the ranking member of the Senate Judiciary Committee, her opposition to Judge Bress should be an important factor in his nomination and confirmation.

Prior to this administration, the Judiciary Committee had never held a hearing for a nominee from the ranking member's home State without his or her support. Again, that has all changed just recently.

Prior rules and norms have not stopped Republicans in the Senate from pushing extreme and sometimes corporate nominees through this process, especially at the circuit court level.

In a recent press release, Senator FEINSTEIN and Senator HARRIS explained that they opposed Judge Bress in part because he had so few connections to California. He lived in California for only 1 year since graduating from high school, he has not voted in California in an election for over a decade, and the California bar lists him as a Washington, DC, attorney.

I mention that because that should be relevant. When a home State Senator—in this case, two home State Senators, one of whom is the top Democrat on the Judiciary Committee—I think in that case there should be deference paid to that kind of concern that is raised. After all, they both represent their State.

As I mentioned earlier, the blue slip process is predicated on the idea that home State Senators are more familiar than anyone else with their State's legal community. I think that goes without saying. They serve an important role in nominating individuals to serve and represent the State.

Judge Bress is an example of why the blue slip process is so important. He is not part of the California legal community. Despite objections of the Senators, he will now sit on the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals and decide cases for a State with over 39 million residents at last count.

Without blue slips, what would prevent a California judge from being nominated to a court in another State? What would happen if you had someone from a different State, who had very little ties to a State, be nominated and confirmed, for example, to serve in a State like Pennsylvania? It doesn't make a lot of sense to most people. It is a norm that should not be violated.

His nomination illustrates how the blue slip process has been eviscerated, especially for the circuit courts, which is something that I had some firsthand experience with. I did not return a blue slip on one nominee who was confirmed, and in the second case, there was a hearing scheduled over my objections by way of not returning a blue slip.

That experience that I had as a Senator whose blue slip and the deference that should be paid as part of that blue slip process—that circumstance in my case is at variance with my experience for district court judges.

Senator TOOMEY and I—my colleague from Pennsylvania—have worked together to jointly recommend experienced, consensus nominees for the Federal district courts in Pennsylvania. We have three districts—the Eastern District, the Middle District, and the Western District.

Unfortunately, this bipartisan district court process has become the exception, not the rule. It used to pertain here in the Senate, where every State had some kind of process by which nominees were presented for confirmation by their home State Senators, and the White House—the administration—in every case would pay deference to that.

That is exceedingly rare today. I am thankful we have maintained it so far in Pennsylvania with regard to the work Senator TOOMEY and I do together and our staffs do together to reach consensus. It doesn't always work, by the way, but usually no one hears about the ones who don't work out because we keep that to ourselves and move on to the next person and see if we can't reach consensus. I appreciate that. I think we are either at 19 or 20 judges confirmed since 2011, working together, and I hope we can maintain that so that at least—at least—the blue slip process can be respected for district court nominees.

I think people who elect us in our home States expect that. They expect us to work together and to try to reach consensus where we can. Sometimes it is not possible, but they do expect us to do that. If there is an expectation of consensus and bipartisan cooperation

that adheres to or is expected of Senators, then there ought to be institutional support for that here in the Senate and by the administration. As I mentioned, that is not the case today, at least as it relates to the appeals court, the circuit courts around the country.

This has relevance, of course, not just to process and norms and traditions; that is in and of itself important. It is of even greater significance when you consider the issues these courts will deal with.

Just today, for example, there was oral argument before the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals in the *Texas v. United States* case—a monumental case that has the potential to cause millions of Americans to lose coverage. We know that because we know that since the Affordable Care Act was passed, more than 20 million people have gained coverage, the larger share of that being people who gained coverage through the expansion of Medicaid.

If that case were to be successful—a case brought by Republican attorneys general from around the country and then later opposed by Democratic attorneys general—if that case is successful, as it was at the district court level, 20 million people stand to lose their coverage, and a much larger number—depending on which number is on the record currently, but at least 150 million-plus Americans have protections today because of the Affordable Care Act, like the protection if you have a preexisting condition protection.

Under the old system, the old rules, the old law, you could be denied treatment or coverage because you have a preexisting condition. That was happening routinely. That is no longer the law today. The law today is that if you have a preexisting condition, you can still get coverage. As I said, that would be at risk for something north of 150 million Americans. Some of the data tells us the numbers are equally substantial when it comes to different parts of the law and those who are adversely or potentially adversely affected.

If you had to step back and summarize where we have been in the last more than—just about 2½ years now since the Trump administration came into office, working with House Republicans and Senate Republicans, you have had a campaign—really a constant campaign of what I would argue is about three things, and maybe not only three but at least three: ripping away coverage; decimating the Medicaid Program or at least attempting to over and over again; and thirdly, sabotage—sabotage mostly by the administration itself but also supported by Republicans here in the Congress. That sabotage has been, unfortunately, successful.

As of January, for example, the Gallup organization released data that said the number of Americans—I am reading from the first line of a news

story from the publication Vox. The headline is “Under Trump, the number of uninsured Americans has gone up by 7 million.” The sub-headline is “Even in a strong economy, Americans are losing their health coverage.” This is an article written by Sarah Kliff—someone who spends a lot of time writing about and analyzing healthcare as an issue. It is dated January 23, 2019. I will read just the first two sentences: “The number of Americans without health insurance has increased by 7 million since President Donald Trump took office, new Gallup data released Wednesday shows.” Again, this is a January 2019 story. It goes on from there to say: “The country’s uninsured rate has steadily ticked upward since 2016, rising from a low of 10.9 percent in late 2016 to 13.7 percent—a four-year high.”

So at the end of 2016, at the beginning of the Trump administration, the uninsured rate was 10.9. At the end or the latter part of 2018, going into 2019, it stood at 13.7. So Gallup tells us that 7 million more people do not have healthcare who had it when the President started his administration.

A number of organizations have catalogued recent analyses of the potential threats that could impact communities if this *Texas v. United States* case were successful. I will mention again for the record that the litigants—the ones who were bringing the case, these Republican attorneys general—prevailed at the district court level. Now it is on appeal at the circuit court, and, in my judgment, it is probably more likely than not that they will prevail at that level too. Then, of course, the only option would be the Supreme Court, and I don’t have a lot of confidence that this Supreme Court would rule against that case, which would result in chaos. That is a terrible understatement for what would happen when 20 million people potentially lose their coverage and tens and tens of millions more lose the protections they enjoy now, especially those against the denial of treatment or coverage because that individual has a preexisting condition.

Here are the numbers, just to remind folks. Everyone has heard the number nationally. One hundred thirty-three million Americans, roughly, have a preexisting condition. In my home State of Pennsylvania, that number is a little more than 5.3 million people. Those numbers are terribly high, but I think the one really making an impression on me and I hope on others—especially those in Pennsylvania—is the number of children in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania who have a preexisting condition. Six hundred forty-two thousand seven hundred Pennsylvania children have a preexisting condition—642,700. No action by the U.S. Congress, by the administration, or by a court should ever result in any child being denied coverage or treatment because of a preexisting condition—any child but let alone numbers that are so

high and so offensive to even consider that number of children or any portion of that number could be denied coverage.

The only number I will emphasize tonight is 642,700 Pennsylvania children with a preexisting condition. I won’t go through all the numbers because I know we are here late tonight, but another number that jumps out at me—and this number comes from a document published by Protect Our Care telling us in a publication today that when you consider the doughnut hole coverage, meaning that the Affordable Care Act began to fill the coverage gap when older Americans were paying for prescription drugs and often paying exorbitant prices for prescription drugs—the Affordable Care Act began to chip away at that number, so much and in such a substantial fashion that the average senior, since the Affordable Care Act was passed—and this is the period of time between 2010 and 2016—that seniors gained \$2,272 on average, almost \$2,300 per senior to help them with their prescription drug costs by helping to fill that so-called doughnut hole, which is a very benign way to talk about a terrible coverage gap that burdens a lot of older Americans. In Pennsylvania, that number is lower, but it was still more than \$1,100 per person.

All of that will be at risk if this case is successful. Just like the protections for preexisting conditions are at risk, the support that has been available up until the recent past for prescription drug coverage for seniors—that support potentially could go away completely. So seniors will again potentially be footing the bill if this lawsuit is successful.

Two more, just for the record. Access to treatment would be in jeopardy for some 800,000 people with opioid use disorder issues. We know there are a huge number of Americans who have a substance use disorder issue, often an addiction. A subcategory of that—probably the biggest subcategory—are those with an opioid addiction. That has hurt families of all kinds—rich and poor, north and south, no matter where you live—east, west, rural, urban, suburban. It knows no bounds.

A lot of that support has come from the support for quality treatment that folks need to lift themselves out of the grip of an addiction. A lot of that support comes from Medicaid expansion. Whether it is the repeal bills that were promoted on the Senate floor over and over again or whether it is the lawsuit that could have as devastating of an impact on healthcare as any repeal bill would, no matter where you turn, in terms of Republican healthcare bills and this lawsuit, you can see the adverse impact on Medicaid expansion.

Virtually every one of them not only wants to cut Medicaid expansion, in most of the Republican bills, they want to eliminate it over time—completely eliminate Medicaid expansion. Somehow it was wrong. I have to ask why.

Why was it wrong that millions of people got their healthcare through an expansion of Medicaid? Why would anyone ever doubt that someone next to you who doesn't have coverage, first and foremost, and might have an opioid addiction problem is getting coverage, and because they have insurance coverage, they can get treatment for that terrible scourge our country is going to be dealing with for decades—why is that the wrong thing to do? How would taking that coverage away from someone with an opioid problem advance the interests of the American people? The answer is, it wouldn't. The answer is, it would set back the efforts to deal with a whole host of folks out there who are getting treatment today solely, completely, because of Medicaid expansion.

The last thing I will mention is our rural areas. I represent a State that has 67 counties, and 48 of them are rural. A lot of the rural hospitals in those communities are already teetering on the edge of collapse and have been for years—not just the last several years but for many years.

One of the fastest ways to ensure that more rural hospitals would close and collapse is to cut Medicaid or to take away Medicaid expansion. That has an adverse impact, the likes of which we can't even begin to calculate because folks in rural Pennsylvania will lose coverage if you decimate Medicaid or you take away Medicaid expansion, but that doesn't end there.

A lot of folks in those communities are getting treatment for an addiction issue or something related. They will be adversely impacted; their families will; their communities will, but it doesn't stop there in a rural area.

In a lot of these rural areas in my home State—and it is true all across the country—the biggest employer, or at least the second or third biggest employer, is often a hospital. In my State, there are probably 25 counties where the top employer in those 48 rural counties—about half of them, roughly—the No. 1 and No. 2 employer is a hospital. So cutting Medicaid or eliminating Medicaid expansion or sabotaging the health insurance markets or taking away the coverage of the Af-

fordable Care Act has healthcare consequences, has opioid addiction treatment consequences, and of course has a job consequence as well. If you cut Medicaid in a lot of rural areas, you are going to lose a lot of jobs. It is as simple as that, as devastating as it is.

So we have a long way to go to make progress on healthcare. I hope—I hope—my Republican friends will come together with us and work on lowering the cost of healthcare and lowering the cost of prescription drugs, but they don't seem to be that interested in that. Some are, intermittently, once in a while, but they don't seem to be interested because there is an obsession in the Senate, on the Republican side, with decimating the Medicaid Program, ending Medicaid expansion, and completely wiping out all the gains of the Affordable Care Act.

That would be bad enough, but it is doubly worse or it is doubly insulting. I should say, when there is no plan for replacement. So what if a court of law, what if a Federal court in the Fifth Circuit, in the next couple of months, says the moving party here, the party that wants to declare the Affordable Care Act unconstitutional—declares the moving party is the prevailing party, that they win? Let's say it doesn't go to the Supreme Court, but even if it does, let's say it loses there. What happens then to those 20 million people who got coverage? What happens to the 150 million-plus who have coverage today, protections today, who did not have it before the Affordable Care Act? They were paying their premiums for years, if not decades. They had coverage for years, if not decades. Their children were maybe covered in their employer-sponsored plan, but in many cases—maybe not in every case—they didn't have much protection from preexisting conditions. They didn't have protections against lifetime limits or caps on the treatment you can get in a year or over a lifetime.

We had the bizarre and insulting and degrading experience, where women were discriminated against by the insurance companies because they were women. Being a woman was actually, in a sense, a preexisting condition. That made no sense. Are we going to go

back to those days because a group of attorneys general wanted to change the law, and they couldn't prevail on the Senate floor, or they couldn't prevail over time in the House, or by way of what the administration would do, so they went into court, and they are going to wipe out coverage for tens and tens of millions of Americans? Is that a good thing for America? I don't think so. I think that sends everything in the wrong direction.

Unfortunately, that is not just theory. Some of it is already happening. As I said before, Gallup tells us that 7 million fewer people have healthcare today, or at least as of January, than did two Januarys before that. So we have a long way to go to make progress on healthcare, but we are not going to make much progress around here if we have a continual fight. I hope some will agree to set aside the fight about repeal and lawsuits taking away coverage. Let's work together to lower costs, and let's work together to lower the costs of prescription drugs, in particular, because I have to answer to a lot of families.

One of them is Matt Stefanelli, a young man we just spoke to today talking about his children. Matt's son has type 1 diabetes. We are from the same home county. He is worried not only about his own healthcare, but he is worried about his son's healthcare. We have an answer, and the answer is to respond to families like Matt's.

I yield the floor.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands adjourned until 9:30 a.m. tomorrow.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 7:07 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, July 10, 2019, at 9:30 a.m.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate July 9, 2019:

THE JUDICIARY

DANIEL AARON BRESS, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

TREATMENT OF DETAINEES AT ICE DETENTION FACILITIES

HON. JASON CROW

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 9, 2019

Mr. CROW. Madam Speaker, today, I include in the RECORD two agency letters my office received in response to two inquiries I sent in February.

The first is a June 25, 2019 letter in response to a February 28, 2019 letter I wrote with 19 of my colleagues to the U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement ("ICE") regarding public health risks and treatment of detainees at ICE detention facilities and contract facilities.

The second is a June 28, 2019 letter in response to a February 20, 2019 letter I wrote to the Department of Homeland Security regarding medical concerns at the ICE contract facility in Aurora, Colorado.

U.S. IMMIGRATION AND CUSTOMS
ENFORCEMENT,
June 18, 2019.

Hon. JASON CROW,
*U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.*

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE CROW: Thank you for your February 28, 2019 letter regarding public health risks and treatment of detainees at U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement detention facilities and contract facilities. Enclosed, please find answers to the questions posed in your letter. The co-signers of your letter will receive a separate, identical response.

Thank you again for your letter and interest in this important matter. Should you wish to discuss this matter further, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

RAYMOND KOVACIC,
*Assistant Director, Office of
Congressional Relations.*

U.S. IMMIGRATION AND CUSTOMS ENFORCEMENT (ICE) RESPONSE TO THE FEBRUARY 28, 2019 LETTER REGARDING PUBLIC HEALTH RISKS AND TREATMENT OF DETAINEES AT DETENTION FACILITIES

1. How many and what kind of outbreaks have occurred at ICE and contract detention facilities nationwide in the past 12 months and how many of those did the ICE Health Service Corps oversee?

Response: In the past 12 months, the U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) Health Service Corps (IHSC) was notified of an estimated 308 public health investigations in 51 detention facilities housing ICE detainees; those investigations affected 308 housing units. IHSC oversaw 112 of these investigations in 15 facilities where IHSC is the facility medical authority that operates the medical clinic.

2. What is the ICE Health Service Corps protocol for treating these diseases, including the protocol to quarantine detainees?

Response: IHSC protocols and official guidance for treating infectious diseases apply in 22 detention and staging facilities where IHSC is the facility medical authority and

operates the medical clinic. ICE staff in these 22 facilities conduct intake medical screening for detainees inclusive of infectious diseases and coordinate with local ICE Enforcement and Removal Operations (ERO) personnel to implement a medical hold for detainees diagnosed with infectious diseases that pose a public health threat to detainees, staff, visitors, and the community until the detainee is rendered non-contagious. ICE policies for these 22 facilities are designed to control or limit the spread of infectious diseases and minimize the impact on ICE operations. This action allows ICE staff sufficient time to facilitate the necessary arrangements for continuity of care prior to the alien's transfer, release, or removal.

Additionally, in these 22 facilities, an IHSC medical provider or designee orders medical isolation of detainees diagnosed with infectious diseases in accordance with guidelines on transmission-based precautions for the duration of the infectious period to prevent transmission. ICE staff are responsible for providing a recommendation on cohorting with restricted movement in adult detention facilities and/or social distancing in family residential facilities to help reduce the spread of significant infectious diseases, if appropriate.

IHSC does not have medical authority in facilities where it does not operate the medical clinic—each medical authority is responsible for developing its own facility policies and protocols for managing infectious and communicable diseases in compliance with governing detention standards. IHSC's assigned Field Medical Coordinators (FMCs) in each area of responsibility conduct site visits at locations housing detainees for over 72 hours to ensure that appropriate medical services are being provided according to national detention standards and contractual requirements.

3. How is the ICE Health Services Corps ensuring that detainees are treated properly, humanely and with dignity while in quarantine?

Response: ICE ERO oversees the civil immigration detention of one of the most highly transient and diverse populations of any detention or correctional system in the world. ICE takes very seriously the health, safety, and welfare of those in our custody, and comprehensive medical care is provided from the moment detainees arrive and throughout the entirety of their stay.

As stated in Question 2, while IHSC does not have direct operational oversight over medical care in facilities where it does not provide that care, its FMCs in each area of responsibility work to ensure proper medical services are being provided and that national detention standards and contractual requirements are met.

In those facilities that are staffed by IHSC, daily assessments are provided of those individuals that are cohorted due to exposure to an infectious disease. IHSC monitors for signs and symptoms associated with the condition and also provides open access to sick call and urgent care services that are usually provided within the cohorted unit. During these interventions, detainees have the opportunity to report any complaints related to their medical and housing conditions.

4. Please provide a list of ICE-owned and operated and contracted detention facilities that ICE Health Services Corps has treated for a disease outbreak and/or quarantine.

Response: The following indicates where public health investigations occurred in the past twelve months. Each facility's medical authority is responsible for overseeing public health investigations in collaboration with their local health department.

Facilities where IHSC is the medical authority: Alexandria Staging Facility, Buffalo (Batavia) Service Processing Center, Caroline Detention Facility, El Paso Service Processing Center, Elizabeth Detention Center, Eloy Federal Contract Facility, Florence Service Processing Center, Houston Contract Detention Facility.

LaSalle ICE Processing Center (Jena), Montgomery Processing Center (Houston), Otay Mesa Detention Center (San Diego CDF), Port Isabel, South Texas Family Residential Center (Dilley), South Texas ICE Processing Center (Pearsall), T. Don Hutto Residential Center.

Facilities where IHSC is not the medical authority: Adelanto ICE Processing Center, Albany County Jail, Broward Transitional Center, Central Arizona Florence Correctional Complex East, Cibola County Correctional Center, Coastal Bend Detention Facility, Denver Contract Detention Facility, East Hidalgo Detention Center, El Valle Detention Facility, Folkston ICE Processing Center (D. Ray James), Geauga County Jail (OH).

IAH Polk Adult Detention Facility, Imperial Regional Detention Facility, James A. Musick Facility, Jerome Combs Detention Center, Joe Corley Detention Center, Johnson County Law Enforcement, La Palma Correctional Center, Laredo Processing Center, LaSalle County Regional Detention Center (TX), McHenry County Jail (IL).

Mesa Verde ICE Processing Center, Northeast Ohio Correctional Ctr (Youngstown CDF), Otay Mesa Detention Center (San Diego CDF), Otero County Processing Center, Pine Prairie ICE Processing Center, Prairieland Detention Facility, Pulaski County Detention Center, Rio Grande Detention Center, San Luis Detention Facility, Stewart Detention Center.

Tallahatchie County Correctional Center, Theo Lacey, Webb County Detention Center (CCA), West Texas Detention Center, York County Prison.

5. How many inter-facility detainee transfers have occurred in the last 12 months nationwide and how many of the detainees has ICE Health Services Corps determined to have had a viral disease?

Response: ICE cannot statistically report this information in the manner in which it was requested.

6. What is the ICE Health Service Corps protocol for ensuring that newly-transferred detainees do not pose a health risk to themselves or other detainees?

Response: At IHSC-staffed facilities, all detainees are screened upon arriving at a facility and a prescreen is conducted to identify those detainees who have acute or urgent medical concerns so that further evaluation can be prioritized. All facilities, including those at which ICE houses its detainees pursuant to Intergovernmental Service Agreements, conduct intake screenings to identify individuals with time-sensitive health concerns.

7. What is the ICE Health Service Corps guidance in place to prevent communicable diseases from spreading among detainee populations?

• 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.

Response: Please see response to Question 2.

8. Which agency is responsible for oversight of the ICE Health Service Corps protocols?

Response: IHSC is responsible for oversight of IHSC protocols, which are only applicable in the 22 facilities for which IHSC is the medical authority and where IHSC operates the medical clinic. These protocols comply with state and local requirements, as well as applicable detention standards.

9. What role does the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) play in responding to public health risks at ICE and contract detention facilities?

Response: ICE defers questions on CDC authorities and responsibilities to the CDC. However, ICE notes that in general, public health interventions fall under the authority of local and state health departments, although state health departments do occasionally request assistance from the CDC. In ICE's case, IHSC routinely collaborates with the CDC on public health interventions involving multiple jurisdictions.

U.S. IMMIGRATION AND
CUSTOMS ENFORCEMENT,

June 28, 2019.

Hon. JASON CROW,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE CROW: Thank you for your February 20, 2019 letter to the Department of Homeland Security.

I appreciate your concerns regarding the recent expansion of the Denver Contract Detention Facility and welcome the opportunity to address them more fully. Please see the attached enclosure with responses to the specific questions posed in your letter.

Thank you again for your letter and interest in this important matter. Please contact the ICE Office of Congressional Relations for additional assistance.

Sincerely,

MARK A. MORGAN,
Acting Director.

THE DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY'S
RESPONSE TO REPRESENTATIVE JASON
CROW'S FEBRUARY 20, 2019 LETTER

Please explain the number and types of disease outbreaks (i.e., chicken pox) in the past year at the Denver Contract Detention Facility in Aurora, including the number of outbreaks requiring quarantines. What are the reporting criteria and requirements for outbreaks and which entities receive the reports?

The Denver Contract Detention Center (CDF) has had seven cases of varicella and 15 probable or confirmed cases of mumps over the past year.

In such cases, U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement's (ICE) Health Service Corps (IHSC) Public Health, Safety, and Preparedness Unit (PHSP) and the Colorado State Health Department are notified. Per the ICE Performance-Based National Detention Standards 2011 (PBNDS 2011), facilities shall comply with current and future plans implemented by federal, state, or local authorities addressing specific public health issues including communicable disease reporting requirements (specific requirements are codified in state regulations). Designated medical staff shall notify the IHSC PHSP of any ICE detainee with a significant communicable disease and of any contact or outbreak investigations involving ICE detainees exposed to a significant communicable disease without known immunity.

Significant communicable diseases include, but are not limited to, varicella (chicken pox), measles, mumps, pertussis

(whooping cough), and typhoid. Additionally, IHSC provides a weekly cohort report to ICE Enforcement and Removal Operations (ERO) leadership in those situations where cohorting of exposed detainees is required.

2. What active have ICE and GEO taken to respond to the recent varicella outbreaks and what measures are being put in place to prevent future outbreaks?

When active varicella is suspected or confirmed, the patient is isolated, placed under airborne precautions, and the dorm in which the patient was housed is placed under cohort status. In addition, dorm members and susceptible contacts are then tested for their immune status if documentation of immunity is not available. Contacts with a positive titer, which is suggestive of immunity, can be released from cohort status. Health care staff monitor the dorms placed under cohort status daily to identify any new patients with signs and symptoms of varicella. The GEO Group Inc. (GEO) followed these precautions in the seven cases identified.

Because medical staff from ICE and our vendor, GEO, often do not know which detainees have been in contact with or exposed to disease prior to being detained, observation of early symptoms and prompt isolation are used to prevent the spread of varicella. IHSC and GEO have also consulted with the state and local health departments regarding their recommendations.

Additionally, ICE notes that six of the seven varicella cases were at the facility for less than three weeks prior to diagnosis. The incubation period for varicella is 10 to 21 days, so it is not known whether they were exposed to varicella before or after entering the facility. All seven individuals came from a facility in California where they were housed for only a few days after crossing the border.

3. Will ICE direct GEO to hire more properly-trained medical staff to accommodate the increase in detainee admissions? Please also describe what contract requirements and oversight are in place to ensure that detainees receive proper medical attention.

ICE continually evaluates medical services nationwide to ensure the highest level of care for its detained population. In accordance with the terms and conditions related to the number of full-time equivalent (FTE) medical staff positions in ICE's Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR)-based contract with GEO, the service provider conducted a staffing analysis and created a staffing plan for the delivery of health care services. FAR-based medical staffing plans, which typically include additional FTEs for overtime, shift rotations, and facility-specific circumstances, are reviewed by IHSC as part of the initial acquisition process and, thereafter, as deemed necessary by ICE. IHSC also has a Field Medical Coordinator (FMC) assigned to the Denver Area of Responsibility who is responsible for monitoring medical concerns at the Denver CDF. The FMC works with local GEO medical staff to ensure detainee healthcare services are being provided appropriately and timely to detainees irrespective of the day-to-day changes in the Denver CDF's admissions and releases. In addition, the FMC receives reports regarding medical cases on a routine basis.

All ICE-owned service processing centers, contract detention facilities, and dedicated inter-governmental service agreement facilities are inspected annually by an ICE inspections contractor. ICE inspectors typically spend three days auditing each facility. In addition to environmental health, safety, and corrections experts, each inspection team includes a Detainee Rights subject matter expert (SME) and a health professional (e.g., physician, physician's assistant, registered nurse, nurse practitioner, or a

medical professional SME). The health professional conducts a Quality of Medical Care (QMC) review as part of the inspection, which measures the quality of detainee health care across more than 20 areas of health care, including such measures as medication, grievances, suicide watch, hunger strikes, screening and health assessment, acute disease and chronic conditions, sick call, urgent care, treatment of disability, continuity of care, laboratory and diagnostics, staffing, credentialing, and medical recordkeeping practices. The results of the QMC are reviewed by the IHSC division.

In addition to the annual inspection, detention facilities are also subject to a number of special assessments conducted by ICE ERO, as well as audits, reviews, and site visits conducted by the Office of Detention Oversight (ODO) within the ICE Office of Professional Responsibility and by the OHS Office for Civil Rights and Civil Liberties (CRCL). When deficiencies are found during any type of inspection or review, ICE works with the field offices and facilities and collaborates with ICE ODO and CRCL to ensure timely and appropriate corrective actions are implemented to address issues and concerns.

4. What requirements are in the GEO contract or other ICE guidance to ensure detainees are provided proper medical care?

ICE takes the health, safety, and welfare of those in our care very seriously. Comprehensive medical care is provided from the moment detainees arrive in ICE custody and continues throughout the entirety of their stay. This care includes an initial health screening, as well as subsequent medical visits, referrals to specialists, and 24-hour access to emergency care as necessary.

Section IV.A.1.5-Management Plan of ICE's contract with GEO states that GEO "[u]nderstands the importance of a fully qualified and trained professional staff in appropriate number to operate a safe, secure, and efficient medical department at the Aurora ICE Processing Center (the Center). Our proposed staffing plan reflects a well thought out and efficient strategy for staffing the Center in order to provide detainees with access to medical care 24 hours a day seven (7) days a week."

Also, at Section IV.A.II-Quality Control and Assurance, GEO is required to establish a Quality Control Plan governing health services at the Center to ensure that healthcare services are in compliance with the Performance Based National Detention Standards, court orders, American Correctional Association (ACA) standards, standards established by the National Commission of Correctional Health Care (NCHC), and specific client policies.

In addition, ICE's PBNDS 2011 clearly lay out the expected outcomes and expected practices for detainee health care at dedicated facilities like the Denver CDF in detention standards 4.3-Medical Care and 4.4-Medical Care (Women). These two standards cover topics such as designation of authority, communicable disease and infection control, notifying detainees about health care services, translation and language access for detainees with limited English proficiency, pharmaceutical management, medications, medical personnel, medical and mental health screening of new arrivals, substance dependence and detoxification, comprehensive health assessment, mental health program, medical/psychiatric alerts and holds, annual health examinations, dental treatment, sick call, emergency medical services and first aid, delivery of medication, health education and wellness information, restraints, continuity of care, informed consent and involuntary treatment, medical records, and documentation.

The Denver CDF is accredited by the ACA and the NCCHC, and the facility is obligated to comply with the requirements of both the ICE PBNDS 2011 and the DHS Prison Rape Elimination Act regulations. On October 4, 2018, ICE's inspection contractor, The Nakamoto Group, completed an annual detention inspection. The Lead Compliance inspector recommended a final rating of "Meets Standards" and reported zero deficiencies in medical care.

5. Please describe the contract relationship between ICE and GEO and attach copies of the relevant contract documents (e.g. agreements, MOUs, guidance, etc.)

GEO was awarded an indefinite-delivery/indefinite-quantity contract to provide detention services at the Denver CDF on September 15, 2011. The contract period of performance included a 2-year base period and four 2-year option periods. The contract Period of Performance expires on September 16, 2021.

GEO provides full-time detention and transportation services at the Denver CDF in Aurora, Colorado, for ICE detainees. Services are provided in compliance with the ICE PBNDS 2011, ACA standards for adult local detention facilities, standards for health services in jails, NCCHC, and other applicable state and local requirements.

6. Since 2015, how many 911 calls were placed from the Facility to local and state emergency professionals?

ICE is unable to provide a response, as it does not track this data. However, as previously noted, detainees have access to 24-hour emergency care as necessary.

7. When privately contracted facilities fail to comply with their contractual obligations, ICE has the opportunity to issue compliance waivers forgiving contractors for the breach. Has ICE issued any compliance waivers for the Facility? If so, how many, and what were the justifications for those waivers?

ICE has issued no compliance waiver to or on behalf of the Denver CDF.

8. Since 2015, has ICE submitted a Contract Discrepancy Report for the Facility following the granting of any compliance waivers? If so, please attach and all such reports in your response.

ICE has not submitted a Contract Discrepancy Report for the facility.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 37TH ANNUAL METRO DETROIT YOUTH DAY

HON. DEBBIE DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 9, 2019

Mrs. DINGELL. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the participants and organizers of the 37th annual Metro Detroit Youth Day. This event provides young people in Southeastern Michigan the opportunity to engage with local officials and role models.

The Metro Detroit Youth Day started in 1981 to promote stronger relations between Detroit residents and the business community. Since its inception, the event has expanded to offer approximately 35,000 children a day of recreation and education on Belle Isle in the Detroit River, becoming the largest youth event in the state of Michigan. Metro Detroit Youth Day hosts over 360 organizations and 260 businesses, allowing participants to build connections with civic leaders and nonprofit groups that offer local employment and educational

opportunities. The event also provides college scholarships to several graduating high school students each year.

Metro Detroit Youth Day has received numerous accolades for its work, including a Point of Light Award from President George H.W. Bush, and a Michigan Governor's Award on Physical Fitness for its promotion of physical activity and health. The event's continued success underscores its significant impact on our nation's youth by instilling the importance of education and health. It has also provided over 1,800 college scholarships since 1991, making it an important fixture of educational opportunity in the Detroit area. Metro Detroit Youth Day provides vital contributions to the vibrant and diverse community of Detroit through its engagement of youth in Southeastern Michigan.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the efforts of the organizers and participants of the 37th annual Metro Detroit Youth Day. It is my hope that Metro Detroit Youth Day continues to serve young people in Michigan and grow in the coming years.

IN RECOGNITION OF SFC JOHNATHAN D. HOGGATT

HON. ROBERT J. WITTMAN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 9, 2019

Mr. WITTMAN. Madam Speaker, I am honored to recognize Sergeant First Class Johnathan D. Hoggatt for his military service.

Sergeant First Class Hoggatt enlisted into military service as an Infantryman at Fort Benning, Georgia in 1998. He served in numerous infantry leadership positions from Fire Team Leader to Infantry Platoon Sergeant. His last assignment was as the Battalion S2/S3-Air and Ranger Instructor at the 6th Ranger Training Battalion. He is currently an Operations NCOIC with Easy Squadron, Asymmetric Warfare Group.

His assignments include A Co, 2nd Battalion, 130th Infantry Regiment, Illinois National Guard (Mattoon, Illinois); HHC, 6th Ranger Training Battalion (Eglin AFB, FL); 1 Battalion, 9th Infantry Regiment, 2nd Infantry Division (Fort Carson, CO); and numerous Virginia National Guard Units. He has deployed to Iraq and Afghanistan, where he served diligently and with honor to uphold and protect the freedoms this nation provides.

SFC Hoggatt's military education includes Senior Leaders Course, Joint Fire Power Course, Joint Air Operations Command and Control Course, Military Free-Fall Basic Course, Battle Staff Course, Pathfinder Course, Tactical Certification Course, Jumpmaster Course, Basic Instructor Course, Emergency Medical Technician Course, Ranger School and Basic Airborne Course.

SFC Hoggatt has earned the Master Parachutist Badge, Pathfinder Badge, Ranger Tab, Military Free-Fall Badge, Combat Infantryman's Badge, and several other awards and decorations. SFC Hoggatt holds a Bachelor of Science in Biology from Virginia Commonwealth University and is currently working on a Masters of Arts in Biomedical Science from Liberty University.

Madam Speaker, please join me in celebrating the courage displayed and sacrifice

made by Sergeant First Class Hoggatt during his time in our nation's armed forces. Our gratitude to Sergeant First Class Hoggatt and all our other servicemen and women cannot be expressed enough.

HONORING COACH RON FIOCHETTA

HON. JOHN JOYCE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 9, 2019

Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Ron Fiochetta, who will be posthumously inducted into the All-American Amateur Baseball Association Hall of Fame later this summer.

Baseball was not his only love. He also coached football where I had the opportunity to play for him. As a former player, student, and someone who looked up to Coach Fio, I realize this award is truly deserved. His late wife, Joy, and his children continue to exemplify his commitment to community, coaching, and leadership.

Sadly, Ron passed away in 1997 at the age of 51, but his legacy lives on. He brought national recognition to Altoona in the AAABA Tournament. He was the manager of Altoona's L.S. Fiore from 1984 through 1997. During his tenure, L.S. Fiore won 10 Altoona AAABA League championships, four AAABA Regional championships, as well as a second place finish in the AAABA National Tournament in 1994. I take great pleasure in congratulating the Fiochetta family on this great honor for Coach Fio.

RECOGNIZING THE 60TH ANNIVERSARY OF ROGER AND RUTH BORR

HON. BILL HUIZENGA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 9, 2019

Mr. HUIZENGA. Madam Speaker, today I rise to congratulate my longtime friends and fellow West Michigan residents, Mr. Roger Hale Borr and Mrs. Ruth Elaine Borr, who will be celebrating their 60th wedding anniversary this August.

This significant benchmark is a symbol of their commitment to each other and to their family. Throughout their marriage, Roger and Ruth have been blessed with two children and three grandchildren, who have seen firsthand the love a dedicated marriage can bring. I am happy to join their friends and loved ones in extending my best to them as they celebrate their 60th wedding anniversary on Tuesday, August 6, 2019.

Over the years, I have personally witnessed the devotion, affection, and passion they share with not only each other, but the West Michigan community as well. Through marriage, Roger and Ruth have strived to serve others, brought joy to one another, and shared their wonderful example of kindness and love.

Madam Speaker, please join me in congratulating my dear friends, Roger and Ruth, on this exciting occasion. Happy 60th wedding anniversary.

HONORING IAN WOOLDRIDGE

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 9, 2019

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Madam Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Ian Wooldridge. Ian 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 1376, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Ian has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Ian has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Ian is a member of the Order of the Arrow and holds the rank of Firebuilder in the tribe of Mic-O-Say. Most notably, Ian has contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project. For his project, Ian constructed shelving units in the storage annex of the Second Baptist Church of Liberty, Missouri.

Madam Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Ian for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

RECOGNIZING THE BREESE
AMERICAN LEGION**HON. JOHN SHIMKUS**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 9, 2019

Mr. SHIMKUS. Madam Speaker, I rise to recognize the American Legion of Breese, IL, which is celebrating its 100th year anniversary this month.

The American Legion was commissioned by Congress as a patriotic veteran's organization. This not-for-profit organization became the nation's largest wartime veteran's service organization. The American Legion is dedicated to mentoring our youth, advocating patriotism with honor and promoting strong national security to continue their dedication to their fellow veterans.

In recognition of a 100 years of faithful service, the Breese American Legion is hosting a picnic on July 20th at 3 p.m., to celebrate with their community. Guests will enjoy great music, delicious food, games for all ages, a petting zoo, and much more. All the proceeds will be put towards benefitting community scholarships, schools, youth programs, and veterans.

It is an honor to extend my well wishes and profound congratulations to the current officers—Commander Jeff Jung, Auxiliary Rep. Julie Tebb, Sons of the American Legion Rep. Mike Haag—and many others who have upheld and played major roles to continue the success of this organization.

Madam Speaker, over the past 100 years, the Breese American Legion have supported and uplifted their communities through their many charitable programs. It is an honor to recognize this organization as it celebrates 100 momentous years of service. I am excited to see how it will continue to grow and wish it all the best in the future.

MICHAEL WYNN RECEIVES THE
COLLIER COUNTY CITIZEN OF
THE YEAR FOR 2019**HON. FRANCIS ROONEY**

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 9, 2019

Mr. ROONEY of Florida. Madam Speaker, I rise to congratulate Michael Wynn who was recently voted the Collier County Citizen of the Year for 2019.

Being chairman and president of Sunshine Ace Hardware in Naples, Mr. Wynn provides leadership to stores delivering friendly and helpful service with "Big City" quality in stores in Estero, Bonita Springs, Golden Gate, Marco Island, Naples, Port Charlotte, Largo and Port Charlotte. Since 1992, Mr. Wynn has held various positions increasing in responsibility with Sunshine Ace Hardware.

Michael is especially grateful for the opportunity to provide several basic hardware lines, such as tools, builders' hardware, paint and glass, housewares and household appliances, outdoor living and fishing products to the citizens of Florida. His good-natured service to the community has led to Michael being voted as the Collier County Citizen of the Year for 2019.

I am grateful for Michael and his commitment to his community. I look forward to seeing what the future holds from the positive effects of Mr. Wynn and Sunshine Ace Hardware.

IN RECOGNITION OF NANCY
HAMOOD FOR HER EXEMPLARY
SERVICE**HON. DEBBIE DINGELL**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 9, 2019

Mrs. DINGELL. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Nancy Hamood for her exemplary service with the Dearborn Police Department. Her years of dedicated work are worthy of commendation.

A lifelong resident of Dearborn, Nancy Hamood dedicated her life to serving her community. Ms. Hamood was hired by the Dearborn Police Department in 1979, initially working with the department's operations division. After a brief period in that position, Ms. Hamood became the Administrative Assistant to the Chief of Police, where she served under Dearborn's past five police chiefs. In her role, she helped coordinate important community events as well as meetings with Heads of State, Federal Government Officials, and State leaders. Ms. Hamood's efforts ensured that the department ran efficiently and effectively during her tenure. After forty years of service to the Dearborn community, Nancy Hamood retired from the Dearborn Police in June of this year.

Throughout her decorated career, Ms. Hamood has served with distinction. Called the "ultimate professional" by coworkers, Nancy Hamood was highly respected during her extended career. She often undertook tasks and responsibilities beyond the normal purview of her position, highlighting her dedication to service. We thank Nancy Hamood for

her commitment to professional excellence and we congratulate her on her retirement. Her dedicated leadership will be missed, but we wish her good health and every happiness in her retirement years.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Nancy Hamood for her four decades of service with the Dearborn Police Department. Her work has had a profound impact on the police department and on the large Dearborn community.

CELEBRATING ANNIE CUMMINS'
20TH YEAR IN EMPLOYMENT**HON. BRAD R. WENSTRUP**

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 9, 2019

Mr. WENSTRUP. Madam Speaker, I rise to honor and thank a member of my staff, who is also a constituent from Ohio's Second District, Annie Cummins.

Annie and her stepmother, Linda, have worked alongside me for much of my careers both in Congress and in private medical practice. Linda devoted 20 years as a medical assistant in my practice, and 2019 marks Annie's 20th year working for me in my medical practice and then in my Congressional office.

Annie Cummins is a hard worker, a caring mother, and a loyal friend to all who know her.

I am honored to have worked with Annie for two decades now. She has selflessly dedicated her life to the people of Southern and Southwestern Ohio, and her influence has made my offices and our community a better place.

I thank Annie for her dedication and hard work throughout the years. I look forward to working with her for many more.

REMEMBERING THE LIFE OF
MICHAEL THOMAS GEORGE**HON. TIM RYAN**

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 9, 2019

Mr. RYAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Michael "Mikey" Thomas George, 16, who passed away surrounded by his loving family on Sunday, June 23, 2019.

Mikey was a proud student of St. Edward High School in Lakewood and a dedicated Michael Bubl  and Roman Reigns fan. His friends and family knew Michael for his contagious smile, laughter, and quick wit.

His favorite summers were spent on Kelley's Island, enjoying the sun and island lifestyle. Mikey was known to entertain all with his singing, dancing, and with the creative nicknames he gave to people.

Mikey loved his family dearly. He is survived by his loving parents, Kristine and Tony George, his triplet siblings, David and Julia, his older siblings, Joseph George, Justin Rose (Lisa), Robert George, Krystle George-Kearns (Christian) and Jonathon Rose (Amber); grandmother Glenna Botkins, along with numerous aunts, uncles and cousins.

My deepest condolences go out to the George Family, and all whose lives were touched by Mikey. He will most certainly live

on in the hearts and minds of all that knew him.

COLORADO RAILROAD MUSEUM

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 9, 2019

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and commend the Colorado Railroad Museum on their 60th anniversary.

Railroads have played a unique role in the development and history of the state of Colorado, enabling the safe transportation of people and goods across Colorado's rugged geography and serving as the backbone of Colorado's economy and culture since 1876.

Connecting the past and future of Colorado, the Museum serves to tell the story of America from the First Nations of the region to the immigrants and their families who came after to build their new lives in Colorado. Servicing more than 100,000 visitors annually, the Museum provides hands-on educational opportunity, preserves and displays educational historical artifacts, and offers exemplary educational programs to the community including: "Day Out with Thomas" events for children and "Living History" train rides in a restored steam locomotive. Thanks to a fundraising effort the Museum has expanded their work to include a climate-controlled library to handle archival records and a roundhouse to ensure the safety of their rolling stock so generations to come may continue to enjoy them. As such they have continually ranked amongst the top 10 paid attractions in the Denver metro area and as one of the top 10 railroad museums in the United States.

The Museum has been recognized by the Smithsonian Institute and others for their work in preserving the history of the Rocky Mountain West. I extend my deepest congratulations to the Colorado Railroad Museum for their well-earned accolades and I look forward to another 60 years of their service to our community and the people of Colorado.

HONORING COMMUNITY CHAMPION SAM ZURZOLO

HON. MIKE KELLY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 9, 2019

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I would like to recognize one of my constituents from back home in Western Pennsylvania, Mr. Sam Zurzolo. Sam is a lifelong resident of Butler County and an admirable veteran who proudly served as a Sergeant Major in the United States Marine Corps. Sam is the epitome of a service-minded citizen and his unwavering dedication to the community is inspiring and praiseworthy.

Sam had a successful military career, dedicating thirty years to the United States Marine Corps and the United States Marine Corps Reserves. During this time, Sam served in various capacities and was stationed all throughout the country. Regardless of the assignment or location, Sam displayed an exem-

plary work ethic and went above and beyond to serve the surrounding communities and volunteer where there was a need. His efforts did not go unnoticed and he was awarded numerous certificates of appreciation and meritorious mast, including the following: Navy Commendation Medal, Armed Forces Expeditionary Medal, Meritorious Service Medal, National Defense Service Medal with Star, Marine Corp Good Conduct Medal with 3 Stars, Marine Corps Reserve Medal, Marine Corps Recruiting Ribbon, Cold War Certificate & Ribbon, Rifle Expert Badge and numerous Pistol Expert Badges.

After his military service Sam spent eighteen years working as a maintenance superintendent for Oxford Development, a real estate and construction company, before retiring. Driven by a desire to continue serving, he got involved with local government and in 2005 Sam was elected to serve as a Butler Township Commissioner, a position which he maintains today. Furthermore, Sam is the Vice-Chairman of the Butler Township Planning Commission and he serves on the Executive Committee for the American Legion Post 778.

Sam is actively involved with the Butler County United Way and the Butler County Rotary Club. As a tireless volunteer for these organizations, his involvement has been absolutely essential to the success of many projects. From taking the lead on a major west-end revitalization project to overseeing the construction of local playgrounds, Sam has spent thousands of hours working to enhance the community. He has installed flag poles, constructed monuments and memorials, remodeled homes for wounded marines, mentored local Eagle Scouts, and much more. In addition, Sam is a past master of the Masonic Lodge, a 32nd Degree Mason, and a lifelong volunteer with Lifesteps and the group Toys for Tots, which he started in Butler in 1983. His involvement does not stop there, Sam is also a member of countless civic organizations, such as, but not limited to: 2nd Marine Division Association, Sons of Italy, Loyal Order of the Moose, and Butler County Law Enforcement Association.

Sam has been a catalyst for improvement throughout the community and his passion and dedication deserve praise. He is a leader in the truest sense of the word and a role model for those who are privileged to know him. Sam has built a legacy based on selflessness, compassion, and integrity. He has set a standard of excellence and generosity that will inspire others for generations to come.

Therefore, on behalf of the 16th Congressional District, the State of Pennsylvania, and the United States of America, I would like to express sincere gratitude and appreciation to Sam Zurzolo—an extraordinary individual, a noble public servant, and a true Community Champion.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE RETIREMENT OF DEARBORN POLICE CORPORAL MICHAEL NELSON

HON. DEBBIE DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 9, 2019

Mrs. DINGELL. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Police Corporal Michael

Nelson for his many years of service to the Dearborn Police Department. Corporal Nelson recently retired after thirty years of exemplary work with the department.

Prior to his service in the Dearborn Police Department Corporal Nelson served three years in the United States Army and was deployed to Grenada. Corporal Nelson began at the Dearborn Police Department in 1989 as an Animal Control Officer. In 1994, Corporal Nelson became a certified Motor Carrier Officer and a regional instructor specializing in commercial vehicle enforcement. In this role, he trained hundreds of police officers and created a safer environment for everyone in the Dearborn community. In 2003, he was promoted to the rank of Corporal and was placed in charge of the Animal Control and Parking Systems Operations.

Corporal Nelson served the Dearborn community in various roles for a total of thirty years. His commitment to protecting the Dearborn Community has impacted hundreds of his fellow officers and residents. His work training officers in commercial vehicle enforcement has been crucial to the continued safety of Dearborn. His exemplary service to the community stands as a role model of the dedication, sacrifice, and commitment of our police officers. His dedicated leadership will be missed, but we wish him good health and every happiness in his retirement years.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the thirty years of service of Police Corporal Michael Nelson to his country and to the Dearborn, Michigan community. His commitment to public safety is worthy of commendation.

IN HONOR OF DAVID TRAN

HON. J. LUIS CORREA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 9, 2019

Mr. CORREA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Mr. David Tran, an esteemed Californian and a caring person to everyone who knew him.

Mr. Tran passed away on June 30, 2019 but will continue to be remembered for his love of family and commitment to serving his community.

Mr. Tran was born on February 8, 1957 in Phu Nhuan, Saigon, Vietnam. After coming to the United States, Mr. Tran worked in a variety of different fields. Mr. Tran worked as a middle school teacher for 20 years, then as an insurance agent for 7 years, and after as a data entry clerk for 10 years. Those who worked with him can attest to his commitment to professional service and valuable contributions.

Mr. Tran was a role model to all and upheld the virtues of integrity and devotion throughout his life. Mr. Tran spent his time enriching the lives of countless others who had the privilege of knowing him.

He enjoyed playing soccer and tennis, as well as playing the guitar. He was a member of the Lien Hoa Temple and Pho Da Temple, where he demonstrated his commitment to his spirituality and serving others.

David Tran lived a life worthy of honor and remembrance. His kindness and love of all people persists with his wife, Quyen Tran; his

two children, Anh Tran and Julie Quynh Nhu Tran; and his two grandchildren, Alexander Tran and Benjamin Tran.

I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the legacy of Mr. David Tran. May his honor and commitment serve as an example for all and his spirit rest in peace and glory.

HONORING THE FAMILY OF GREG
MCDANIEL

HON. JIM COSTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 9, 2019

Mr. COSTA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the family of Greg McDaniel on Atwater's 2019 4th of July parade. On December 25, 2018, the greater Atwater community lost one of their most dedicated leaders who served as the President of Atwater's 4th of July Committee for over 20 years. In honor of Mr. McDaniel's many years of commitment to organizing this parade, his wife Pinky has been named the Grand Marshal of this year's parade.

As President of the Atwater 4th of July Committee, Mr. McDaniel played an integral role in the planning of Atwater's annual 4th of July parade and celebration. Each year he successfully helped raise the necessary funds and oversaw many of the operations that helped make the parade the event it has grown into today. Mr. McDaniel was committed to making each year's celebration better than the year before, which is reflected in what Atwater's 4th of July celebration has become.

Atwater's 4th of July celebration is now a day consisting of a morning run, parade, and fireworks that attracts thousands from throughout the City of Atwater and other cities in Merced County. The positivity Mr. McDaniel exuded in this endeavor is now present in the Atwater community members that have stepped up to continue the traditions Mr. McDaniel cared so deeply about.

Mr. McDaniel was joined in all he did by his wife of 45 years, Pinky. She was by his side assisting him in all his tremendous community contributions. In addition to planning the 4th of July celebration, Mr. McDaniel spent many years with local youth sports organizations, announced the Atwater High School football games, and served many times as the president of the Atwater Chamber of Commerce, among various other civic engagements. Though he is deeply missed, his wife Pinky, sons Christopher and Jeffory, grandchildren, and residents of Atwater continue to carry on the legacy he left.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the family of Greg McDaniel. It is both fitting and appropriate that we honor them as his wife Pinky is recognized as the Grand Marshal of a parade and celebration her husband dedicated so many years to. I wish his family and the residents of Atwater the best as they celebrated the 4th of July.

HONORING THE RETIREMENT OF
CAPTAIN JASON B. FITCH

HON. MIKE LEVIN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 9, 2019

Mr. LEVIN of California. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the retirement of Captain Jason B. Fitch. Captain Fitch has devoted his young adult life to the service of his family and country. Later this year, on December 1, 2019, Captain Fitch will retire from active duty after honorably serving this Nation for 28 years. As he completes his tour of duty in the Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Research, Development and Acquisition, and prepares to hang up his military uniform, we all know that his influence has reached far beyond the strict confines of his rank and previous job titles.

Captain Fitch's military career began 28 years ago today as a Midshipman when he took the Oath of Office at the United States Naval Academy in Annapolis, Maryland. After graduation, he was commissioned as an Ensign into the United States Navy. He served honorably in uniform for nearly three decades with tours of duty across the United States and deployments around the world. He served as the Supply Officer for Naval Special Warfare Center in Coronado, California. He served aboard the USS *Bonhomme Richard* (LHD 6) and the USS *Mount Vernon* (LSD 39). In 2006, Captain Fitch was recognized as the Navy Fuel Officer of the Year and as the Fuel Director for the Navy Bulk Fuel Terminal of the Year for 2007. He also served as the Naval Aviation Enterprise Officer and Director for the H-60 "Seahawk" Integrated Weapons Support Team at Naval Inventory Control Point in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. While assigned to U.S. Special Operations Command, he deployed to Operation Enduring Freedom (2013) in support of the Special Operations Joint Task Force-Afghanistan (SOJTF-A) as the J4 director.

Captain Fitch was entrusted with command ashore, where he served as the Commanding Officer for Naval Special Warfare Group ONE Logistics Support Unit. During his tenure in command, he deployed to Operation INHERENT RESOLVE (2015) as the J4 director of Combined Joint Special Operations Task Force-Iraq and received the Bronze Star Medal. He currently serves at the Pentagon as the Director for Outcome Based Logistics and Supply Chain Management, in the Office of the Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Expeditionary Programs and Logistics Management (E&LM).

In addition, Captain Fitch earned a master's degree in Business Administration with concentrations in Petroleum Management and International Business from the University of Kansas. He earned a Master of Science in National Security and Resource Strategy from the National Defense University's Eisenhower School. Captain Fitch also completed Kellogg's Executive Development Program.

In honor of his service, I would like to express my gratitude for Captain Jason B. Fitch's dedication to this country and our community. I wish him and his family the best as he retires to San Diego this December.

CAPE CORAL CITIZEN FLORIAN
MICKULEIT RECEIVES THE CITIZEN
COMMENDABLE ACTION
COIN

HON. FRANCIS ROONEY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 9, 2019

Mr. ROONEY of Florida. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Florian Mickuleit on receiving the Citizen Commendable Action Coin for aiding law enforcement in rescuing a man from a canal. This award is given by an Officer of the Cape Coral Police Department to a civilian for exemplary behavior or a remarkable act.

On June 4, 2019, a concerned citizen called Cape Coral Police to report that a man had been swimming in the canal by their home for an extended period, and he refused to come out of the water. When police arrived, they found the man was not acting rationally and was out of their rescue rope's range. The man claimed that the current was too strong for him to swim to shore.

Mickuleit had been delivering a rental boat in the area and offered to use the boat in a rescue attempt. He drove the boat to the middle of the canal with officers onboard, and they were finally able to bring the man safely to shore. The man was then taken to the local hospital by Lee County Emergency Medical Services.

I am grateful for Florian and his actions to help save a citizen in need. I commend his actions and congratulate him on receiving this honor.

MEDICAID AND CHIP TERRITORY
TRANSPARENCY AND INFORMATION ACT

**HON. GREGORIO KILI CAMACHO
SABLAN**

OF THE NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 9, 2019

Mr. SABLAN. Madam Speaker, today, I introduce the Medicaid and CHIP Territory Transparency and Information Act, which would require the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (CMS) to publish on its website, and periodically update, specified information related to federal expenditures under Medicaid and the Children's Health Insurance Program (CHIP) in each of the U.S. territories.

Presently, data reporting for the Northern Mariana Islands' (NMI) Medicaid program is waived at the discretion of Secretary of Health and Human Services, as allowed by Section 1902(j) of the Social Security Act. American Samoa also has this waiver. Absent this waiver, other insular areas are required to maintain appropriate reporting systems as a condition of receiving Medicaid funds. However, there is little evidence to suggest that CMS has been carrying out any robust oversight. An April 2016 Government Accountability Office report found that "the lack of enforcement of program integrity mechanisms and information systems—have contributed to the limited federal program integrity efforts in the territories." The report goes on to state "until recently,

CMS regulations exempted territories from the requirement to develop a Medicaid Management Information System, which could provide more detail on the territories' Medicaid and CHIP spending, including increasing the level of detail on the territories' . . . reporting."

Data collection on existing insular area Medicaid programs is not only important for transparency and accountability, but essential if long-term Medicaid funding solutions are to be developed for our most remote U.S. jurisdictions. Gathering enrollment, utilization, and expenditure data will allow for a greater understanding of unique health care needs—enabling local government and CMS officials to make evidenced based decisions when it comes to Medicaid program improvements for our insular areas.

The gentleman from Florida, Mr. BILIRAKIS originally introduced this bill in the 115th Congress and is an original co-sponsor of this bill today along with my colleagues, Ms. PLASKETT, Mrs. RADEWAGEN, Mr. SAN NICOLAS, and Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN. This bill is important to the future of Medicaid in the U.S. Territories. I urge all my colleagues to support this bipartisan legislation.

REMEMBERING JULIUS W.
HEGELER II OF DANVILLE, ILLINOIS

HON. JOHN SHIMKUS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 9, 2019

Mr. SHIMKUS. Madam Speaker, I rise to note the passing of a most remarkable man. Julius W. Hegeler II of Danville, Illinois died July 5, 2019 at the age of 91.

To say that Mr. Hegeler led an impactful life would be to gloss over the thousands who benefitted from his caring nature, his generosity of spirit, and his humanity. Few people are in a position to make such a positive impact, and even fewer take the opportunity. Mr. Hegeler will forever be remembered for having seized his opportunity with such an outsized desire to help that he never turned anyone away.

A lifelong resident of Danville, Julius graduated from Danville High School and went on to earn a business degree before enlisting in the Air Force. He flew 70 missions as a jet pilot during the Korean War, was awarded the Distinguished Flying Cross in May 1954 for "extraordinary achievement," and earned the Air Medal and Oak Leaf Cluster as well.

Returning from the war, Julius and others built a chemical packaging company that he later sold. His fortune made, in 1992 he placed 90 percent of his wealth into the Julius W. Hegeler II Foundation and set out to give back to the community that he loved. Julius was especially concerned with helping those with disabilities and gave generously to local organizations such as Danville AMBUCS and WorkSource Enterprises. There were no limits to causes he would support, however, as the arts, education, recreation, community, and youth-focused groups and organizations have all benefited from Julius's assistance.

Danville has lost one of its very best, a man who shunned the limelight but who nonetheless made so many lives brighter and richer. It has been my privilege to spend time with

Julius Hegeler, and those memories I will always hold dear.

Madam Speaker, I would like to offer my sincerest condolences to the family of Julius W. Hegeler II on the loss of this truly remarkable individual, and I wish the family the best during this very trying time.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 100TH ANNUAL ANN ARBOR CITY TENNIS TOURNAMENT

HON. DEBBIE DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 9, 2019

Mrs. DINGELL. Madam Speaker, I rise today to celebrate Ann Arbor's 100th City Tennis Tournament. The event provides a vital outlet promoting community building and healthy competition.

Established in 1919, the Ann Arbor City Tennis Tournament is one of the oldest city tennis tournaments in the country. Starting with a tournament of 24 men at West Park, the competition has expanded to over one hundred players across several categories, adding a women's event in 1922 and parent-child matches. The Ann Arbor Area Community Tennis Association organizes the tournament, youth programs, and charity events with the support of corporate sponsorships and local donations. The Town Tennis Celebration, a citywide event featuring afternoon clinics, food, and a viewing of the doubles finals of the competition, marks the conclusion of the tournament.

The Ann Arbor City Tennis Tournament provides an outlet for community building and allows local athletes to showcase their commitment to the sport. The tournament underscores a dedication to fellowship and friendly competition and its continued success highlights the importance of these events in our communities. We are grateful for the commitment of the Ann Arbor Area Community Tennis Association for their exceptional work supporting physical fitness, charity, and community building.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in celebrating Ann Arbor's 100th City Tennis Tournament. We thank the Ann Arbor Community Tennis Association for their exemplary work supporting the city of Ann Arbor.

HONORING JOHN FALKENBURY AND HIS RETIREMENT AS PRESIDENT AND COO OF THE USO OF NORTH CAROLINA

HON. RICHARD HUDSON

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 9, 2019

Mr. HUDSON. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Mr. John Falkenburg, the President and Chief Operating Officer for the United Service Organizations (USO) of North Carolina, on his decades of service to the State of North Carolina.

John was appointed President and COO for the USO of North Carolina in March 2009. During his tenure, he was responsible for planning, organizing and directing the oper-

ations of the state headquarters, five USO fixed centers and a mobile center. More than that, he helped organize and marshal thousands of volunteers over the years to support hundreds of thousands of active-duty servicemembers, veterans and their families. John brought 25 years of corporate and military experience to the job, which allowed him to grow and advance the mission of USO.

The USO centers across the state provide vital resources and support to our men and women in uniform and their families. These services include transition assistance, financial literacy, child educational programs, deployment and homecoming operations, military and civilian outreach programs, Fallen and Wounded Warrior escort services, and a focus on providing the entire community with support and assistance. Through his leadership, dedication and passion for service, John has been a champion in ensuring these programs are readily available for anyone who needs them.

A resident of North Carolina's Eighth Congressional District and someone I've been lucky enough to call a friend for more than two decades, I can say from experience that John is a true pillar of the community above and beyond his USO and military service. John has served as President and CEO of Five Oaks Nursing Center in Concord, the Managing Partner of the Falkenburg Family LLC, and President of the Stephen D. Falkenburg Jr. Foundation in Charlotte. He also served as the WBT-AM radio station's on-air analyst and was a credentialed military consultant and frequent guest for News14 Carolina. I know I speak for everyone in the community when I say we are truly grateful for his unwavering service and cannot thank him enough. I would like to offer my sincerest appreciation and wish him a long and happy retirement.

Madam Speaker, please join me today in honoring President John Falkenburg and his service to our state.

HONORING ROSS PEROT

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 9, 2019

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, today, I would like to honor the life and legacy of Ross Perot, a Texas native and gracious philanthropist. His innovation, leadership, and generosity in both the private and public sectors were immeasurable.

Mr. Perot led a life of excellence and service. He was a pioneer in the computer services industry, founding the Electronic Data Systems Corp. in 1962 and Perot Systems Corp. in 1988. With his success, he prioritized efforts to honor and care for our nation's POWs and veterans. For this work, he was recognized with the Winston Churchill Award, only the third American to receive this award.

His humanitarian efforts through the Perot Foundation have brought immeasurable gains to the Dallas community and the state of Texas. He was a strong supporter of the University of Texas Southwestern Medical Center in my district, and his family continues to honor his legacy with the Perot Museum of Nature and Science.

We are all grateful for the talents he shared with us. I would like to extend my deepest

sympathies to his wife, Margot; their five children and spouses, Ross Jr. and Sarah Perot; Nancy Perot and Rod Jones; Suzanne and Rathjen; and Katherine and Eric Reeves; and Patrick K. McGee; Carolyn and Dr. Karl his 16 grandchildren.

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

See Résumé of Congressional Activity.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S4705–4742

Measures Introduced: Nine bills and two resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 2058–2066, and S. Res. 272–273. **Pages S4729–30**

Measures Reported:

S. 279, to allow tribal grant schools to participate in the Federal Employee Health Benefits Program. (S. Rept. No. 116–54)

S. Res. 198, condemning Brunei's dramatic human rights backsliding, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute and with an amended preamble.

S. 1173, to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize the Emergency Medical Services for Children program.

S. 1199, to amend the Public Health Service Act to revise and extend the poison center network program, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

S. Con. Res. 10, recognizing that Chinese telecommunications companies such as Huawei and ZTE pose serious threats to the national security of the United States and its allies, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute and with an amended preamble. **Page S4729**

Measures Passed:

Christa McAuliffe Commemorative Coin Act: Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs was discharged from further consideration of S. 239, to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in recognition of Christa McAuliffe, and the bill was then passed, after agreeing to the following amendment proposed thereto: **Page S4739**

Thune (for Shaheen) Amendment No. 907, relating to date changes. **Page S4739**

Encouraging a Swift Transfer of Power in the Republic of the Sudan: Senate agreed to S. Res. 188, encouraging a swift transfer of power by the

military to a civilian-led political authority in the Republic of the Sudan, after withdrawing the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute and the committee reported amendment to the preamble, and agreeing to the following amendments proposed thereto: **Pages S4736–39**

Thune (for Cruz/Durbin) Amendment No. 908, in the nature of a substitute. **Pages S4736–38**

Thune (for Cruz/Durbin) Amendment No. 909, to amend the preamble. **Page S4738**

Wetherell II Nomination—Cloture: By 82 yeas to 16 nays (Vote No. EX. 192), Senate agreed to the motion to close further debate on the nomination of T. Kent Wetherell II, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Florida. **Page S4724**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that at approximately 9:30 a.m., on Wednesday, July 10, 2019, Senate resume consideration of the nomination, post-cloture. **Page S4740**

Leichty Nomination—Cloture: By 87 yeas to 11 nays (Vote No. EX. 193), Senate agreed to the motion to close further debate on the nomination of Damon Ray Leichty, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Indiana. **Pages S4724–25**

Ranjan Nomination—Cloture: Senate resumed consideration of the nomination of J. Nicholas Ranjan, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Pennsylvania. **Page S4725**

During consideration of this nomination today, Senate also took the following action:

By 83 yeas to 15 nays (Vote No. EX. 194), Senate agreed to the motion to close further debate on the nomination. **Page S4725**

Nominations—Agreement: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that at 11 a.m., on Wednesday, July 10, 2019, Senate vote on confirmation of the following nominations in the order listed: T. Kent Wetherell II, to be United States District

Judge for the Northern District of Florida, J. Nicholas Ranjan, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Pennsylvania, and Damon Ray Leichty, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Indiana; that at 4:30 p.m., Senate vote on the pending motions to invoke cloture on the nominations of Robert L. King, of Kentucky, to be Assistant Secretary for Postsecondary Education, Department of Education, and John P. Pallasch, of Kentucky, to be an Assistant Secretary of Labor, and that if cloture is invoked, the votes on confirmation of the nominations occur at a time to be determined by the Majority Leader, in consultation with the Democratic Leader on Thursday, July 11, 2019; and that the motion to invoke cloture with respect to the nomination of Peter C. Wright, of Michigan, to be Assistant Administrator, Office of Solid Waste, Environmental Protection Agency, ripen following disposition of the nomination of John P. Pallasch.

Page S4725

Nomination Confirmed: Senate confirmed the following nomination:

By 53 yeas to 45 nays (Vote No. EX. 191), Daniel Aaron Bress, of California, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit.

Pages S4706–24

Measures Read the First Time:

Page S4726

Executive Communications:

Page S4726

Petitions and Memorials:

Pages S4726–29

Additional Cosponsors:

Pages S4730–32

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions:

Page S4732

Additional Statements:

Page S4726

Amendments Submitted:

Pages S4733–35

Authorities for Committees to Meet:

Page S4735

Record Votes: Four record votes were taken today. (Total—194)

Pages S4724–25

Adjournment: Senate convened at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 7:07 p.m., until 9:30 a.m. on Wednesday, July 10, 2019. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today's Record on page S4740.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

USSOUTHCOM NATIONAL DEFENSE STRATEGY IMPLEMENTATION

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities concluded a hearing to examine implementation of the National Defense Strategy in the United States Southern Command

area of responsibility, after receiving testimony from Admiral Craig S. Faller, USN, Commander, United States Southern Command, Department of Defense.

NASA EXPLORATION PLANS

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Subcommittee on Aviation and Space concluded a hearing to examine National Aeronautics and Space Administration exploration plans, focusing on where we have been and where we are going, after receiving testimony from Eugene F. Kranz, former Apollo Flight Director, Houston, Texas; Christine M. Darden, formerly of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Langley Research Center, Hampton, Virginia; Mary Lynne Dittmar, Coalition for Deep Space Exploration, and Eric Stallmer, Commercial Spaceflight Federation, both of Washington, D.C.; and Homer Hickam, *Rocket Boys*, Huntsville, Alabama.

ENERGY LEGISLATION

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Energy concluded a hearing to examine S. 1602, to amend the United States Energy Storage Competitiveness Act of 2007 to establish a research, development, and demonstration program for grid-scale energy storage systems, S. 1593, to require the Secretary of Energy to establish an energy storage research program, a demonstration program, and a technical assistance and grant program, S. 1183, to establish an energy storage and microgrid grant and technical assistance program, S. 1741, to direct the Secretary of Energy to establish a program to advance energy storage deployment by reducing the cost of energy storage through research, development, and demonstration, S. 2048, to require the Secretary of Energy to establish a demonstration initiative focused on the development of long-duration energy storage technologies, including a joint program to be established in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, S. 1685, to require the Secretary of Energy to establish a program for the research, development, and demonstration of commercially viable technologies for the capture of carbon dioxide produced during the generation of natural gas-generated power, S. 143, to authorize the Department of Energy to conduct collaborative research with the Department of Veterans Affairs in order to improve healthcare services for veterans in the United States, S. 983, to amend the Energy Conservation and Production Act to reauthorize the weatherization assistance program, S. 1857, to amend the National Energy Conservation Policy Act to improve Federal energy and water performance requirements for Federal buildings and establish a Federal Energy Management Program, S. 1064, to require the Secretary of Energy to conduct a study on the national security

implications of building ethane and other natural-gas-liquids-related petrochemical infrastructure in the United States, and H.R. 1138, to reauthorize the West Valley demonstration project, after receiving testimony from Senators Collins and Klobuchar; and Bruce J. Walker, Assistant Secretary, Office of Electricity, and Shawn Bennett, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Oil and Gas, Office of Fossil Energy, both of the Department of Energy.

PROTECTING INNOCENCE IN A DIGITAL WORLD

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee concluded a hearing to examine protecting innocence in a digital

world, after receiving testimony from Duffie Stone, National District Attorneys Association, Bluffton, South Carolina; Angela J. Campbell, Georgetown Law, and Stephen Balkam, Family Online Safety Institute, both of Washington, D.C.; Christopher McKenna, Protect Young Eyes, Caledonia, Michigan; and John F. Clark, National Center for Missing and Exploited Children, Alexandria, Virginia.

INTELLIGENCE

Select Committee on Intelligence: Committee held closed hearings on intelligence matters, receiving testimony from officials of the intelligence community.

Committee recessed subject to the call.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 33 public bills, H.R. 3628–3660; and 7 resolutions, H. Con. Res. 52; and H. Res. 475–480 were introduced.

Pages H5301–03

Additional Cosponsors:

Pages H5304–06

Reports Filed: Reports were filed today as follows:

H.R. 1988, to clarify seasoning requirements for certain refinanced mortgage loans, and for other purposes, with an amendment (H. Rept. 116–138, Part 1);

H.R. 677, to amend gendered terms in Federal law relating to the President and the President's spouse (H. Rept. 116–139);

H.R. 2368, 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 (H. Rept. 116–140);

H.R. 1986, to amend section 175b of title 18, United States Code, to correct a scrivener's error (H. Rept. 116–141);

H.R. 1569, to amend title 28, United States Code, to add Flagstaff and Yuma to the list of locations in which court shall be held in the judicial district for the State of Arizona (H. Rept. 116–142); and

H. Res. 476, providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2500) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes, and providing for con-

sideration of motions to suspend the rules (H. Rept. 116–143).

Pages H5293, H5301

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein she appointed Representative Clay to act as Speaker pro tempore for today.

Page H5273

Resignation from the House Republican Conference: Read a letter from Representative Cheney wherein she announced that Representative Amash resigned from the House Republican Conference.

Pages H5273–74

Committee Election Vacated: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein she announced that Representative Amash's election to the Committee on Oversight and Reform has been vacated effective July 9, 2019.

Page H5274

Recess: The House recessed at 2:06 p.m. and reconvened at 4:31 p.m.

Page H5274

Suspensions: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measures:

Protect Affordable Mortgages for Veterans Act of 2019: H.R. 1988, amended, to clarify seasoning requirements for certain refinanced mortgage loans;

Pages H5274–76

Amending the Securities and Exchange Act of 1934 to amend the definition of whistleblower: H.R. 2515, amended, to amend the Securities and Exchange Act of 1934 to amend the definition of whistleblower, by a 2/3 yeas-and-nays vote of 410 yeas to 12 nays, Roll No. 431;

Pages H5276–78, H5287–88

Agreed to amend the title so as to read: "To amend the Securities and Exchange Act of 1934 to amend the definition of whistleblower, to extend the

anti-retaliation protections provided to whistleblowers, and for other purposes”; **Page H5288**

Housing Financial Literacy Act of 2019: H.R. 2162, amended, to require the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to discount FHA single-family mortgage insurance premium payments for first-time homebuyers who complete a financial literacy housing counseling program; **Pages H5278–80**

Emphasizing the importance of grassroots investor protection and the investor education missions of State and Federal securities regulators, calling on the Securities and Exchange Commission to collaborate with State securities regulators in the protection of investors: H. Res. 456, emphasizing the importance of grassroots investor protection and the investor education missions of State and Federal securities regulators, calling on the Securities and Exchange Commission to collaborate with State securities regulators in the protection of investors; **Pages H5280–82**

Improving Investment Research for Small and Emerging Issuers Act: H.R. 2919, to require the Securities and Exchange Commission to carry out a study to evaluate the issues affecting the provision of and reliance upon investment research into small issuers; **Pages H5282–83**

Expanding Investment in Small Businesses Act of 2019: H.R. 3050, amended, to require the Securities and Exchange Commission to carry out a study of the 10 per centum threshold limitation applicable to the definition of a diversified company under the Investment Company Act of 1940, by a 2/3 yeas-and-nay vote of 417 yeas to 2 nays, Roll No. 432; and **Pages H5283–85, H5288**

Expanding Access to Capital for Rural Job Creators Act: H.R. 2409, to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to expand access to capital for rural-area small businesses, by a 2/3 yeas-and-nay vote of 413 yeas to 7 nays, Roll No. 433. **Pages H5285–87, H5288–89**

Recess: The House recessed at 6:17 p.m. and reconvened at 6:30 p.m. **Page H5287**

Protecting Affordable Mortgages for Veterans Act of 2019: The House agreed to discharge from committee and pass S. 1749, to clarify seasoning requirements for certain refinanced mortgage loans. **Page H5289**

Recess: The House recessed at 8:03 p.m. and reconvened at 11:48 p.m. **Page H5293**

Quorum Calls—Votes: Three yeas-and-nay votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H5287–88, H5288, and H5288–89. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 2 p.m. and adjourned at 11:49 p.m.

Committee Meetings

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2020

Committee on Rules: Full Committee held a hearing on H.R. 2500, the “National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2020”. The Committee granted, by record vote of 8–4, a structured rule providing for consideration of H.R. 2500, the “National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2020”. The rule provides one hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill. The rule provides that an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 116–19, modified by the amendment printed in part A of the report, shall be considered as adopted and the bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. The rule waives all points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended. The rule makes in order only those further amendments printed in part B of the report and amendments en bloc described in section 3 of the resolution. Each amendment in part B 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, may be withdrawn by the proponent at any time before action thereon, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question. The rule waives all points of order against the further amendments printed in part B of the report or amendments en bloc described in section 3 of the resolution. The rule provides that the chair of the Committee on Armed Services or his designee may offer amendments en bloc consisting of amendments printed in part B of the report not earlier disposed of. Amendments en bloc shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services or their designees, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question. The rule provides that 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 question of such amendments’ adoption shall be put to

the House en gros and without division of the question. The rule provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions. The rule provides that clause 7(a)(1) of rule XV shall not apply with respect to H.R. 553. Finally, the rule provides that it shall be in order at any time on the legislative day of July 11, 2019, or July 12, 2019, for the Speaker to entertain motions that the House suspend the rules, as though under clause 1 of rule XV, relating to the bill (H.R. 1327) to extend authorization for the September 11th Victim Compensation Fund of 2001 through fiscal year 2090, and for other purposes. Testimony was heard from Chairman Smith of Washington, and Representatives Thornberry, Garamendi, Armstrong, Bacon, Barr, Bishop of Utah, Dunn, Gallagher, Hartzler, Lesko, Mast, Olson, Pence, Smith of New Jersey, Shimkus, Stauber, Yoho, Stivers, Wilson of South Carolina, and Wenstrup.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR WEDNESDAY, JULY 10, 2019

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Armed Services: business meeting to consider pending military nominations, 10 a.m., SR-222.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: business meeting to consider S. 149, to establish a Senior Scams Prevention Advisory Council, S. 153, to promote veteran involvement in STEM education, computer science, and scientific research, S. 384, to require the Secretary of Commerce, acting through the Director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology, to help facilitate the adoption of composite technology in infrastructure in the United States, S. 553, to direct the Secretary of Commerce to establish a working group to recommend to Congress a definition of blockchain technology, S. 1148, 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. 1342, to require the Under Secretary for Oceans and Atmosphere to update periodically the environmental sensitivity index products of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration for each coastal area of the Great Lakes, S. 1427, to amend the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act to improve the Network for Manufacturing Innovation Program, S. 1601, to direct the Secretary of Transportation to issue a rule requiring all new passenger motor vehicles to be equipped with a child safety alert system, S. 1611, to ensure appropriate prioritization, spectrum planning, and

interagency coordination to support the Internet of Things, S. 1694, to require any Federal agency that issues licenses to conduct activities in outer space to include in the requirements for such licenses an agreement relating to the preservation and protection of the Apollo 11 landing site, S. 1881, to provide PreCheck to certain severely injured or disabled veterans, and the nominations of Stephen M. Dickson, of Georgia, to be Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration, Michelle A. Schultz, of Pennsylvania, to be a Member of the Surface Transportation Board, and a routine list in the Coast Guard, 10 a.m., SH-216.

Committee on Environment and Public Works: to hold hearings to examine investing in America's surface transportation infrastructure, focusing on the need for a multi-year reauthorization bill, 10 a.m., SD-406.

Committee on Foreign Relations: to hold hearings to examine defense cooperation, focusing on the use of emergency authorities under the Arms Export Control Act, 10:15 a.m., SD-419.

Special Committee on Aging: to hold hearings to examine how the special diabetes program is changing the lives of Americans with Type 1 diabetes, 9:30 a.m., SD-106.

House

Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs, hearing entitled "United States Efforts to Counter Russian Disinformation and Malign Influence", 10 a.m., 2362-A Rayburn.

Committee on Energy and Commerce, Subcommittee on Consumer Protection and Commerce, markup on H.R. 2211, the "STURDY Act"; H.R. 3172, the "Safe Sleep Act of 2019"; H.R. 3170, the "Safe Cribs Act of 2019"; H.R. 1618, the "Nicholas and Zachary Burt Carbon Monoxide Poisoning Prevention Act of 2019"; H.R. 806, the "Portable Fuel Container Safety Act of 2019"; and H.R. 2647, the "SOFFA", 10 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Committee on Financial Services, Full Committee, hearing entitled "Monetary Policy and the State of the Economy", 10 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Investor Protection, Entrepreneurship, and Capital Markets, hearing entitled "Building a Sustainable and Competitive Economy: An Examination of Proposals to Improve Environmental, Social, and Governance Disclosures", 2 p.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Committee on Homeland Security, Full Committee, hearing entitled "About Face: Examining the Department of Homeland Security's Use of Facial Recognition and Other Biometric Technologies", 10 a.m., 310 Cannon.

Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, and Homeland Security, hearing entitled "Marijuana Laws in America: Racial Justice and the Need for Reform", 10 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Committee on Natural Resources, Subcommittee on National Parks, Forests, and Public Lands, hearing on H.R. 252, the "Pershing County Economic Development and Conservation Act"; H.R. 1475, the "LOTTERY Act"; H.R. 2199, the "Central Coast Heritage Protection Act"; H.R. 2215, the "San Gabriel Mountains Foothills and

Rivers Protection Act”; H.R. 2250, the “Northwest California Wilderness, Recreation, and Working Forests Act”; H.R. 2546, the “Colorado Wilderness Act of 2019”; and H.R. 2642, the “Wild Olympics Wilderness and Wild and Scenic Rivers Act”, 10 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

Committee on Oversight and Reform, Full Committee, hearing entitled “The Trump Administration’s Attack on the ACA: Reversal in Court Case Threatens Health Care for Millions of Americans”, 10 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Civil Rights and Civil Liberties, hearing entitled “Kids in Cages: Inhumane Treatment at the Border”, 2:30 p.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, Subcommittee on Space and Aeronautics, hearing entitled “A Review of NASA’s Plans for the International Space Station and Future Activities in Low Earth Orbit”, 10 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Energy, markup on H.R. 3597, the “Solar Energy Research and Development Act of 2019”;

H.R. 3607, the “Fossil Energy Research and Development Act of 2019”; and H.R. 3609, the “Wind Energy Research and Development Act of 2019”, 2 p.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Committee on Small Business, Full Committee, hearing entitled “Continuing to Serve: From Military to Entrepreneur”, 11:30 a.m., 2360 Rayburn.

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Full Committee, hearing entitled “Water Resources Development Acts: Status of Implementation and Assessing the Future Needs”, 10 a.m., 2167 Rayburn.

Committee on Veterans’ Affairs, Subcommittee on Economic Opportunity, hearing entitled “Economic Well-being of Women Veterans”, 10 a.m., HVC–210.

Subcommittee on Health, hearing entitled “The Cost of Caring”, 2 p.m., HVC–210.

Committee on Ways and Means, Full Committee, markup on H.R. 397, the “Rehabilitation for Multiemployer Pensions Act of 2019”, 10 a.m., 1100 Longworth.

Résumé of Congressional Activity

FIRST SESSION OF THE ONE HUNDRED SIXTEENTH CONGRESS

The first table gives a comprehensive résumé of all legislative business transacted by the Senate and House.

The second table accounts for all nominations submitted to the Senate by the President for Senate confirmation.

DATA ON LEGISLATIVE ACTIVITY

January 3 through June 30, 2019

	<i>Senate</i>	<i>House</i>	<i>Total</i>
Days in session	98	101	..
Time in session	533 hrs., 9'	438 hrs., 39'	..
Congressional Record:			
Pages of proceedings	4,678	5,266	..
Extensions of Remarks	867	..
Public bills enacted into law	10	14	24
Private bills enacted into law
Bills in conference
Measures passed, total	249	292	541
Senate bills	45	11	..
House bills	16	180	..
Senate joint resolutions	23	1	..
House joint resolutions	4	7	..
Senate concurrent resolutions	8	4	..
House concurrent resolutions	6	8	..
Simple resolutions	147	81	..
Measures reported, total	*108	*127	235
Senate bills	65
House bills	9	94	..
Senate joint resolutions
House joint resolutions	1	..
Senate concurrent resolutions	2
House concurrent resolutions	2	..
Simple resolutions	32	30	..
Special reports	12	7	..
Conference reports	1	1	..
Measures pending on calendar	93	41	..
Measures introduced, total	2,394	4,187	6,581
Bills	2,053	3,593	..
Joint resolutions	49	71	..
Concurrent resolutions	21	51	..
Simple resolutions	271	472	..
Quorum calls	2	1	..
Yea-and-nay votes	189	182	..
Recorded votes	247	..
Bills vetoed	1	1	..
Veto overridden

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE NOMINATIONS

January 3 through June 30, 2019

Civilian nominations, totaling 410, disposed of as follows:	
Confirmed	135
Unconfirmed	264
Withdrawn	11
Other Civilian nominations, totaling 697, disposed of as follows:	
Confirmed	19
Unconfirmed	678
Air Force nominations, totaling 1,843, disposed of as follows:	
Confirmed	1,503
Unconfirmed	340
Army nominations, totaling 4,952, disposed of as follows:	
Confirmed	4,517
Unconfirmed	435
Navy nominations, totaling 1,827, disposed of as follows:	
Confirmed	1,821
Unconfirmed	6
Marine Corps nominations, totaling 1,416, disposed of as follows:	
Confirmed	1,407
Unconfirmed	9
<i>Summary</i>	
Total nominations carried over from the First Session	0
Total nominations received this Session	11,145
Total confirmed	9,402
Total unconfirmed	1,732
Total withdrawn	11
Total returned to the White House	0

*These figures include all measures reported, even if there was no accompanying report. A total of 53 written reports have been filed in the Senate, 135 reports have been filed in the House.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

9:30 a.m., Wednesday, July 10

Senate Chamber

Program for Wednesday: Senate will resume consideration of the nomination of T. Kent Wetherell II, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Florida, post-cloture, and vote on confirmation of the nominations of T. Kent Wetherell II, J. Nicholas Ranjan, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Pennsylvania, and Damon Ray Leichty, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Indiana, at 11 a.m.

At 4:30 p.m., Senate will vote on the motions to invoke cloture on the nominations of Robert L. King, of Kentucky, to be Assistant Secretary for Postsecondary Education, Department of Education, and John P. Pallasch, of Kentucky, to be an Assistant Secretary of Labor.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

10 a.m., Wednesday, July 10

House Chamber

Program for Wednesday: Consideration of H.R. 2500—National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2020 (Subject to a Rule). Consideration of measures under suspension of the Rules.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Correa, J. Luis, Calif., E881
Costa, Jim, Calif., E882
Crow, Jason, Col., E877
Dingell, Debbie, Mich., E879, E880, E881, E883
Graves, Sam, Mo., E880

Hudson, Richard, N.C., E883
Huizenga, Bill, Mich., E879
Johnson, Eddie Bernice, Tex., E883
Joyce, John, Pa., E879
Kelly, Mike, Pa., E881
Levin, Mike, Calif., E882
Perlmutter, Ed, Colo., E881

Rooney, Francis, Fla., E880, E882
Ryan, Tim, Ohio, E880
Sablan, Gregorio Kilili Camacho, Northern Mariana Islands, E882
Shimkus, John, Ill., E880, E883
Wenstrup, Brad R., Ohio, E880
Wittman, Robert J., Va., E879



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.

The *Congressional Record* (USPS 087-390). The Periodicals postage is paid at Washington, D.C. The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are