United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 165 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, OCTOBER 17, 2019 No. 164

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
October 17, 2019.

I hereby appoint the Honorable HENRY CUELLAR to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

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

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

HONORING ELIJAH CUMMINGS

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I have the sad task of announcing what probably most of you already know. We have lost a great American, a decent American, a wonderful Member of this body, ELIJAH CUMMINGS, who died early this morning of illnesses he had been suffering from for a significant period of time.

Members of the House, the people of Maryland, and the people of the United States of America woke up to this sad and shocking news that we had lost this dear friend, a devoted public servant, and a dedicated patriot, who reflected courtesy and respect for all.

At a time of confrontation, disagreement, anger, and, yes, sometimes hate, he was a beacon of civility, of fairness, and of justice. He was chairman of the Oversight and Reform Committee. He passed away too early at 68 years of age.

All of us who served with him knew his passion for justice; his sharp intellect, having graduated Phi Beta Kappa from Howard University, where he was president of the student government association; his wit; and his devotion to the cause of making government work for the people.

It will be surely said of ELIJAH that he worked hard until the very end. He was on a telephone call with all of us on Sunday talking about how we ought to proceed with the heavy duties that confronted him, his committee, and the Congress.

He never wavered in his dedication to the causes he made the hallmarks of his career, even in recent days when, as I said, his health was waning.

Those causes were equality and opportunity for all, the son of a sharecropper who rose to be a great leader in this country. He was concerned about voting rights, civil rights, alleviating poverty, establishing justice, and ensuring that those entrusted with high office are held accountable and carry out their responsibilities lawfully and ethically.

ELIJAH CUMMINGS was, of course, a true son of Baltimore, a city of grit and hope, a city of dreams and hard work. He was loved in the city of Baltimore. At a time of great distress in the city of Baltimore, it was ELIJAH CUMMINGS in the streets bringing calm and peace to that city.

His life will forever be an example to all of us of striving to better one's community and one's country, a passion and service to one's fellow man and woman, and a perseverance in the face of adversity while in pursuit of making this country and the world a better place.

Whenever he believed we were falling short of the vision of our Founders—and many of you will hear this resonate in your ears—he would say to all of us in a loving way, as he said throughout our State at a time of trouble and difference: ''We are better than this.''

As we see conflict, as we see people disparaging one another, we want to think to ourselves, ''we are better than this,'' and think of ELIJAH CUMMINGS, a man of great faith, of great humility, of great humanity, and of great service.

We will miss ELIJAH CUMMINGS. We are a lesser place for losing him. Like the prophet for whom he was named, he was taken from us too young, too soon, too suddenly. We can say, with Shakespeare: He should have died hereafter. Tomorrow, and tomorrow, and tomorrow.

ELIJAH will not have those tomorrows, and we will not have them with him. We will miss him dearly.

My thoughts are with his wife, Maya, and his three children.

I offer my condolences to the people of Maryland's Seventh Congressional District, who loved their Congressman. They had confidence in their Congressman, and they knew that he was, in fact, better, and they were better for his service.

May God bless ELIJAH CUMMINGS, his family, all of us, and this great country.

IMPEACHMENT

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

Printed on recycled paper.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, since I joined this body in January, I have done my darnedest to steer clear of the political circus that we see on a daily basis in Washington.

Instead, I have worked with so many Members to pass legislation preventing child abuse and legislation that makes it easier for Americans to save for school and for their retirement. We have made progress, and I have been a key part of that progress in USMCA, in welfare reform, and in implementing the farm bill.

But, Mr. Speaker, the impeachment proceedings going on in this Chamber in the last few weeks have given me pause, and they should give pause to every Member of this Chamber and to all American people.

I know—we all know—that some Members are for impeachment and others of us are opposed. But we should all admit that, by its very nature, impeachment is emotional, it is taxing, and it is divisive.

You are talking about removing our President from office. This is no small thing. This is changing the trajectory of this country.

Given how contentious and given how important that proceeding is, we have an obligation to play by the rules and to have a process that is open, that is sound, and that is fair. Mr. Speaker, we are failing at that special obligation.

First, the Speaker has launched impeachment without a vote by this body, and that is unprecedented. Members have been denied their authority, their voice, their opportunity to be on the RECORD in that matter.

Let us be clear: Under the Constitution, the authority to launch impeachment rests with the U.S. House of Representatives, not with the Speaker and not with the chair of House intelligence.

Second, this proceeding has not been open and transparent. Instead, Members have been denied access to witness testimony and kicked out of committees. There is no live streaming and there is no TV coverage as we have seen in past impeachments. The result is that Americans don't have access to important facts because they can't get them.

Finally, this proceeding has not been fair. In the past, Presidents have had an opportunity to have counsel present. Counsel has had an opportunity to cross-examine witnesses, and they have been given an opportunity to review the evidence and to prepare a defense instead of battling secondhand accounts of closed-door testimony selectively leaked to the media.

228 Members of this body have already announced that they are for impeachment even though the evidence is not fully gathered yet, and, in any case, they have not reviewed it. How is that fair?

Mr. Speaker, elections matter; transparency matters; due process matters; and faith in this Constitution, in our Constitution, and in institutions matter.

As I said, it is time that this body lives up to its special obligation. Our country deserves nothing less.

CHARLESTON C–17 CREW

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

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the heroic actions of Captain Forrest Lampela, Captain Ken Dickenscheidt, Senior Airman Chris Bowers, Airman First Class Timothy Henn, and Technical Sergeant Nick Scarmeas, who broke diplomatic protocol and fought near-zero visibility to save the life of a U.S. Navy sailor who was wounded in combat.

The Joint Base Charleston crew was flying a critically injured sailor to Walter Reed from Ramstein Air Base in Germany. Halfway through their mission, the sailor took a turn for the worse and needed immediate surgery. The commander, Captain Lampela, made the decision to turn around and make an emergency landing in Shannon, Ireland, in dense fog and without diplomatic clearance.

In an incredibly stressful situation, the team fell back on their training and made a life-and-death decision that ultimately saved the life of their fellow servicemember. I am honored to commend them.

WARREN COUNTY BICENTENNIAL

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Warren County, Pennsylvania's recent bicentennial.

In March of 1819, the Pennsylvania General Assembly approved legislation to establish Warren County. On October 1, later that year, the legislation became official, and Warren County became a part of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

This occasion was celebrated earlier this month at the Warren County Courthouse, with local leaders and live entertainment, including the Youngsville High School band. In addition to the remarks and performances, a time capsule was buried on the grounds.

As an avid outdoorsman, I am proud to call Warren County a part of my district, particularly for its beautiful natural landscapes. Home to a portion of the Allegheny National Forest, Warren County has beautiful outdoor spaces that rival much of the Commonwealth.

This bicentennial is an exciting occasion, and I would like to congratulate Warren County on this milestone. I wish them continued success in the next 200 years.

□ 1015

COLLEGE AFFORDABILITY

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

Mrs. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor for his steadfast leadership of the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act, and introduction of the College Affordability Act.

But I cannot do that without further recognizing my colleague and my friend, Chairman ELIJAH CUMMINGS, whose family was from South Carolina, Clarendon County, to be exact, which is the home of the Briggs v. Elliott case, one of the first cases challenging school segregation. He understood the power of a high-quality education, and I know that he would be so incredibly proud of this remarkable piece of legislation that is being introduced this week.

This is an achievement that reflects the priorities of the entire Democratic Caucus to expand opportunities and make college affordable and accessible for all students.

I am proud that this bill embraces and reflects my priorities in Congress, including the Pell Grant Restoration Act, the Teacher Debt Relief Act, the Teacher Diversity and Retention Act, and the Jumpstart on College Act.

These bills would respectively protect student aid of vulnerable students who have been defrauded; provide educators with much-needed student debt relief so that they can stay in the classroom; reinforce critical programs that help develop a diverse educator workforce; and provide a robust investment in dual-enrollment classes that will lower the cost of a degree for students who need it most.

This bill is a year's-long effort to level the playing field for every demographic of students across the country, from veteran students, to working parents; and from small family farmers, to public servants. It is for students hoping to become the first in their family to go to college and afford it.

This bill is for families who struggle to put enough in the bank for their children's education. This bill is for students who struggle to fill out the overly complicated FAFSA; who struggle to earn degrees and keep the lights on while working and raising children; who utilize the Pell grant and other Federal aid to make it through, and still find themselves in debt.

My own journey reflects the challenges of navigating a system that simply is not built for everyone, of jumping through untenable hurdles to complete a degree. So it is deeply gratifying today to be part of the change that I so desperately needed as a student, to give a new, more diverse generation of students the supports they need to succeed.

The College Affordability Act would immediately lower the cost of college

for students and families across the country by expanding Pell grants, incentivizing free community colleges, and driving States to substantially reinvest in their public institutions.

The bill invests in teachers by fixing a broken Public Service Loan Forgiveness program and TEACH Grant system, and permanently funding historically Black colleges and universities and minority-serving institutions, all proven incubators of diverse educators.

The bill raises the quality of higher education by holding accreditors and schools accountable and weeding out bad actors. The bill also improves the completion rate for underserved communities through more robust and flexible student support.

This bill tackles the growing student default crisis by making student loans cheaper to take out, simpler to understand, and easier to pay off.

With the passage of the College Affordability Act, for-profit colleges will no longer be able to look at students as mere profit centers to swindle out of their Pell or GI dollars.

The bill closes loopholes to prevent veterans and low-income students from predatory for-profit institutions and creates more guardrails to ensure that every student can have the peace of mind that the degree they are investing in has value upon graduation.

That is all Americans want—the opportunity to get an education that opens the doors to a life of achievement, fulfillment, and economic power, and to be self-sufficient.

The College Affordability Act is a downpayment on the success and financial stability of students in my district and across the country. I am proud to have contributed to it and I support it here today.

HONORING RONALD K. GREENLEAF

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

Mr. KATKO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Village of Hannibal Mayor Ronald K. Greenleaf who was recently named Veteran of the Year by the Oswego County Veterans Service Agency.

Ron Greenleaf has spent the vast majority of his life in public service, demonstrating an unwavering commitment to his country and community.

In 1967, he entered the United States Navy, serving in Vietnam on the USS *Harnett County*. An electrician by trade, Mr. Greenleaf assisted with maintenance, while contributing to the ship's overall mission of providing tactical assistance to American and Vietnamese forces. In recognition of his service, Mr. Greenleaf was recommended to receive the Combat Action Ribbon.

Following his deployment, Mr. Greenleaf returned to central New York to pursue a career as an electrician, to raise a family, and to continue his service in the Navy Reserves.

Ron Greenleaf has been married to his wife, Dawn, for 47 years, and together, they have two daughters. He is known for his commitment to his family, attending countless practices, games, dance recitals, and plays of his grandchildren.

Following his retirement, Mr. Greenleaf ran for the Hannibal Village board, a position he was elected to in 1994, and served in for 10 years. He then ran for the position of town supervisor where he served seven terms. Leaving this position in 2017, Mr. Greenleaf went on to be elected as the mayor of Hannibal, a role he still holds today.

Of his many accomplishments as an elected official, Mr. Greenleaf has most notably worked to improve infrastructure and promote recreation in Hannibal. He has been praised as a driving force behind the popular Hannibal ramp park, a multiuse park for bikes, skateboards, and Rollerblades.

Aside from his work in public service, Mr. Greenleaf has found many other ways to serve his community. As a member of the VFW, Hannibal American Legion, and chairman of the 2013 Wounded Warrior Benefit, he has worked to assist and support his fellow veterans through adversity and hardship. A deeply patriotic man, Mr. Greenleaf has given several speeches at Memorial Day and Veterans Day ceremonies in and around Hannibal.

On several occasion, Mr. Greenleaf donated his skills as an electrician to assist with repairs for in-need neighbors. Devoted to his faith, for many years Mr. Greenleaf has been an active participant in the Hannibal United Methodist Church, serving as a trustee and youth group leader.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues in the House to join me in honoring Ronald K. Greenleaf. Serving in the military, contributing as an elected official, and volunteering in central New York, Mr. Greenleaf has spent the majority of his life serving others.

Our Nation and community need more people like Mr. Greenleaf, and we are inspired by and thankful for his commitment to public service.

HONORING THE LIFE OF ELIJAH CUMMINGS

Mr. KATKO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and passing of my friend, ELIJAH CUMMINGS.

When I first came to Congress a few terms ago, I teamed up with Mr. CUMMINGS to introduce a bill honoring the life and legacy of Harriet Tubman.

When I approached Mr. CUMMINGS about this bill, he didn't ask me what party I was in. He didn't ask me what my political philosophies were. He didn't care about partisanship. What he cared about is the fact that we had a common interest; that being, Harriet Tubman.

I always appreciated that and in the years that have passed since then, we continued to cosponsor that bill and continued to push it.

I am sad to hear of his passing, and I offer my prayers to his wife and family, and I pray that he is united with God right now. And I think going forward, we can all be happy and proud of the legacy he set for us here in Congress.

SECOND CHANCES

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

Mr. BUDD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss second chances.

Across our Nation, one in three adults have an arrest or conviction that makes it difficult to find a job.

Take Kevin Miller, for example, who was incarcerated for 8 months in 1992 after a minor altercation with police officers.

Kevin was only 19 at the time, but more than a quarter century later, Kevin hasn't been able to get a steady job because he must disclose his arrest on every job application.

Michael Mirsky faced similar hardships. He lost his job as a Verizon technician in 2012 after he pled guilty to resisting arrest during a disagreement over child support payments. In the years following the incident, he faced foreclosure of his home, and even as the economy improved and more and more jobs became available, Mr. Mirsky was unable to find a permanent job and start rebuilding his life.

Mr. Speaker, stories like Kevin's and Michael's are all too common. In fact, more than 70 million Americans have minor criminal records that they must disclose on job applications. As a result, millions of Americans have been turned down from countless jobs for mistakes made decades ago.

The reluctance of employers to hire people with criminal records, combined with job applications that contain check-the-box measures, has detrimental effects on the economy and prevents millions of Americans from becoming productive members of society.

In addition, excluding people with minor criminal records from the workforce, often results in their return to crime and to drugs.

That is why I am proud to cosponsor the Fair Chance Act, which prohibits the Federal Government and Federal contractors from asking about a job applicant's prior criminal record before a conditional offer of employment. This process humanizes applicants and gives them a chance to meet employers face to face and explain their past before employers make a sweeping judgment based on one checked box.

Mr. Speaker, America is a land of second chances. Barriers to employment should not follow a person long after they have served time, paid their debt to society, and started a new life. People deserve the freedom to redeem themselves.

As my colleagues go to conference over the NDAA, I urge them to include this legislation as part of any final deal.

HONORING SENATOR RICHARD LUGAR

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

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to celebrate legislation the House passed this week to name the post office in Indianapolis after the late Senator Richard Lugar.

Senator Lugar was a true statesman who served his country and the State of Indiana with pride. He will be remembered as one of America's greatest Senators, leaving his mark on domestic and global affairs throughout his six terms.

Senator Lugar was an essential part of American diplomacy and strived for peace throughout the globe. In 2013, Lugar's lasting contributions and decades of service to this great country earned him the Presidential Medal of Freedom.

Our Nation is stronger and safer because of Senator Lugar, and I thank my colleagues for supporting legislation to honor his legacy.

POSITIVE IMPACT OF U.S.-JAPAN TRADE DEAL

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to highlight the positive impact the new U.S.-Japan trade deal will have on our Nation and on the Hoosier State.

Japan is an important ally of the United States and a critical trading partner that benefits the Hoosier economy. Japan is heavily invested in the Hoosier State and in Indiana's Sixth Congressional District.

Of the 19 counties in the Sixth District, Japan is currently invested in 14 of them. This trade deal will help increase those investments in our local communities, creating opportunities and jobs for many Hoosiers. In Congress, we must build upon this successful trade agreement President Trump has struck with the American people.

We can and we must pass the USMCA, which will increase opportunities for workers and farmers across this country. I urge my colleagues to continue to support these trade deals.

CONGRATULATING THE WINCHESTER NEWS-GAZETTE ON SERVING HOOSIERS FOR 175 YEARS

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate the Winchester News-Gazette on celebrating their 175th year as a newspaper.

Previously called the Winchester Patriot, Hoosiers in Randolph County have relied on the News-Gazette for local news since 1844.

Local press is essential to a thriving community and is a prime example of the First Amendment in action.

Congratulations to the Winchester News-Gazette on serving Hoosiers for 175 years.

CONGRATULATING MUNCIE-DELAWARE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE ON 125 YEARS

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the Muncie-Delaware Chamber of Commerce for celebrating their 125th anniversary.

The chamber has been an integral part of the greater Muncie community since 1894. Their strategy for engaging large, medium, and small businesses has been the driving factor behind the thriving economy in the city of Muncie and Delaware County.

Congratulations to the Muncie-Delaware County Chamber of Commerce.

RECOGNIZING ROLLS-ROYCE

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize Rolls-Royce for the tremendous work they are doing in my Hoosier State. I recently visited both the Rolls-Royce Indianapolis headquarters and the Rolls-Royce LibertyWorks plant, which produces more Rolls-Royce products than anywhere else in the world.

Rolls-Royce employs 4,000 Hoosiers, and in recent years, invested hundreds of millions of dollars to create world-class engines and products that are on the cutting edge of our national defense.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Rolls-Royce for the great work they are doing for Indiana and the United States.

□ 1030

MOURNING THE DEATH OF THE HONORABLE ELIJAH CUMMINGS

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, there are many things that we come to this floor to do. In the midst of our duties, we stand in this well as armor and advocates for democracy. There are moments of joy, and there are moments of high debate, but I come this morning partly for a moment of sadness.

I am looking at my iPhone at a picture of myself and the late Congressman ELIJAH CUMMINGS so many years ago. It tells the story of the breadth and depth of his life, when he invited Members of Congress to come to his district to challenge the scourge of HIV and to stand against the proliferation of addiction.

He was always standing in the gap for his constituents, his beloved Baltimore, and his beloved family. He always considered himself as someone who would find a cure for the ailments of society.

That is why, this morning, we have heard some of his words: ''Come on, people, we are better than this.''

The wonderment of his words that really came from his strong spiritual connection—I want everybody to know that he was able to say all of this and remain that steady figure in the eye of the storm because he was a man of faith who had no shame in his love of God and the teachings of his parents, who he reminded us all the time, as they rest in peace themselves, that they were sharecroppers.

Look at him now. He ascended to greatness. As chairman of the Oversight and Reform Committee, his focus was not only on this recent impeachment inquiry. He looked at all aspects of wrongness that afflicted the American people, certainly one being the overuse of prescription drugs causing people to either lose their lives or not be able to take care of themselves.

He was also a man of justice who wanted criminal justice reform and wanted to work to ensure that our police persons and law enforcement could have the kind of training and understanding of culturally diverse communities.

He served us in many ways. He certainly was an icon amongst the Congressional Black Caucus, but he was not ours alone. He belonged to this Congress—Republicans and Democrats—and he belonged to the Nation.

But, Baltimore, I cannot leave you out. He belonged to his beloved Baltimore and also the heritage of his parents.

I stand here today to give comfort to those who are mourning, to try to ease the pain that I am experiencing, and to be able to call upon a Nation that has the beauty of allowing us to pray to any God that we worship in any faith that we may have, that we call upon that faith today to be reminded of a giant like ELIJAH CUMMINGS.

I conclude with just a moment to say that I pray for the families in Syria, the fleeing Kurds. I pray that this unmistakable disaster that has occurred, that we can put it right-side up with the Congress working to secure a no-fly zone and to have a cease-fire in northern Syria to be able to stop the bloodletting of women and children and the fleeing that is going on.

As my good friend would want, we want to fix government. In fixing government, we want to protect the American people. This threat to national security that has now been unleashed with the escaping of ISIS supporters and family members along with ISIS persons, we must come together to find a way to bring about peace.

In his name, I am grateful to have this opportunity to honor him and to also speak to peace. That is what I believe his life legacy will be, that he always wanted the best for America. He would always say to all of us, no matter what walk of life we were in, what background we came from, and what diverse part of America we represented, he would always say, ''We are better than this.''

His faith in a higher power was without question, and that will be the strength that I have today, faith in a higher power.

May God bless him. May he rest and have a soul that is rested. May God bless his family, may God bless all those who loved him and his constituents, and may God bless the United States of America.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 35 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LANGEVIN) at noon.

PRAYER

Pastor Phil Waldrep, Phil Waldrep Ministries, Decatur, Alabama, offered the following prayer:

Our Eternal God, today, we pause to thank You for Your blessings and to ask that You remind us that with these blessings come responsibilities.

So, we ask that You will quieten our hearts that we might find time to listen to the dreams of a child or the memories of an older adult.

Help us to find time to thank a teacher, or a veteran, or someone who puts their life at risk every day that we might be free.

Help us to find time to assist the families of military personnel and time to pray for the safety of their loved one.

Help us to find time to see the needs, and the gifts, and the worth of others.

O Lord, help us to find time to be Your hands and Your feet in a world that desperately needs love.

In Jesus' name, 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 New Hampshire (Mr. PAPPAS) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. PAPPAS led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under clause 5(d) of rule XX, the Chair announces to the House that, in light of the passing of the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS), the whole number of the House is 432.

WELCOMING REVEREND PHIL WALDREP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BROOKS) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, it is a great privilege to welcome Reverend Phil Waldrep to the House of Representatives to serve as today's guest chaplain.

Reverend Waldrep was born in Morgan County, Alabama, near Decatur, and began preaching when he was 14 years old.

He earned his bachelor of science degree from the University of Alabama and completed seminary at Luther Rice Theological Seminary in Georgia.

Through his ministries, Reverend Waldrep connects with audiences of all ages and sizes with his sense of humor, powerful illustrations, and Scriptural insight.

He is a frequent speaker at some of America's largest churches and conferences and has been a vocational evangelist since 1975.

Reverend Waldrep is also an author, having published ''Beyond Betrayal: Overcome Past Hurts and Begin to Trust Again,'' ''Reaching Your Prodigal: What Did I Do Wrong? What Do I Do Now?'' and ''The Grandparent Factor: Five Principles to Help You Make a Difference in the Life of Your Grandchild.''

Phil and his wife, Debbie, live in Decatur, Alabama, and have two daughters who, with their husbands, actively serve in the ministry.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

PRESCRIPTION DRUGS

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

Mr. PAPPAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of individuals across New Hampshire and the country who are struggling to afford the skyrocketing cost of prescription drugs.

Across my district, I hear from individuals each and every day about the significant burden and anxiety caused by the exorbitant costs of these prescriptions. That is why I introduced H.R. 4661, the Advancing Enrollment and Reducing Drug Costs Act, along with Representative TONKO.

This is an important addition to H.R. 3, the Lower Drug Costs Now Act of 2019, to expand seniors' access to prescription drugs under Medicare part D. This legislation will automatically enroll individuals in part D's subsidy program, known as Extra Help, when they have aged out of Medicaid Expansion.

We must continue to ensure that seniors receive access to this earned benefit without having to navigate what can be a complicated process.

When seniors arrive at the pharmacy counter, they shouldn't have to worry whether they can afford the medications they need to live with health and with dignity. This legislation is a step toward addressing this injustice, and I urge my colleagues to continue to support efforts to reduce the cost of prescription drugs in a bipartisan fashion and pass this legislation.

NATIONAL FARM TO SCHOOL MONTH

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize October as National Farm to School Month.

The National Farm to School Network is an organization that strives to strengthen the relationship our Nation's schools have with fresh, healthy foods from local farms.

The farm to school movement focuses on agriculture education in our schools and even encourages learning opportunities through school gardens, cooking lessons, and farm field trips to better connect students with where their food comes from. It also spurs market opportunities for local farmers and ranchers.

Healthy and nutritious food is important in all stages of life, but particularly for our Nation's young people. In some unfortunate cases, the meals that students receive at school may be the only time they eat during the day. It is important that we do what we can to ensure schools have the resources they need to provide students with delicious and nutritious options.

LOWERING DRUG COSTS

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

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to say this: Americans are suffering from extortionate, skyrocketing drug prices, and this is unacceptable.

Between 2013 and 2016, 67 percent of Americans who had to file for bankruptcy did so because of enormous medical expenses. That is unacceptable.

Last year, in my home State of Pennsylvania alone, one in four individuals had to forgo medical care so they could pay their rent or put food on the table. That is not a choice we can, in good conscience, allow them to have to make. It is unacceptable.

I am, therefore, proud to announce my support of the Lower Drug Costs Now Act, H.R. 3, landmark legislation which takes bold strides to lower prescription drug prices for all Americans.

On behalf of the families who demand and deserve drug pricing reform, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to ensure swift passage of this landmark, critical legislation.

HONORING THE LIFE OF WYMAN COPASS

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

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the remarkable life led by my friend and former pastor, Dr. Wyman Copass.

Wyman passed away on Friday, October 4, having lived an extraordinary life of 80 years. Wyman will live on in the memories of all who have had the privilege to know him.

For me, his influence lives on in the memory of his role in my salvation. As a graduate of Campbellsville University and Luther Rice Seminary, Dr. Copass oversaw a ministry spanning not only the Commonwealth of Kentucky, but also the breadth of the Nation.

While he enjoyed golfing, cooking, and gardening, his greatest passion was his family, whose love and devotion he cherished and returned in kind. His wife of 62 years, Glenda; his daughter, Susan; and his son, Chris; as well as his five grandchildren undoubtedly consider themselves lucky to have had such an emblematic figure in their lives, just as I do.

Dr. Wyman Copass was a force for good in the First Congressional District of Kentucky, and his example and vision will be missed.

MEASURING REAL INCOME GROWTH

(Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, for years, our country's prosperity was broadly shared. The difference between rich and poor wasn't too big. When the economy grew, most Americans benefited. The saying was that ''a rising tide lifts all boats.''

But today, income inequality is at its highest level in nearly a century. The top 1 percent take home about 20 percent of all income.

But this story is not being told by economic indicators like GDP. GDP tells us how fast or slow our economy is growing, but not how that growth is spread across income levels.

I am working to change that. The Joint Economic Committee, where I serve as vice chair, held a hearing this week to examine proposed measures to track inequality. These new measures are included in my legislation, the Measuring Real Income Growth Act.

Under my bill, GDP growth will be analyzed by income level. It will tell us who the economy is working for and who is left behind, and it will help us craft policies to start reducing inequality so a rising tide really does lift all boats.

REMEMBERING WES BARR

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

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, this is a tough one today. I rise to remember Sheriff Wes Barr, who passed away on October 1. Wes was a beloved member of the Springfield community, who impacted many through his law enforcement career and charity work.

Wes' story is one of true American spirit. He lived in the former John Jay housing project in Springfield until he was 13. After graduating from Southeast High School, Wes enlisted in the United States Marine Corps.

Afterwards, he served as a correctional officer before he began his career in law enforcement. He served as an officer in Loami, Illiopolis, and Chatham before joining the Sangamon County Sheriff's Office in 1991, eventually serving his one term, where I got to serve with him, as sheriff from 2014 to 2018.

Wes and his wife, Sherry, are well known for their generous hearts and extensive charity work with several organizations. For years, and where I first met Wes, Wes led the local Toys for Tots drive, collecting thousands of toys for children in need.

In every aspect of his life, Wes put others before himself. He lived to serve others and, for so many, he was a role model and a mentor. Wes had a compassion for people and a determination to give back to his community. Words cannot describe how much he will be missed.

The thoughts and prayers of Shannon and me are with the entire central Illinois community and especially his wife, Sherry, during this difficult time.

HONORING ED DIAZ

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

Mr. SPANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor a great American, World War II veteran Seaman First Class Ed Diaz.

Mr. Diaz, a native of New York, enlisted in the Navy in 1944 and was subsequently assigned to the USS *Columbus* heavy cruiser. During World War II, he served in the South Pacific and participated in Operation Road's End, a campaign in which 24 Japanese submarines were sunk and which led to the final destruction of Japan's submarine fleet.

Mr. Diaz was discharged after the war but continued to serve in the Naval Reserve for another decade. He later worked as a machinist in Pennsylvania until a promotion relocated him to the heart of Florida District 15. In total, he served with Hazleton Pumps for 42 years.

Like many from the Greatest Generation, Seaman First Class Ed Diaz humbly and sacrificially served this country in one of its darkest hours. He looked evil in the eye and stood up to it in the name of democracy and freedom.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. Diaz for his service and his dedication. He showed us how to live and gave our State and Nation a better future. Today I salute him.

□ 1215

RECOGNIZING 13 PLANO ISD PARENT TEACHER ASSOCIATIONS

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

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate 13 Plano ISD schools on receiving the National PTA School of Excellence designation. This recognition program, accredited by the National Parent Teacher Association, works to support and celebrate the partnership between PTAs and schools across this great land.

Plano ISD is setting an incredible example with a current PTA membership of more than 16,000 parents. With the help of their PTAs, Plano ISD is cultivating crucial relationships between parents, teachers, and the surrounding community. Their dedication to improving the learning environment for students in and outside the classroom serves as a crucial reminder of the volunteerism and its role in shaping a community.

I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating these 13 Plano PTAs on their success of putting students first and championing a quality education.

IMPEACHMENT INQUIRY

(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, I rise today to shed light on House Democrats' impeachment inquiry, a scheme that has been devised in the dark.

From day one of this Congress, my colleagues have sought to use their new majority to undermine President Trump every step of the way. The majority has chosen to break precedent and deprive Republicans of the ability to do our job.

Today, I went down to the SCIF to read the classified Volker testimony for myself, and, sadly, I was turned away. It is remarkable that elected officials have been blocked from reading material, parts of which have already been leaked to the press in selective and incomplete pieces. Simply, this is wrong.

The House of Representatives has been reduced to obsessing over a perpetual Ground Hog Day cycle of relitigating the 2016 election.

For the sake of our Nation, it is time to remove what the obstacles we face

are and return to our constitutional duty of being legislators.

SEC DISCLOSURE EFFECTIVENESS TESTING ACT

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 1815, and to insert extraneous material thereon.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 629 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 1815.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1224

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1815) to require the Securities and Exchange Commission, when developing rules and regulations about disclosures to retail investors, to conduct investor testing, including a survey and interviews of retail investors, and for other purposes, with Mr. LANGEVIN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

General debate shall be confined to the bill and amendments specified in the first section of House Resolution 629 and shall not exceed 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services.

The gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 1815, the SEC Disclosure Effectiveness Testing Act crafted by Representative CASTEN from Illinois, a new Member of Congress and member of the Financial Services Committee.

H.R. 1815 requires the Securities and Exchange Commission to test its disclosure documents with retail investors through one-on-one interviews and surveys to ensure that these documents are actually understood by their target audience.

The SEC's approach to protecting retail investors from conflicts of interest and other risks has been based on informing them through disclosure. This is a problem when those disclosures are written in a way that retail investors don't understand.

Since at least 2012, when the SEC conducted a financial literacy study, we have known that many of the disclosures intended for retail investors are not well-understood by those investors.

While the public has the opportunity to comment on most rulemakings or new disclosures, these comments are largely from well-funded industry representatives, rather than the mom-and-pop investors who will be receiving these new disclosures.

H.R. 1815 ensures that the SEC gets the input it needs from retail investors on disclosure forms by requiring the SEC to test those forms and engage in qualitative one-on-one interviews and nationwide surveys.

Investor testing has been embraced by both Democratic and Republican commissioners at the SEC. In addition, the SEC itself has been engaged in investor testing in several instances, including most recently in 2018, when it tested a proposed disclosure for brokers and investment advisers to provide to retail investors known as Form Client Relationship Summary, that is, CRS.

This proposed five-page disclosure was intended to help retail investors understand the obligations owed and services provided by investment professionals, as well as the fees and costs that could affect their investment accounts.

To ensure that retail investors are able to use Form CRS as intended, the SEC conducted a nationwide online survey of 1,800 individuals and 31 qualitative, in-depth interviews in Denver and Pittsburgh. The mixed results of the SEC's testing of Form CRS showed that changes and possibly more testing were necessary.

Unfortunately, in that instance, the SEC did not engage in the robust, iterative investor testing that H.R. 1815 would require, and finalized a vague disclosure.

H.R. 1815 would require the SEC to go back and review and test existing disclosures like Form CRS and determine whether changes should be made. This review of existing documents is particularly important as the capital markets, investor behaviors, and investing trends change.

In addition to the SEC, other regulators like the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau and the Federal Trade Commission also engage in usability testing of their disclosures.

H.R. 1815 builds on the efforts of the SEC by requiring the Commission to engage in a similar iterative process for all existing or future disclosure, intended to help retail investors make informed investment decisions.

I thank Representative CASTEN for putting forth this commonsense piece of legislation that will help investors make better informed financial decisions regarding their hard-earned earnings.

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

□ 1230

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to H.R. 1815, the SEC Disclosure Effectiveness Testing Act of 2019.

Mr. Chair, Democrats claim that this bill would ''build on efforts to engage in investor testing by requiring the SEC to conduct usability testing of any new disclosure.''

If my friends on the other side really wanted to build on efforts to engage in investor testing, I believe they would have worked with Republicans on the committee and the Securities and Exchange Commission to craft a bill that would actually be signed into law. Unfortunately, this bill is a deliberate effort to not only delay the SEC's rulemaking on Regulation Best Interest and Form CRS, but it is also an effort to tie the SEC's hands with regard to future disclosure rulemakings and may have an effect even on past rulemakings.

In fact, what the bill's author won't tell you is that the SEC already conducted investor testing on the very disclosure regulation Democrats are targeting with this particular bill. With Reg BI, 1,800 Main Street investors nationwide were surveyed about the regulation. There were 31 one-on-one, in-depth interviews with retail investors. Seven roundtables were held that the SEC gained input from. Finally, more than 6,000 comment letters were received by the SEC before they actually put together the Reg BI.

The Securities and Exchange Commission collected all this, analyzed the information from all of those sources, and very carefully crafted what had been very contentious and, frankly, outside the bounds of what had normally been accepted with Regulation Best Interest by having the Department of Labor try to drive this rather than the Securities and Exchange Commission. I believe that they have a good product.

The SEC used this information to adopt a workable regulation all without the help—or the so-called help—of H.R. 1815. So what does the final rulemaking package on Reg BI and Form CRS accomplish?

It raises the standard of care owed by broker-dealers to retail investors, and that, at the end of the day, is what this is all about. It is a standard that we agree needed to be addressed.

But why make the SEC do it again and further delay a rulemaking that makes significant improvements for Main Street investors? It is a rule that is in place. I can only surmise it is because my friends on the other side didn't like the outcome and didn't like what they heard in that investor testing.

Not only did they not like the current outcome for Reg BI and Form CRS, but my friends on the other side of the aisle want to tie the SEC's hands in future disclosure rulemaking. They accomplish this by requiring investor

testing for documents and information that are relied on or ''substantially likely to be materially relied upon by retail investors.''

Now, I don't know what that phrase means. Here is why I don't know what that phrase means: It is because it wasn't in the version of the bill reported out of the committee. That is a phrase thrown in at the last minute by my friends on the other side of the aisle.

If that weren't enough, the bill targets the SEC's previous disclosure rulemaking. H.R. 1815 requires the SEC to retroactively conduct investor testing on similar disclosure rulemakings that were finalized before enactment of this bill. This means disclosure rules finalized 5, 10, 15, maybe even 20 years ago could be captured and will be captured by this bill.

Finally, if subjecting past and future disclosure rulemakings to investor testing weren't enough, the bill captures present rulemaking. H.R. 1815 creates a bureaucratic loop by requiring the SEC to conduct investor testing if substantive changes are made to a proposed rulemaking, and those changes are untested before the rules are finalized.

What does this bill mean for everyday investors? It means more bureaucracy. It means less certainty. Certainly, it does not speed up what all agree is an issue that needs to be addressed. There is no doubt that investor testing is an effective tool for designing smart, workable regulatory frameworks to benefit the Main Street investor. It can help craft disclosures and information that everyday investors can actually understand and use. It does not have to come in the form of a mandate.

This bill is not only a delay tactic, but it will drastically undermine the ability of the SEC to do its primary job of protecting investors.

Under the last administration, that is all we heard about on the committee. I have been on the subcommittee that handles this, and all we heard was how Congress was undercutting the Securities and Exchange Commission, that it wasn't supporting it enough and wasn't allowing it to do its job.

What are my friends now doing? The exact thing that they were complaining about.

By delaying it or in some cases preventing the SEC from finalizing rules intended to protect investors and diverting resources from cybersecurity and enforcement actions, Main Street investors that this bill claims to serve will only be harmed.

I am confident the SEC can and will devote the utmost attention and consideration to help everyday American investors without this particular bill.

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

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chair, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CASTEN), who will correct all the misstatements that were just made by the gentleman from Michigan. Representative CASTEN is the sponsor of the bill.

Mr. CASTEN of Illinois. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of my bill, H.R. 1815, the SEC Disclosure Effectiveness Testing Act. I thank Chairwoman WATERS and Subcommittee Chair MALONEY for their leadership on the Financial Services Committee and their unwavering dedication to protecting investors.

That is exactly what this bill does. It is a pro-investor bill that has one goal: that the SEC ensures disclosures made to retail investors are clear and concise so that Americans can make informed investment decisions.

We are not here to relitigate the proper duty that brokers owe to investors. Instead, this bill is about making sure that disclosure documents convey information to investors effectively. We would never let companies post warning labels in ancient Greek, yet we too often allow disclosure documents—say, for conflicts of interest—to be written in jargon that is unintelligible to anyone without a law degree. Merely providing information to investors is not enough. We have also to make sure that information is understood.

Whether it is buying a house, sending your kids to college, investing in your retirement, or just saving for a rainy day, the American Dream depends on our ability to invest in our future. This bill protects Americans by doing pretty basic market research to ensure that legally required disclosures can be understood by the average investor. Disclosures are already legally mandated to disclose information about fees, comparisons of investment advisory services, conflicts of interest, and much more, but just because those forms are provided to investors doesn't mean that investors understand them.

As we all know, the biggest lie on the internet is that ''I have read and understand the terms and conditions.'' So we should not assume that just because an investor has been provided a disclosure agreement means that they understand it.

Now, in point of fact, the RAND Corporation—this was what my colleague referred to—conducted this investor testing—we agree—with 1,800 individuals, 31 qualitative, in-depth interviews. This is what they concluded: ''Nearly 90 percent of respondents opined that the relationship summary would help them make more informed decisions about investment accounts and services . . . but interview discussions revealed that there were areas of confusion for participants, including differences between types of accounts or financial professionals.''

There were no changes made after that. Yes, they did the surveys, but many did not know and still do not know the difference between account types or financial professions. Others didn't appear to have synthesized the information in ways that they could apply it.

In other words, consumers want these disclosures. Qualitative testing shows that what they are getting is not informing them properly, and that is why this bill is so important.

The SEC Disclosure Effectiveness Testing Act would build on SEC's investor testing efforts and require the agency to engage in a robust iterative process for any existing or future disclosures intended to help retail investors make investment decisions.

Specifically, the bill anticipates that the SEC will test those documents used by retail investors when selecting an investment professional to work with, assessing an investment recommendation, or deciding to purchase or sell a security. This would include testing of, for example, brokers' trade confirmation statements and investment advisers' brochures that detail business practices, fees, conflicts of interest, and disciplinary information.

In short, if we are going to rely on disclosures, we need to make sure the disclosures work.

We use market research to convey simple and important messages. Take an example: We don't put warnings on a box of cigarettes that says that in multiple peer-reviewed papers, scientists have found that prolonged exposure to cigarette smoke increases your risk to certain types of cancers, and those results are less than 5 percent likely to have been the result of sampling error.

Nobody would understand that. We say, ''Smoking kills,'' because our job is to communicate. We would be delinquent if we weren't equally clear in this case.

We are talking about disclosures like Form CRS that would require financial professionals to deliver to their retail customers a short and simple disclosure form to clarify the scope of their customers' relationship and companies who offer them financial services.

A consumer disclosure has to do more than just protect the discloser. If an investor doesn't understand what is being disclosed, then we cannot say that anything was truly disclosed. We must make sure that investors know what is being disclosed, and that is what the bill does.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chair, I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. CASTEN of Illinois. This isn't a mandate on high to dictate to the SEC what the disclosures should say but rather says that it must do qualitative interviews to confirm that investors understand the disclosure. That is why the AARP has endorsed the bill, as well as the Financial Planning Coalition, the Consumer Federation of America, and the Certified Financial Planner Board of Standards.

This is a narrowly tailored bill that applies to a number of disclosure statements that Main Street retail investors rely on. It does not apply to disclosures that are relied on primarily by sophisticated institutional investors.

When I was growing up, there was an ad on television for a discount menswear store called Syms. At the end of every commercial, their president, Sy Syms, would say, ''An educated consumer is our best customer.'' We owe nothing less to the American people, and I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes.''

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH), who is the vice ranking member of the subcommittee.

Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the bill being discussed today. While I appreciate my good friend Mr. CASTEN's effort on the bill, the problem is in the details.

While he clearly stated that this is a narrowly tailored bill, the reality is that a casual counting of SEC-promulgated rules yields over 600 rules that this would apply to. At 6 months of testing each, that is over 300 years' worth of testing—300 years. Our Republic hasn't been in existence for 300 years.

What I hear from Hoosiers back home is they are tired of our regulators being distracted and going back and looking at the history, and what they want to be focused on is how they protect investors going forward.

As Mr. CASTEN and I have discussed before, I think we share those laudable aims about ensuring that disclosures truly convey the information we want them to convey, but this bill doesn't do that.

This bill distracts the SEC from the necessary work on regulating our markets and protecting our investors by going back and doing hundreds of investor tests on over 600 different SEC-promulgated rules. Because of that, I will oppose the bill.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY), who is the chairwoman for the Subcommittee on Investor Protection, Entrepreneurship, and Capital Markets.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chair, I thank the chairwoman for yielding and for her leadership on the committee.

Mr. Chair, I strongly support H.R. 1815, which is just plain common sense, and I congratulate my colleague and friend for his leadership and hard work on this bill.

We want investors to understand the disclosures that companies, brokers, and advisers are required to give them.

What would be the point of requiring disclosures that the vast majority of investors don't even understand? If they don't understand the disclosures—or worse, if they haven't even read the disclosures—then they are not making their investment decisions with all the information that they need.

The best way to ensure that investors understand the disclosures is actually to engage in investor testing of proposed disclosure forms.

□ 1245

Disclosures that a sophisticated institutional investor might understand or that the experts on the SEC staff might understand might not be clear and understandable to the average retail investor.

This isn't surprising. The SEC staff who designed these disclosures are typically lawyers and not disclosure design experts. That is why it is important to require the SEC to engage in investor testing of these disclosures. That way, they don't end up requiring a disclosure that simply does not work.

Quite frankly, I don't understand why anyone would oppose this bill, because that would be the equivalent of saying that you don't want investors to understand the disclosures. And if you think the SEC has the authority to do investor testing, then why would you oppose simply codifying that authority? Other agencies have done effective usability testing for disclosures.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chair, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. The Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, under Director Cordray, engaged in extensive consumer testing of new disclosure forms that it was proposing for prepaid cards. It came up with two different proposed disclosure forms and then field-tested the two forms for months before finalizing the prepaid card rule. That is the kind of data-driven regulation that helps consumers, investors, and, ultimately, all market participants because it improves trust in the entire financial markets.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. WAGNER), who has had extensive history and experience with this particular issue at the Securities and Exchange Commission.

Mrs. WAGNER. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA) for yielding his time. He has been a terrific leader on capital markets and has been serving in his capacity as we try and work hard for that low- and middle-income investor, that Main Street investor who is so important that we finally get some regulation and some guidance in place that is going to make sure that they are getting the information that is going to help them make good investment and savings decisions that are truly in the best interest of that consumer. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA), the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Investor Protection, Entrepreneurship, and Capital Markets, is absolutely right.

Since my very first year in Congress 7 years ago, I have been fighting for that Main Street investor. I have been fighting to make sure that the best interest of that investor is in place.

This is not about Wall Street; it is about Main Street. It is about taking care of the low- and middle-income consumer. And the SEC has been dealing with this fiduciary rule and with the best interest standard for years and years and years.

Mr. Chairman, we have studied it. We have had countless comment periods. It has been litigated. The investor testing has been done. Years and years have gone into this moment where the SEC is finally ready and has, in fact, moved forward with the best interest standard.

The difficulty with this piece of legislation, H.R. 1815, is it is, frankly, just a political ploy, Mr. Chairman, a political ploy that is an attempt to stop the rule in its tracks, one that is going to take care of those that need the kind of support from their broker-dealer the most.

It is important that we finally have this issue back in the jurisdiction of the SEC where it belongs. It is time that this rule move forward and that we look out—all of us—for the best interest of our retail investors. Let's let this go forward and stop the political ploys.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FOSTER).

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS), the chairwoman, for yielding.

Mr. Chair, I rise in support of H.R. 1815, which would simply require the SEC to conduct investor testing when developing rules and regulations about disclosures to retail investors.

Creating effective disclosures is often a difficult task and requires developmental testing with consumers. It is a complex and technical task in its nature. These disclosures are meant to be clear and concise so that retail investors understand the scope of their relationships with brokers and investment advisers and important decisions regarding their investments.

The SEC has had evidence since at least 2012, when it conducted a financial literacy study, that many of the disclosure documents that we currently rely on are not well understood by those investors. This includes cost disclosures that don't clearly convey costs, risk disclosures that don't clearly convey risks, and conflict disclosures that do not clearly convey the nature and the impact of these conflicts.

Effective disclosure testing is imperative for facilitating informed decisionmaking on the part of consumers who are trying to save and invest their hard-earned money, and that is why the AARP and many other groups have endorsed H.R. 1815.

By requiring qualitative testing in the form of one-on-one cognitive interviews of investors, it provides a deeper look into how typical retail investors synthesize information. If investors understand key differences in firms' conflicts, obligations, and revenue streams, then more retail investors will receive and interpret correctly the professional guidance that is right for them.

The framework laid out here will increase transparency and access to critical and understandable information, as well as facilitate informed decision-making for Americans making investment decisions and saving for their retirement. This should be accomplished without delay.

Mr. Chair, I urge a ''yes'' vote on H.R. 1815.

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Chairman, I include in the RECORD the following letters:

An October 16, 2019, letter from the SIFMA expressing support for both of my amendments that exempt Regulation Best Interest and Form CRS from the bill's requirements, and the gentlewoman from Missouri, Mrs. WAGNER's amendment, which would make the bill effective beginning on January 21, 2021, and apply only to future rulemaking; an October 16, 2019, letter from SIFMA opposing H.R. 1815; and also, an October 16, 2019, letter to the Speaker of the House and Leader MCCARTHY from ACLI, FSI, IPA, IRI, ICI, NAIFA, SIFMA, and the Chamber of Commerce expressing concern with H.R. 1815 and the negative impact it would have on retail investors.

As we are starting to have discussion on these particular amendments, I look forward to my friends across the aisle who are saying that the bill does not change any of the current situation, I look forward to them potentially supporting these amendments.

SIFMA,
October 16, 2019.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.
Hon. KEVIN MCCARTHY,
Minority Leader, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER PELOSI AND LEADER MCCARTHY: The Securities Industry and Financial Markets Association (SIFMA) appreciates the opportunity to comment on two of the amendments made in order by the Rules Committee to H.R. 1815, the ''SEC Disclosure Effectiveness Testing Act.'' This legislation would impose on the Securities and Exchange Commission (''SEC'') an investor testing requirement for all past and future regulations, with some exceptions, about disclosure to retail investors.

The amendment offered by Representative Huizenga would exempt Form CRS from the bill's retroactive investor testing requirements. In the development of the Regulation Best Interest rulemaking package (commonly referred to as ''Reg BI''), the SEC conducted extensive investor testing of Form CRS. The SEC's testing involved both a comprehensive national survey to collect information on the opinions, preferences, attitudes, and level of self-assessed comprehension of the Form CRS, as well as qualitative interviews to obtain further insight into individuals' attitudes toward the Form CRS. We support Rep. Huizenga's amendment, as further testing of Form CRS would unduly interfere with and delay the implementation process which is already well underway.

Representative Wagner's amendment would apply the bill's investor testing requirements only to applicable disclosure documents developed after January 21, 2021. Based on our firm belief in the heightened strength of the new Reg BI conduct standards and their value to everyday investors, which have been fully effective since September 10, 2019 with a compliance date of June 30, 2020, SIFMA supports the Wagner amendment. We believe the underlying legislation would unnecessarily delay the implementation of a new set of sweeping regulations that would provide strong investor and consumer protections for 43 million households. SIFMA has long supported enhancing the standard of conduct applicable to broker-dealers when providing personalized investment advice about securities to retail investors and we believe the SEC has successfully accomplished this important goal through Reg BI.

SIFMA appreciates and shares the interest of Representative Casten and the Committee on Financial Services in advocating for robust investor testing of retail investor disclosures. We agree that in many cases, investor testing is appropriate and makes sense. We believe disclosures are designed to give the investing public the information they need to make informed financial decisions but could be held up in an endless loop of repeated testing if the underlying bill is enacted. SIFMA therefore supports the proposed amendments made by Representatives Huizenga and Wagner, which improve the legislation and offer a better approach to investor testing.

We appreciate the opportunity to comment and we appreciate your consideration of our views. If you have any questions or require any additional information, please feel free to contact us.

Sincerely,
KENNETH E. BENTSEN, JR.,
President & CEO, Securities Industry and Financial Markets Association.

SIFMA,
October 16, 2019.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.
Hon. KEVIN MCCARTHY,
Minority Leader, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER PELOSI AND LEADER MCCARTHY: The Securities Industry and Financial Markets Association (SIFMA) appreciates the opportunity to comment on H.R. 1815, the ''SEC Disclosure Effectiveness Testing Act.'' H.R. 1815 would impose on the Securities and Exchange Commission (''SEC'') an investor testing requirement for all past and future broker-dealer regulations, with some exceptions, about disclosure to retail investors.

SIFMA appreciates and shares the interest of Representative Casten and the Committee on Financial Services in advocating for robust investor testing of retail investor disclosures. We agree that in many cases, investor testing is appropriate and makes good common sense. In fact, the SEC conducted extensive investor testing of the proposed Form CRS, an important component of the Regulation Best Interest rulemaking package (collectively, ''Reg BI'')—the most comprehensive enhancement of standard of conduct rules governing broker-dealers since the enactment of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934. The SEC's testing involved both a comprehensive national survey to collect information on the opinions, preferences, attitudes, and level of self-assessed comprehension of the Form CRS, as well as qualitative interviews to obtain further insights related to the reasoning and beliefs behind individuals' attitudes toward the Form CRS.

Reg BI has been fully effective since September 10, 2019 and has a compliance date of June 30, 2020. Further testing of Reg BI would unduly interfere with and delay the implementation process which is already well underway. Ultimately, the bill would divert valuable and limited regulatory resources and thereby undermine the roll-out of a significantly strengthened best interest standard of conduct designed to better protect and serve retail investors.

Over the past several months, the SEC and FINRA have been working diligently to assist financial services firms in answering Reg BI interpretive questions and developing Reg BI compliance programs. Late last month, the SEC published a small entity compliance guide to Reg BI. Just last week, FINRA published a Reg BI compliance checklist and announced additional resources to aid firms in compliance.

Based on our firm belief in the heightened strength of the new Reg BI conduct standards and their value to everyday investors, SIFMA respectfully opposes H.R. 1815. We believe the bill would likely unnecessarily delay the implementation of historically new set of regulations that would provide strong investor and consumer protections for forty-three million households. SIFMA has long supported enhancing the standard of conduct applicable to broker-dealers when providing personalized investment advice about securities to retail investors and we believe the SEC has succeed in accomplishing this important goal through Reg BI.

Further, enactment of the bill as written, despite the carve outs listed in the manager's amendment, will subject other rules that apply to broker dealers under the federal securities laws to retroactive review and testing, including Form ABD, Investment Company Act disclosures, Trust Indenture Act disclosures, order routing, order execution, penny stock disclosures and others. These disclosures are designed to give the investing public the information they need to make informed financial decisions, but could be held up in an endless loop of repeated testing under the bill. While we understand and appreciate that this was likely not the Committee's intent or purpose, we believe that imposing such a requirement would likely result in an unprecedented, costly, resource intensive undertaking by the SEC.

We appreciate the opportunity to comment and we appreciate your consideration of our views. If you have any questions or require any additional information, please feel free to contact us.

Sincerely,
KENNETH E. BENTSEN, JR.,
President & CEO, Securities Industry and Financial Markets Association.

OCTOBER 16, 2019.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.
Hon. KEVIN MCCARTHY,
Minority Leader, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER PELOSI AND LEADER MCCARTHY: The undersigned associations, representing investment advisers, broker-dealer firms, life insurers and their financial professionals as well as registered investment companies, appreciate the opportunity to comment on H.R. 1815, the ''SEC Disclosure Effectiveness Testing Act,'' which would impose on the Securities and Exchange Commission (''SEC') an investor testing requirement for all past and future regulations, with some exceptions, about disclosure to retail investors.

We appreciate and share the interest of Representative Casten and the Committee on Financial Services in advocating for robust investor testing of retail investor disclosures. Retail investors should be provided clear and understandable disclosures, and we agree that in many cases, investor testing

makes good common sense. However, we are concerned that this legislation will have an immediate negative impact on retail consumers as it would interfere with the implementation of the Regulation Best Interest rulemaking package (collectively, ''Reg BI'')—the most comprehensive enhancement of standard of conduct rules governing broker-dealers since the enactment of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934. This result is nonsensical—as investor testing was part of SEC's Reg. BI rulemaking promulgation. Specifically, the SEC conducted extensive investor testing of the proposed Form CRS, an important component of the Regulation Best Interest rulemaking package. The SEC's testing involved both a comprehensive national survey as well as qualitative interviews with investors.

Reg BI has been fully effective since September 10, 2019 and has a compliance date of June 30, 2020. Financial services firms have spent months developing Reg BI compliance programs, and further testing of Reg BI would unduly interfere with and delay this ongoing implementation process. Based on our firm belief in the heightened strength of the Reg BI conduct standards that will better protect forty-three million households, we respectfully oppose H.R. 1815.

Further, despite the carve outs in the manager's amendment, enactment of the bill as written will subject other rules regarding disclosure to retail investors to retroactive review and testing. These rules include, among others, retail disclosure requirements that are designed to give consumers the information they need to make informed investing decisions. Under H.R. 1815, however, these existing rules could be held up in an endlessly iterative loop of repeated testing.

In addition, with respect to future rulemakings, the SEC is well-positioned to determine the most efficient way to test and support their disclosure related rulemakings. The SEC conducting investor testing may or may not be appropriate, depending on the rulemaking. For each rulemaking, however, the SEC already is required to seek public comment; the comment period is intended to get public input, including from investors and entities that represent investors and entities that regularly engage with investors. In this way, the SEC is able to get real insights into what may or may not work well for investors. H.R. 1815 may impede rulemakings intended to provide valuable information to investors, a cost that exceeds its possible benefits.

We appreciate the opportunity to comment and your consideration of our views. If you have any questions or require any additional information, please feel free to contact us.

Sincerely,

AMERICAN COUNCIL OF LIFE INSURERS (ACLI).
FINANCIAL SERVICES INSTITUTE, INC. (FSI).
INSTITUTE FOR PORTFOLIO ALTERNATIVES (IPA).
INSURED RETIREMENT INSTITUTE (IRI).
INVESTMENT COMPANY INSTITUTE (ICI).
NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF INSURANCE AND FINANCIAL ADVISORS (NAIFA).
SECURITIES INDUSTRY AND FINANCIAL MARKETS ASSOCIATION (SIFMA).
U.S. CHAMBER OF COMMERCE.

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 1815 is a commonsense bill that is supported by our Nation's seniors, investment advisers, and investor advocates. Here is what they have said about the bill:

According to AARP, they wrote: ''AARP, on behalf of our nearly 38 million members and all older Americans nationwide, is pleased to endorse H.R. 1815, which would require the Securities and Exchange Commission to conduct investor testing when developing rules and regulations about disclosures to retail investors. Robust investor testing of retail investor disclosures will assist investors in getting the information they need to make informed choices about their hard-earned savings.''

According to the Financial Planning Coalition: ''The coalition believes that H.R. 1815 would provide the statutory framework necessary for the SEC to ensure to Congress and Main Street investors that disclosures required under SEC rules have been thoroughly and adequately tested by the SEC and are reasonably effective in achieving their intended purpose.''

According to the Consumer Federation of America: ''Disclosure is both an important investor protection tool and a regulatory requirement that imposes significant cost on industry. We, therefore, have an obligation to make those disclosures as effective as possible. H.R. 1815 would help to achieve that goal by updating the SEC's approach to disclosure development. Anyone who supports commonsense, evidence-based regulation should support this legislation.''

Mr. Chair, before reserving the balance of my time, I include in the RECORD correspondence from the Financial Planning Coalition, the AARP, and the CFA, that is the Consumer Federation of America.

FINANCIAL PLANNING COALITION,
October 11, 2019.

Re Support for H.R. 1815, the ''SEC Disclosure Effectiveness Testing Act''.

DEAR MEMBER OF CONGRESS: On behalf of the Financial Planning Coalition (Coalition), we are writing to express our strong support for H.R. 1815, the ''SEC Disclosure Effectiveness Testing Act.'' We encourage you to support the legislation when it is considered on the House floor in the coming week.

A fundamental public policy goal of the federal securities laws is to ensure full and adequate disclosure of ''material'' information to American investors. The expectation is that the disclosure will assist investors in making an informed investment decision. Given this, we appreciate the work the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission's (SEC) Office of the Investor Advocate has done to identify and confront the challenges to improve investor disclosure.

Research conducted on behalf of AARP, Consumer Federation of America and the Coalition organizations, as well as separate research conducted by the SEC, all highlight the challenges and difficulties in developing clear, understandable investor disclosures. Information about financial issues and investments is often complex and technical in nature, and investor comprehension of this information typically is poor. All too often, mandated disclosures contain technical language and concepts that, as research confirms, are confusing to or misunderstood by investors. Indeed, research studies prove time and again how difficult it is to convey even the most basic financial and investment concepts in a way that typical Main Street investors understand.

To determine whether proposed investor disclosures would be effective at achieving their regulatory purpose of informing investor decision-making, it is not enough simply to survey investors generally on their likes or preferences. Thorough and adequate investor testing must go beyond that and, more importantly, must assess investors' ability to integrate information and synthesize it into a rational evaluation. This involves a more complex and higher-level cognitive skill. Conducting thorough one-on-one cognitive testing is the only proven way to determine whether a proposed disclosure document will achieve its intended purpose.

For these reasons, we are particularly pleased that the proposed legislation includes a requirement for qualitative testing in the form of one-on-one cognitive interviews of investors. A deeper look into the way investors analyze and synthesize information is necessary to determine the usefulness and effectiveness of any disclosure document in an investor's decision-making process.

The Coalition believes that H.R. 1815 will provide the statutory framework necessary for the SEC to ensure to Congress and Main Street investors that disclosures required under SEC rules have been thoroughly and adequately tested by the SEC and are reasonably effective in achieving their intended purpose. The legislation to be considered on the House floor appropriately clarifies that the scope of testing is limited to those disclosures that are intended to be used by retail investors in choosing a financial professional or investment product. The modified legislation to be considered on the House floor makes additional important clarifications that the Coalition supports.

We urge a ''Yes'' vote when the legislation comes up for a vote on the House floor.

Sincerely,

KEVIN R. KELLER, CAE,
Chief Executive Officer, CFP Board.
LAUREN SCHADLE, CAE,
Executive Director/CEO, FPA™.
GEOFFREY BROWN, CAE,
Chief Executive Officer, NAPFA.

AARP®
Washington, DC, October 16, 2019.

Hon. MAXINE WATERS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRWOMAN WATERS: AARP, on behalf of our nearly 38 million members and all older Americans nationwide, is pleased to endorse H.R. 1815, which would require the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) to conduct investor testing when developing rules and regulations about disclosures to retail investors. Robust investor testing of retail investor disclosures will assist investors in getting the information they need to make informed choices about their hard-earned savings.

AARP has a long history of fighting for investor protections and is especially eager to provide clarity and transparency to the often confusing and overly complicated investment world. AARP has experienced firsthand the value of investor testing to provide individuals with meaningful information needed for financial decision-making. In response to the SEC's proposed Client Relationship Summary (CRS) disclosure forms, AARP commissioned two, independent rounds of research

and testing to gauge retail investor understanding. The findings provided valuable information that helped guide our recommendations for design and content modifications to improve consumer understanding. AARP believes that such retail testing should be utilized extensively by the SEC for the development of effective, consumer facing disclosures.

AARP appreciates that creating effective disclosure is often a difficult and daunting task. We also understand that the price of ineffective disclosures can be poor investment decisions and inadequate levels of retirement savings. We believe testing is imperative for facilitating informed decision-making on the part of consumers trying to save and invest their hard-earned money.

We look forward to working with you and your colleagues to increase transparency and access to critical and understandable information, as well as facilitate informed decisionmaking for older Americans making investment decisions and saving for their retirement. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,

BILL SWEENEY,
Senior Vice President, Government Affairs.

CONSUMER FEDERATION OF AMERICA.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: We understand that H.R. 1815, the SEC Disclosure Effectiveness Testing Act, will soon be brought to the House floor for a vote. We are writing to urge you to vote yes on this pro-investor bill, which would help to ensure that the disclosures retail investors rely on convey as effectively as possible the key information needed to make an informed choice about decisions that are critical to their financial wellbeing.

The sad reality is that the disclosures investors receive when choosing investment professionals or evaluating investment options often do a poor job of conveying critically important information in a way that typical retail investors can understand. This includes cost disclosures that don't clearly convey costs, risk disclosures that don't clearly convey risks, and conflict of interest disclosure that do not clearly convey the nature or impact of those conflicts. Evidence of this can be found, for example, in a 2018 SEC proposal to create a summary prospectus for variable products that, while sound in concept, is long, dense, poorly organized, and full of technical jargon.

As a result, retail investors, and particularly the least sophisticated retail investors, are too often flying blind when making investment decisions that will affect their ability to afford a secure and independent retirement or fund other long-term financial goals. There are several reasons for this. One is the inherent difficulty of the Securities and Exchange Commission's task of developing clear disclosures of complex topics for a non-expert retail audience. But the other is the SEC's failure to adopt best practices widely used by industry and some other government agencies to develop more effective disclosures, including incorporating qualitative testing of disclosure effectiveness early in the development process.

This bill would help to correct the second of these two problems. It would do so, first, by requiring the SEC to incorporate qualitative disclosure effectiveness testing in the development of new disclosures designed for retail investors. Importantly findings of the testing would have to be made available for public comment. This would both hold the SEC accountable for addressing those findings in any rulemaking subject to the testing requirement and provide all stakeholders with an opportunity to weigh in.

Second, the bill would require the SEC, with input from the Office of Investor Advocate, to develop a plan for testing existing retail disclosures, without imposing a rigid timeframe for completing that review. Appropriately, disclosures primarily relied on by institutional investors, analysts, and other sophisticated market participants would not be subject to the testing requirement. This, along with the involvement of the Office of Investor Advocate in determining which existing disclosures are priorities for testing, would help to ensure resources are devoted to testing the disclosures most important for retail investors.

Disclosure is both an important investor protection tool and a regulatory requirement that imposes significant costs on industry. We, therefore, have an obligation to make those disclosures as effective as possible. H.R. 1815 would help to achieve that goal by updating the SEC's approach to disclosure development. Anyone who supports common sense, evidence-based regulation should support this legislation.

Respectfully submitted,

BARBARA ROPER,
Director of Investor Protection.
MICAH HAUPTMAN,
Financial Services Counsel.

Ms. WATERS. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Chair, may I inquire how much time is remaining on each side and whether the gentlewoman is prepared to close at this time.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Michigan has 21½ minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from California has 14 minutes remaining.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chair, I am prepared to close.

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Chair, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chair, I do want to point out that as the gentlewoman from Missouri and I were chatting a little bit about this, it is amazing, when this issue came to a head at the end of the Obama administration, there was a massive move away from the Securities and Exchange Commission where this Reg Best Interest traditionally has been the domain of such regulation and was moved over to the Department of Labor.

Why? Because the administration believed they needed to move so quickly and they couldn't get the Securities and Exchange Commission to act and agree—parenthetically, agree—with them as to what it should look like, they kicked it over to the Department of Labor, which has a small little silver of oversight of this area because of pensions. But, nonetheless, they came up with a wholly unsatisfactory rule that caused a tremendous amount of confusion. The Securities and Exchange Commission put itself forward and said: No, we need to get this done.

That is what kicked off all of the roundtables and the interviews and the 1,800 surveys and the 6,000 comment letters. We are now at this point where we can deliver on much-needed reform, and my colleagues across the aisle want to kick it backwards.

Now, Mr. Chairman, you heard the author say that they are not interested in relitigating current rulemaking, so I look forward to them all supporting my amendment that we are going to be talking about. And let's exempt Form CRS and the Reg BI. But I am afraid, Mr. Chair, that is not their goal and intent. I am afraid that they don't like the policy; therefore, they want to go back in and delay.

When the gentleman was talking about how there was no changes because of this, that is simply not true. The Form CRS went from four pages down to two pages, with significant, simplified changes that were inserted into that.

And so that is the goal and objective at the end of the day, Mr. Chairman: to protect investors, to give them certainty and clarity; to give those who provide the advice to them certainty and clarity; and, frankly, to move forward.

I am afraid that H.R. 1815 here does the exact opposite. It is going to delay it. It is going to make it even more murky than what it had been previously.

I just want to urge my colleagues to think this through, what they are proposing to do to the Securities and Exchange Commission, the power of the Securities and Exchange Commission.

And again, my first term was spent listening to how the Republicans ''were trying to destroy the Securities Exchange Commission'' by not funding them enough, by not allowing them to do their job, by not having the appointees do what their backgrounds and expertise would allow them to do. I never bought that charge, Mr. Chairman, because it simply wasn't true.

But we can see clearly, right now, this is a delaying tactic by the opposition; and how we would put not just current rulemaking, not just future rulemaking, but even past rulemaking back into this system would simply be a huge mistake.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1300

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

Mr. Chairman, I must admit that I am a bit surprised at this opposition. I am a bit surprised at this opposition because, first of all, everyone must understand that the SEC is our cop on the block. This agency has, as its basic mission, to protect investors.

Who best to be protected than the small, retail investors? We have so many schemes, so much fraud that we witness every day that is being brought forth to basically take advantage of the most vulnerable people in our society, many of them who don't have a lot of resources, who don't have money that they could lose. So, we believe that they must understand in what they are investing.

This is not about the big, institutional investors. This is about your retail investors. This is about the little

guy. This is about those people who are depending on the information that they get and their investment advisers to help guide them so they can have enough money in retirement, for example.

Why is it we would have any elected official coming to represent the people from their districts who would be opposed to making sure that these small investors are represented, that they are protected, that they are cared about?

So, I am surprised at this opposition, and I don't know why there would be so much time spent saying that the SEC does not need to do additional kinds of testing, that they don't need to be concerned about these disclosures.

What is it you need to protect about the SEC from doing its basic job? I don't understand that.

But, however, let me just say that H.R. 1815 is a commonsense bill that benefits mom-and-pop investors by putting a process in place to ensure that the SEC's disclosures are clear and comprehensible for those investors.

A disclosure is only useful if it can be understood by its audience, and this legislation ensures that disclosures are tested in a robust way so that they are clear.

This bill is supported, again, by groups such as the AARP, our seniors; the Financial Planning Coalition; and the Consumer Federation of America, looking out for consumers.

I, again, commend Representative CASTEN for putting forth this important legislation, and I thank him for his work. But, more than that, I thank him as a new Member of Congress who understands that his job, his responsibility, is to look out for his constituents and for the small investors, the little people, those people who need some protection, those people who don't need to be ripped off, those people who need to have clear information and disclosure about what they are getting into.

I thank Representative CASTEN for his vision, for his foresight, and for understanding the responsibility of the SEC.

Mr. Chair, I urge all Members to vote ''yes'' on this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Financial Services, printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 116–34 modified by the amendment printed in part A of House Report 116–237, shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as the original bill and shall be considered as read.

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

H.R. 1815

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 ''SEC Disclosure Effectiveness Testing Act''.

SEC. 2. DISCLOSURE TESTING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 23(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78w(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(4) INVESTOR TESTING.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Commission shall engage in investor testing prior to issuing any rule or regulation which designates documents or information to be disclosed under the securities laws, if such documents or information are required to be delivered to, and are intended or substantially likely to be materially relied upon by, a retail investor when—

''(i) selecting a broker-dealer or investment adviser, evaluating their services and fees, or materially altering a brokerage or advisory relationship;

''(ii) assessing a securities recommendation or investment advice provided by a broker- dealer or investment adviser;

''(iii) making a decision to purchase or sell a security; or

''(iv) such other circumstances as the Commission may, with input from the Investor Advocate, determine appropriate for the protection of retail investors.

''(B) EXEMPTION FOR CERTAIN DISCLOSURES.—This section shall not apply to—

''(i) disclosures made pursuant to Regulations S-K and S-X (including Industry Guides), Regulation 14A, Form N-PX, Form 10-K, Form 10-Q, Form 8-K, Form SD, Form N-PORT, Form PF, Regulation SBSR, disclosures mandated by or jointly with the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System or the Financial Stability Oversight Council, or successors thereto; or

''(ii) any other documents or information that the Commission, with input from the Investor Advocate, determines are outside the intended scope and purposes of this Act.

''(C) COMMISSION AUTHORITY TO CONDUCT ADDITIONAL TESTING.—This section shall not be construed to limit the Commission's ability to conduct any investor testing on any other documents or information not subject to this section 23(a), provided that any such investor testing shall not be subject to the requirements of this section 23(a).

''(D) CONTENTS.—Investor testing conducted pursuant to subparagraph (A) shall include the following:

''(i) Qualitative testing in the form of one-on-one cognitive interviews of retail investors about documents or information, or samples of such documents or information, to be provided.

''(ii) Such other forms of testing that the Commission, with input from the Investor Advocate, deems appropriate for evaluating the effectiveness of retail disclosures.

''(iii) Analysis and publication in the Federal Register of the results of the testing.

''(iv) An opportunity for the public to comment on such results published in the Federal Register.

''(E) SUBSTANTIVE CHANGES.—If the Commission, in the period between engaging in investor testing and publishing a final rule, makes substantive changes to such rule that the Commission determines would have a significant impact on retail investors, and such changes were not already investor tested, the Commission shall again engage in investor testing related to such changes.

''(F) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY OF RETAIL TESTING RESULTS.—The Commission shall make the data and results of any investor testing performed pursuant to this paragraph available to the public.

''(G) RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.—

''(i) The determination that some or all of a document or information is deemed to be subject to this paragraph shall not forestall the determination that such document or information may also be used or relied upon by the public, market participants other than retail investors, or government agencies.

''(ii) The Commission may, in consultation with the Investor Advocate, determine which, if any, components of such document or information are substantially likely to be relied on by retail investors for the purposes outlined in paragraph (4)(A) above and focus testing under this paragraph on those components of the disclosure.

''(iii) Notwithstanding clause (ii) above, where any information subject to testing under this paragraph may be used or relied upon by the public, market participants other than retail investors, or government agencies, the results of testing made pursuant to this paragraph shall not provide grounds for reducing or eliminating (including any undermining of reliability of and accountability for) the information that existing or proposed regulation requires or would require be made available to the public, market participants other than retail investors, and government agencies, whether or not such information is delivered to retail investors.''.

(b) PARTICIPATION OF INVESTOR ADVOCATE.—Section 4(g) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78d(g)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (4)—

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

(B) by redesignating subparagraph (E) as subparagraph (F); and

(C) by inserting after subparagraph (D) the following: "(E) engage in investor testing—

''(i) to carry out the functions of the Office; and

''(ii) pursuant to section 23(a)(4), as appropriate; and'';

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(9) PUBLICATION OF DATA AND RESULTS OF INVESTOR TESTING.—With respect to any investor testing carried out by the Investor Advocate pursuant to paragraph (4)(E), the Investor Advocate may make the data and results of such investor testing available to the public, without further review or editing by the Commission.

''(10) PERSONNEL.—If the Investor Advocate decides, within its sole discretion, to conduct testing under this Section, the Investor Advocate may do so and the Commission shall provide the Office of the Investor Advocate with sufficient personnel and funding necessary to carry out such testing. Such testing may qualify as the testing covered by this section, provided that all requirements of the section are met.''.

(c) PRIOR RULES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—For any final rule or regulation issued by the Securities and Exchange Commission (in this subsection referred to as the ''Commission'') before the date of the enactment of this Act that would be subject to investor testing under section 23(a)(4) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, had such rule been issued on or after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commission shall perform investor testing with respect to such rule or regulation that includes the contents described in such section 23(a)(4).

(2) SCHEDULE.—The Commission shall, not later than 6 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, with input from the Investor Advocate, establish a schedule for completing any investor testing required under paragraph (1) that prioritizes testing of any final rules and regulations that designate documents or information central to retail investor decision making, and in particular prioritize the testing of documents or information required to be delivered to retail investors in the form of summary documents or summary sections of documents including for the purpose of determining whether and how such summary documents can achieve the goals of informed investor decision-making in the circumstances set forth in Section 23(a)(4) of the Securities 6 Exchange Act of 1934

above while maintaining full accessibility by retail investors, the public, other market participants, and government regulators to the full range of documents and information that they may utilize or rely on, whether or not such documents or information are required to be delivered to retail investors.

(3) REPORT.—The Commission shall, with input from the Investor Advocate, issue a report to Congress each year containing the following:

(A) The status of any investor testing required under paragraph (1) initiated within the last year or otherwise ongoing.

(B) The results of any investor testing completed under paragraph (1) within the last year.

(C) Any priorities the Commission has, based on results of investor testing required by paragraph (1), for—

(i) revising any proposed or final rule or regulation based on the results of testing pursuant to;

(ii) initiating any rulemaking or actions to arising from the results of the testing pursuant to; and

(iii) the Investor Advocate's views on the above priorities and any such other matters arising from the testing or results of testing pursuant to.

The CHAIR. No further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in part B of House Report 116–237. Each such further amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. HUIZENGA

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part B of House Report 116–237.

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 2, line 17, after ''Guides),'' insert the following: ''Form CRS''.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 629, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is very simple. It would add Form CRS to the list of exempted disclosures that would not require SEC investor testing. They have gone through it.

Now, you just heard one of my colleagues talk about why somebody would oppose this. I can tell you why somebody would oppose this: Because we have been doing it for 7 years.

For 7 years Reg BI has been debated. It has been litigated. It has been confusing. And it is time to move forward.

The Securities and Exchange Commission has done that.

So, again, the author of the bill earlier had said, Mr. Chair, that he was not interested in relitigating current rulemaking. Now is the time to show that. Now is the time to prove that. Support my amendment.

So, Form CRS was part of the Regulation Best Interest rulemaking package. The form is a short, plain-language description of an investor-adviser or a broker-dealer's relationship summary.

It is designed to help retail investors select or determine to remain with an advisory or brokerage firm. They are trying to figure it out.

Importantly, Form CRS was the result of an extensive deliberative process at the SEC. Beyond the typical comment process—and the SEC did consider 6,000 comments for the Reg BI rulemaking package—the SEC also engaged in substantial investor outreach, including in-person meetings across the country; surveys—1,800 of those surveys—and, importantly, engaged the RAND Corporation to perform one-on-one, in-depth investor testing of the proposed Form CRS.

Now, earlier it was claimed, Mr. Chair, that the initial form was unchanged. That is not true. The SEC did figure out that four pages was too long, too confusing. They streamlined that down to two.

So, that is, the SEC did its work—again, for the last 7 years. And we are now at a critical juncture. We can choose to take this road, or we can choose to turn around and head backward. I, for one, do not want to turn around and head backward. I want to provide that protection to my Main Street investors and my constituents back in my district.

So, the SEC did its job. It did testing that was substantially similar to what was proposed by this bill on Form CRS already. It has been 7 years that we have been going through this process. We could not get, under the last administration and in the beginning of this administration, the Department of Labor and the Securities and Exchange Commission to agree on how to move forward.

And when in the Trump administration, this current administration, the Department of Labor was trying to assert itself, the Securities and Exchange Commission did its job and stepped in, which it didn't do under the last administration, and said: Nope. We got it. We are the lead agency. We will take this, and we will come up with a final product.

And the reason why I oppose this bill, certainly without my amendment, is all this does is it reverts back to what we had before this rulemaking was done by the Securities and Exchange Commission. Confusion, muddiness, and uncertainty will be the rule of law, and we are trying to clear that up. The Securities and Exchange Commission is trying to clear that up.

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

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chair, this amendment is unnecessary and could undermine the investor understanding of how retail investors relate to brokers.

H.R. 1815, the SEC Disclosure Effectiveness Testing Act, simply requires the Securities and Exchange Commission to test its documents with retail investors through one-on-one interviews and surveys to ensure that disclosure documents intended for retail investors are actually understood by their target audience.

H.R. 1815 is in no way intended to repeal Regulation Best Interest, a rule adopted by the SEC in June to change the standard of conduct for brokers when providing retail investors with personalized investment advice.

And, to be clear, the bill does not require testing of the standard imposed by the SEC under Regulation Best Interest. Instead, it requires testing of how well retail investors understand the standard and how it impacts the advice they receive, along with any other disclosures.

In addition, the bill contemplates that the SEC, in consultation with the investor advocate, would develop a schedule of disclosures that it intends to test and report to Congress. There is nothing in the bill that requires investor testing of disclosures related to Regulation Best Interest on day one of enactment.

But this amendment would say that the SEC should never test these disclosures, regardless of changes to the markets, investment product offerings, investor behaviors, and investment trends. This makes little sense, particularly considering the rise of riskier products like cryptocurrencies that are being targeted to retail investors.

I would also point out that, to the extent that the SEC, in consultation with the investor advocate, determines that it should make substantial changes to the disclosures that would have a significant impact on retail investors, H.R. 1815 would simply require the SEC to test new and existing disclosure forms to ensure that they are actually understood by the intended audience.

Mr. Chair, I oppose this amendment, I ask all of my colleagues to do so, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Chairman, just to address a couple of things: This bill clearly says it will add Form CRS to the list of exempted disclosures that would not require SEC investor testing. It has nothing to do with cryptocurrencies unless, somehow, magically, a crypto broker appears.

There is no such thing. It has no application. This amendment is only going to be narrow. It is going to exempt Form CRS from having to go through this again.

The author of the bill had said that he had no interest in relitigating current rulemaking. Here is the opportunity to prove it because, I would hope, Mr. Chairman, that we would all agree that Form CRS does not need to be subject to further testing.

It has been 7 years. I don't want it to be another 7 years. As my colleague from Indiana earlier was saying, 600 rules at 6 months per rule is 300 years. We don't have that time.

Mr. Chair, I hope that my colleagues would support my amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to inquire how much time I have remaining.

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman from California has 2½ minutes remaining.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chair, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CASTEN), the sponsor of this important legislation.

□ 1315

Mr. CASTEN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Huizenga amendment, and I want to clarify a couple of points.

The bill gives the SEC Office of the Investor Advocate a larger role to prioritize which disclosures to test. The bill also says that once testing is completed and is found to be clear, there is no need to do further testing unless there are substantive changes.

To argue that every single bill is going to have to be reviewed every single time is not an argument that is made in good faith. The question here on the amendment is simply: Should we exempt one single form from the broad discretion given to the SEC in this rule? It is not clear to me why you would exempt Form CRS from investor testing, unless you don't want investors to understand the fees, costs, or conflicts of interest of investment professionals.

We know, through the testing that was done, that Form CRS appeared to be helpful for investors who had already read similar documents and who had more investing experience. And we know from the testing that was done that Form CRS, as currently written, is not that helpful for investors who haven't otherwise read similar documents.

We can't tie the SEC's hands in determining which disclosure documents need further investor testing. But if we are sitting here and believe that we have an obligation to look out for the best interests of the American people, for investors, for Main Street investors, then the only choice before us is to vote ''no'' on this amendment, and I encourage all of my colleagues to do so.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. GOTTHEIMER

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in part B of House Report 116–237.

Mr. GOTTHEIMER. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 4, insert after line 8 the following:

(v) A consideration of unique challenges faced by retail investors age 65 or older.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 629, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GOTTHEIMER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. GOTTHEIMER. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is straightforward. It simply requires the SEC to specifically consider the unique challenges senior investors face as part of its overall investor testing.

Since I took office, I have been committed to helping seniors save their hard-earned money for retirement so they can afford to stay in New Jersey and enjoy their lives with their kids and grandkids.

Unfortunately, there are millions of senior investors across the country who have been the victims of financial scammers, hucksters, and snake oil salesmen who have cheated them out of their rightful retirement.

That is why, earlier this year, I introduced the Senior Security Act, bipartisan legislation that overwhelmingly passed out of the House to help the SEC protect vulnerable seniors from predatory scams and financial abuse.

This amendment is another critical step in making sure that the SEC continues to do right by our seniors, by making sure there is explicit consideration of senior investors as they proceed with investor testing.

New Jersey seniors have given us so much. I will always have their backs to ensure they have the help they need to stay in Jersey and to protect them from those who would seek to take advantage of them.

I thank my colleague and friend, Mr. CASTEN, for introducing this bill and for his commitment to protecting seniors. I thank the chairwoman also for her excellent leadership. And I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense amendment.

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

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the proposed amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Chairman, I share my colleague's concerns about the challenges that senior investors face. I have had that with my own parents, who, unfortunately, are no longer with us. But I was a part of those investment discussions and decisions, and I had a brother who was very, very involved in that and a sister who also. We all worked together as a family, trying to figure this all out. This is a concern that all of us had.

The author of the amendment was also the author of the Senior Security Act, which I supported, and massive bipartisan support came out of this House. Many people would be surprised about that, I would bet.

But I am opposed, however, to adding to the already significant requirements of this investor testing bill. I will note that the bill, as drafted, would already require that the SEC do whatever testing it, in consultation with the Office of the Investor Advocate, determines is ''appropriate for evaluating the effectiveness of retail disclosures.''

It doesn't say for young people. It doesn't say middle-income people. It doesn't say for old people. It says for everyone. This is already covered.

Earlier, you heard my amendment, that I was going to add to an exemption. Well, there is already a list of exemptions, that forms are exempted. Mine would have been in addition to that.

The purpose of my amendment and my opposition to this amendment is to simplify, not to make it duplicative, not to make it more complicated, not to make it more cumbersome, burdened, and bureaucratic.

As I read it, for the amendment to have any type of meaning, the amendment suggests that testing is either: A, flawed as it currently is; or, B, wouldn't consider seniors.

I am assuming that is not what the author is intending to do, to question that.

I just see this as unnecessary, duplicative testing that would add to the bill's cost and expand another layer of bureaucracy that doesn't ultimately help those retail investors. John and Jane 401(k), those mom-and-pop investors, whatever title you want to put to them, they need to be our focus.

Now, there is a cottage industry of now-congressionally mandated investor testers. I am not really interested in continuing to give them jobs. I want to make sure that we protect those investors, but also give them that protection in a timely manner because timeliness is part of that protection.

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

Mr. GOTTHEIMER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to add one thing. Given the gravity of the situation with seniors in this country getting scammed out of billions of dollars or more every year, I don't think we can do enough.

The only thing I would urge my friend here is, anything we can do to actually protect our seniors, we should be doing because what we are doing now is not working.

When I go anywhere, I hear from seniors about these awful instances and stories of what is happening to them on these calls and getting defrauded. I think anything that we can do to help protect our seniors and go the extra

mile to help them is critically important. This is a way to do it that I think is effective, efficient, and will get the backs of our seniors, which, to me, is the least we can do for our seniors who have given so much to us.

Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CASTEN), the sponsor of the bill.

Mr. CASTEN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Gottheimer amendment. I would like to thank my friend, Representative GOTTHEIMER, for his amendment and for his longtime support for seniors and their financial health.

This amendment rightfully highlights that the SEC should take into account the unique circumstances that seniors face in making investment decisions when they do their investor testing.

The financial health of seniors is critically important, and I am delighted that this bill has the support of the AARP and the 38 million seniors who they represent across our country. I stand with them in making clear that effective disclosure testing is imperative for facilitating informed decision-making for Americans trying to save and invest their hard-earned money.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on the Gottheimer amendment.

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Chair, I am prepared to close. I am curious on the remaining balance of time on both sides.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Michigan has 2 minutes remaining. The gentleman from New Jersey has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOTTHEIMER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to add, just one more time, to the critical importance, please.

There is a reason why I think Mr. CASTEN and so many others have been driving this bipartisan legislation, and why the Senior Security Act was bipartisan is for a pretty simple reason.

We all recognize that we have to do whatever possible to keep these fraudsters, these hucksters, these snake oil salesmen from scamming our seniors. It is beyond upsetting when you hear these stories of what has happened to our moms, our dads, and so many people in our community who have been, frankly, ripped off by these scam artists.

This legislation—not just this amendment, but the legislation—will help protect our seniors; will help protect investors; and with my amendment, will make sure that when people are ready to retire, they have the nest egg they need to not just take care of themselves and have the medicine they need but, of course, buy a gift for their grandkid and make sure they are able to have those resources that they spent their whole lives saving for.

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

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Chairman, again, my opposition to the amendment has nothing to do with putting seniors in danger. In fact, that is why I supported a litany of bills and a package of bills that included the author's Senior Security Act this last April. The House is unified in supporting seniors. What we are not unified in is supporting bureaucracy.

By the way, the aforementioned that I had talked about, the Office of the Investor Advocate, would you like to know where that came from? The Dodd-Frank Act.

What this amendment is saying is the Dodd-Frank Act failed in protecting seniors. The Dodd-Frank Act must have failed in protecting investors because we now need to have a specific, senior-worded sort of category that needs to be looked out after.

The law is supposed to be blind, whether you are young, old, middle income, rich, poor, whatever it is. That protection also goes there.

My opposition, again, is not about who has been affected but what is going to slow down that protection that those people deserve.

Reasonable cost equals access. If we continue to increase costs, it limits the ability for people to access that protection, that advice. That is why I rise in opposition to my friend's amendment.

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

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GOTTHEIMER).

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

Mr. GOTTHEIMER. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MRS. WAGNER

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in part B of House Report 116–237.

Mrs. WAGNER. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 1, line 11, insert after ''regulation'' the following ''after January 21, 2021''.

Page 7, strike line 12 and all that follows through the end.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 629, the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. WAGNER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Missouri.

Mrs. WAGNER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of my amendment to H.R. 1815, which would apply the bill's additional investor testing requirements only to disclosure documents developed after January 21, 2021.

If enacted, this legislation would hinder the implementation of important rules designed to better protect Main Street investors, particularly, the SEC's Regulation Best Interest rule. This rule has been in effect since September 10, 2019, but it has a compliance date of June 30, 2020.

If further and ongoing testing were required, it would onerously roll back and delay further—after 7 years of testing, debate, deliberation, comment periods, litigation, it would only roll back and further delay, Mr. Chairman, all of the SEC's efforts to better protect those retail investors.

□ 1330

The bottom line is that this legislation is duplicative for rules already under consideration. The SEC has already conducted extensive investor testing of the proposed Form CRS, a component of the Regulation Best Interest rule. This is nothing, Mr. Chairman, but a political ploy, rope-a-dope, more neglect in not doing the work of the people. It does not serve those low- and middle-income investors, those constituents of mine in Missouri's Second Congressional District.

It makes no sense to go back and conduct repetitive investor testing, leaving broker dealers and their clients—again, there are low- and middle-income investors—without a uniform best interest standard.

That is why I ask all of my colleagues to support this commonsense amendment, and if it is not agreed to, to oppose the underlying bill, H.R. 1815, that does nothing but delay and disserve the people that we should be working hard to protect, those low- and middle-income retail investors that are a part of our beautiful and wonderful Main Street districts.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

First, let me just say, no matter how many amendments the opposite side can come up with, no matter how many ways they try to explain why they are not speaking for the retail investors, the small folks, the people with not a lot of resources, the people who depend on good information to be disclosed to them, they can come up with all the amendments they want, but no one thinking clearly about this will understand why they are trying to protect the SEC, our cop on the block, from doing everything they possibly can do to protect our seniors and our most vulnerable people.

So H.R. 1815 seeks, again, to ensure that disclosures specifically designed for the most vulnerable investors, including mom-and-pop retail investors, can actually be used and understood by their intended audiences. Isn't that a simple request in this bill, that our most vulnerable retail investors understand what they are investing in, that that information should be disclosed to them? I don't get the arguments against it.

This amendment, however, directly conflicts with the scope of the bill,

which covers new as well as existing disclosures. Requiring existing disclosures to be subjected to investor testing makes good sense. Evidence has shown many existing disclosures are not understood. The evidence is there that tells you that we have discovered that the disclosures are not understood by these vulnerable people. We have information that documents that, that the investors, the small investors, these seniors, don't understand. This bill is about helping them to understand what they are signing on the dotted line for.

Mandatory disclosures that are unused or not understood impose unnecessary costs on the companies making those disclosures, and importantly, fail to inform retail investors of key risks that they should know when making investment decisions.

However, this amendment that is before you would treat disclosures that are put forth before the next Presidential election as perfect, without need for further investor input through testing. Such an exemption is inconsistent with the object and purpose of this bill.

This undermines H.R. 1815 and its value to retail investors. So I could say this another 100 ways, they can come up with all the amendments they want to come up with; the fact of the matter is, this bill that is put forward by Mr. CASTEN is to protect the citizens who need the information the most, because they are vulnerable. And so having said that, I would urge my colleagues to join me in opposing this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. WAGNER. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time is remaining?

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Missouri has 2 minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from California has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mrs. WAGNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA), the ranking member of the Investor Protection, Entrepreneurship, and Capital Markets Subcommittee, my friend, to speak in support of the amendment and in opposition to the underlying bill.

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague and friend for yielding.

Nobody is opposed to the idea of investor testing of SEC disclosure documents. By the way, neither is the SEC. They just proved that, as we know, from their testing of Form CRS.

What I am opposed to, and I believe the gentlewoman is opposed to, is a testing loop. You test and refine, test-refine, test-refine. What is happening in between those time periods? What does it revert back to? And we can get into a death spiral or paralysis by analysis sometimes. Not that we don't have the best intentions and have the SEC move forward, we just need closure.

Again, cost is a part of the access, but timeliness is part of access for everybody as well, and I am just afraid that with what we could get into we are going to be in this testing loop.

Mrs. WAGNER. Mr. Chairman, let me just say, I have been working on this issue and fighting for the retail investors for all 7 of my years here in Congress with several pieces of legislation to bring this to fruition and to always, always hold that retail investor in the best interest to make sure that we are taking care of them and giving them the best advice, the best access, the best cost, but most of all that we secure their savings and their retirement investment and do everything we can to serve in their best interests. And that is why we must bring this after 7 long years to a close.

It is time that we stop playing rope-a-dope with duplicative rules that have already been under consideration and by conducting extensive investor testing that has already been done. The SEC is the absolute body of jurisdiction. They must harmonize with the Department of Labor, and have, and now we have got a short, two-form page. We have got disclosures and titles that are clear that is serving the best interests of our constituents.

I would ask everyone to consider my amendment to H.R. 1815, and if it is not agreed to, to oppose the underlying bill.

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

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CASTEN), the author of this bill, to continue to tell the public why we must protect the most vulnerable in our society.

Mr. CASTEN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Wagner amendment. The wealth that Americans hold in their retirement accounts, in their 401(k)s, in their IRAs, all the places that they hold their wealth, the fees they pay on that wealth, the returns they earn on that wealth do not care when the law was written, or the form was processed.

We know, we have evidence, that many of the existing disclosure documents intended for retail investors are not well understood by their target audience. So I would ask you: What is the cost to your wealth of another percent a year in asset management fees? What is the cost to you, to your wealth, of another percent a year compounding in the growth of your wealth? Multiply that by all the Americans who make their investments. Billions, trillions of dollars.

This amendment was offered as a way to protect people. It is protecting people, but it isn't protecting investors. I strongly urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this amendment.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. WAGNER).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mrs. WAGNER. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Missouri will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. CASTEN OF ILLINOIS

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in part B of House Report 116–237.

Mr. CASTEN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I rise as the designee for the gentleman from New York (Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY) to offer amendment No. 4.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 6, insert after line 5 the following:

''(H) RETAIL INVESTOR DEFINED.—For the purposes of this paragraph, the term 'retail investor' means any investor that is not an institutional investor.''.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 629, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CASTEN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CASTEN of Illinois. Mr. Chair, H.R. 1815 was drafted specifically for SEC disclosures that are required to be delivered to or intended or substantially likely to be materially relied on by retail investors, but not by sophisticated institutional investors like mutual funds or hedge funds.

Representative SEAN MALONEY's amendment clarifies that this bill is intended to protect retail investors. That is a commonsense amendment, which allows the bill to achieve our goal, which is to ensure that mom-and-pop investors are able to use the disclosures intended specifically for them.

I thank Representative MALONEY for this amendment, and I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes.''

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Chairman, this amendment simply attempts to define an unclear and undefined term by making reference to another unclear and undefined term.

For context, let me be clear on where this comes from. The Securities and Exchange Act of 1934 does not define either the term ''retail investor'' or ''institutional investor.'' This amendment pretends to add clarity, but arguably further muddies an already confusing bill by adding a second new undefined term.

In fact, there are some who believe that the amendment might actually expand the bill's reach, because the bill, as amended, could be interpreted to apply to any document designed to reach anybody other than that ''institutional investor.''

So we have a problem here, Mr. Chairman. We have undefined terms. We have muddied, not clear goals and objectives here, and so, I would rhetorically ask, what is an institutional investor? Is it a small-town investment manager who is a sole practitioner, but has set up their own business and now is, thus, an institution? Does the business require multiple employees? Does it require a large number of employees? I, for one, am not sure. Does it have a dollar amount attached to it? It could be one person, a very wealthy person investing millions or a whole bunch of smaller investors, who don't have millions, banding together and now they are suddenly institutional investors.

So let's just not make H.R. 1815 more confusing than it already is. I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1345

Mr. CASTEN of Illinois. Mr. Chair, I encourage my colleagues to vote for the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Chairman, the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 has been a living, breathing document; but in those subsequent years from 1934, there has never been a definition of either ''retail investor'' or ''institutional investor,'' and to hang an amendment on those terms which are undefined legally is simply a mistake.

So, Mr. Chair, I do not support this unnecessarily confusing amendment, and I urge a ''no'' vote on this amendment.

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

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CASTEN).

The amendment was agreed to.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in part B of House Report 116–237 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 1 by Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan.

Amendment No. 2 by Mr. GOTTHEIMER of New Jersey.

Amendment No. 3 by Mrs. WAGNER of Missouri.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. HUIZENGA

The CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 188, noes 229, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 561]

AYES—188

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

NOES—229

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Amash
Axne
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brindisi
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Case
Casten (IL)
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Cisneros
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Cox (CA)
Craig
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Cunningham
Davids (KS)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny K.
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Engel
Escobar
Eshoo
Espaillat
Evans
Finkenauer
Fletcher
Foster
Frankel
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
García (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Golden
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Green, Al (TX)
Grijalva
Haaland
Harder (CA)
Hastings
Hayes
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Hill (CA)
Himes
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Luján
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McAdams
McBath
McCollum
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Morelle
Moulton
Mucarsel-Powell
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Norcross
Norton
O'Halleran
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Phillips
Pingree
Plaskett
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rose (NY)
Rouda
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Sablan
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shalala
Sherman
Sherrill
Sires
Smith (WA)
Soto
Spanberger
Speier
Stanton
Stevens
Suozzi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres Small (NM)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Van Drew
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wexton
Wild
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—20

Babin
Bishop (NC)
Gohmert
Gooden
Granger
Lawson (FL)
Lesko
Loudermilk
McEachin
Ocasio-Cortez
Radewagen
Ratcliffe
Rush
Ryan
San Nicolas
Weber (TX)
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wright
Yoho

□ 1415

Messrs. PANETTA, O'HALLERAN, ENGEL, and JOHNSON of Georgia changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. CRAWFORD, BILIRAKIS, BURCHETT, and BROOKS of Alabama changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. GOTTHEIMER

The Acting CHAIR (Ms. PINGREE). The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GOTTHEIMER) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 240, noes 178, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 562]

AYES—240

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Axne
Bacon
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brindisi
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Carbajal
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Case
Casten (IL)
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Cisneros
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Cox (CA)
Craig
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Cunningham
Davids (KS)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny K.
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Engel
Escobar
Eshoo
Espaillat
Evans
Finkenauer
Fitzpatrick
Fletcher
Foster
Frankel
Fudge
Gallego
Garamendi
García (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Golden
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Green, Al (TX)
Haaland
Harder (CA)
Hastings
Hayes
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Hill (CA)
Himes
Horn, Kendra S.
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Huffman
Hurd (TX)
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Luján
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Mast
Matsui
McAdams
McBath
McCollum
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Morelle
Moulton
Mucarsel-Powell
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Norcross
Norton
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Phillips
Pingree
Plaskett
Pocan
Porter
Posey
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Reed
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rose (NY)
Rouda
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Sablan
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shalala
Sherman
Sherrill
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Soto
Spanberger
Speier
Stanton
Stefanik
Stevens
Suozzi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres Small (NM)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Van Drew
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wexton
Wild
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth
Young

NOES—178

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

NOT VOTING—19

Babin
Bishop (NC)
Cárdenas
Gabbard
Gohmert
Gooden
Granger
Lawson (FL)
Loudermilk
McEachin
Radewagen
Ratcliffe
Rush
Ryan
San Nicolas
Weber (TX)
Williams
Wright
Yoho

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1422

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MRS. WAGNER

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. WAGNER) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 188, noes 230, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 563]

AYES—188

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

NOES—230

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

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

NOT VOTING—19

Babin
Bishop (NC)
Cárdenas
Gabbard
Gohmert
Gooden
Granger
Grijalva
Lawson (FL)
Loudermilk
McEachin
Radewagen
Ratcliffe
Ryan
San Nicolas
Weber (TX)
Williams
Wright
Yoho

□ 1428

Mr. BUCHANAN changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. RICHMOND). There being no further amendments under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. PINGREE) having assumed the chair, Mr. RICHMOND, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1815) to require the Securities and Exchange Commission, when developing rules and regulations about disclosures to retail investors, to conduct investor testing, including a survey and interviews of retail investors, and for other purposes, and, pursuant to House Resolution 629, he reported the bill, as amended by that resolution, back to the House with sundry further amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. HOYER was allowed to speak out of order.)

MOURNING THE PASSING OF THE HONORABLE ELIJAH CUMMINGS

Mr. HOYER. Today, Mr. Speaker, is a sad day. It is a sad day for us; it is a sad day for this institution; and it is a sad day for America. We have lost a wonderful human being, a good and decent human being, a human being who made a difference for this institution, for all of us who knew him and were his friend, for his constituents, and for all Americans. All of us in this House lost a respected colleague. Many of us lost a dear, longtime, and good friend.

He came in 1996 to this body, and every time I ran for a leadership position, my friend ELIJAH CUMMINGS nominated me. The passing this morning of Chairman ELIJAH CUMMINGS of the Committee on Oversight and Reform was a painful shock to all who have served with him, more, of course, to his family, Dr. Rockeymoore Cummings, his wife, and his three children.

Elijah was a prophet of God whose name means ''my God is the Lord.'' ELIJAH CUMMINGS was true to his name.

He was a leader for our country and for our State of Maryland, and we have the Members, including our favorite daughter. He was a leader for our State. He was a leader, like our brother JOHN LEWIS, for principle, for comity, and for civility.

He was a quiet man who did not seek the limelight, but he was not afraid to step out into the arena and fight hard for the causes in which he believed strongly. As all of us know, those causes were justice, equality, opportunity, civil rights, education, and children. He liked to say that children are the message we send to a future that we will never see. His parents sent ELIJAH into the future, and how much better the future was.

He was beloved by his constituents, both those in the city of Baltimore and those in its suburbs. Indeed, ELIJAH was probably better loved in my district than I am. Most of my colleagues will understand that, of course.

He worked hard, even in his final days. The Speaker is going to speak, and I am sure she will say something about the telephone call she had with him just days ago, doing the people's business. As his health faltered, his passion for his work did not.

In the days ahead, we will have many opportunities, of course, to speak about our friend, ELIJAH, about his passion for service, his many contributions to Maryland and our Nation, and his deep convictions as a moral leader and a man of decency and love for his neighbor.

Some of you recall ELIJAH at the time of great distress in Baltimore—anger, outbursts. ELIJAH walked among them as a man of peace and, like no other person in our State, brought peace where there was no peace. We will have opportunities to remember that. And we have a chance to reflect on the love he had for his wife, Maya, and his three children.

Today, in remembering ELIJAH CUMMINGS, we have a chance to promote the vision he held of the people's House coming together in a spirit of unity and purpose. Sadly, today, that purpose is to mourn his passing and remember a dear friend who will no longer be with us as we continue his work to which he gave his all. But, hopefully, his example will be with us.

ELIJAH used to say, when he saw conflict and confrontation, when he saw things he thought were not up to the standards we had set for our country and for ourselves because of our faith, our Constitution, and our Declaration, he would say, ''We are better than that.''

As we human beings do things, from time to time, that are not kind to one another, not thoughtful, and not respectful to one another, let us say to ourselves: We are better than that. That is what ELIJAH said to himself.

Mr. Speaker, in that spirit of unity, I will be yielding shortly to the Republican leader to share his reflections. But first, as I referred to her as Maryland's favorite daughter, I am honored to yield to the Speaker of the House, NANCY PELOSI D'ALESANDRO. Now she would say NANCY D'ALESANDRO PELOSI. I understand that. We are so proud of our Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI).

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, it is a very disconcerting day for so many of us here.

I thank Mr. HOYER for bringing us together to mourn the loss of our dear friend and colleague, ELIJAH CUMMINGS. I thank my friend for his beautiful statement calling forth so many of the beautiful attributes of ELIJAH CUMMINGS.

As the gentleman spoke, I was reminded of how he always was a calmer of the waters. No matter how rough and tumble things would be, he would always just calm the waters and reach out, whether it was across the aisle, across the issue, across the Capitol, or down Pennsylvania Avenue.

I know that the people of Baltimore, the U.S. Congress, and America have lost the voice of the unsurpassed moral clarity and truth of our beloved Mr. Chairman, ELIJAH CUMMINGS. I am personally devastated by his passing, as I know many of us are.

We have flowers in his place where he sat, where we all sought counsel, learned more, or calmed down and were lifted up by the wisdom, the graciousness, and the goodness of ELIJAH CUMMINGS.

In the House, ELIJAH was the North Star. He was a leader of towering character and integrity whose stirring voice and steadfast values pushed the Congress and the country to give rise to a higher purpose of why we are here.

His principled leadership as the chair of the Committee on Oversight and Reform was a perfect testament to his commitment to restoring honesty and honor to government, and he leaves a powerful legacy for years to come.

People think of him as that chairman but meaning so much to him was his role as a senior member of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee. He was always fighting for his district, for his State of Maryland, and for the country. He was a powerful voice for building the infrastructure of America and for creating good-paying jobs. He was a working-class guy in terms of whom he was here to serve.

I was very proud of him as a member of the U.S. Naval Academy Board of Visitors. He took great pride in the Naval Academy, his role on the board, and Maryland's role in our national security. I know we have some Naval Academy graduates here, and that was a source of great pride. He said that you have taken me to a new level of decisionmaking, in terms of national security.

Chairman CUMMINGS' story was the story of America. He was a sharecropper's son who dedicated his life to advancing justice, respecting human dignity, and—as the gentleman from Maryland said—ending discrimination.

He believed in the promise of America because he had lived it. He dedicated his life to advancing those values that safeguard our Republic: justice, equality, liberty, and fairness.

As our distinguished leader, Mr. HOYER, said earlier, we were always listening to ELIJAH. These flowers remind me of it because of the growth and renewal that are there. He said, ''Our children are the living messages we send to a future we will never see.''

He also wanted to build a future that was worthy of the aspirations of our children. He always wanted to make sure that they took with them the values that nurtured him and that he was promoting in his public service.

Earlier this year, Chairman CUMMINGS asked us: ''When we are dancing with the angels, the question will be asked: In 2019, what did we do to make sure we kept our democracy intact?''

He is now with the angels, out of pain.

And Maya said this morning, he fought the fight right up until the end. And those of us who communicated with him—I didn't know he was this close. I thought he was coming back in a few weeks.

But our Members, as I stated to our Republican colleagues, we had a conference call on Friday, this past Friday, not a full week ago, in which ELIJAH, as always, was passionate about what he believed in, dispassionate about how he conveyed a plan for how we would go forward with fairness, with justice, with dignity, worthy of the oath of office that we take to the Constitution, worthy of the vision of our Founders establishing this institution, and worthy, again, of the aspirations of our children, his words: messengers to a future we will never see.

His leadership made a difference in strengthening our democracy. Again, during difficult times, let us draw strength from his righteous words that the leader has been reminding us of all day: ''We are better than this. We are better than this.''

In the Congress, we will miss his wisdom, his dignity, the brilliance of his mind, the kindness of his heart, the friendship that meant so much to us and that we could all call upon.

In Baltimore, we will miss him as a champion.

May it be a comfort to his wife, Maya, to whom I conveyed the good wishes of the Congress this morning, may it be a comfort to Maya, to his three children and Chairman CUMMINGS' entire family and, I want to add to that, his dedicated and devoted staff, in every capacity—as a Member, as a chairman, as a member of the committee, whom he just treated with such fairness and respect, his staff—may it be a comfort to them all that so many mourn their loss and are praying for them at this sad time and that he will always be inside of our hearts as we make decisions about our responsibilities and how we will be accountable when we are dancing with the angels.

God bless you, darling ELIJAH. We all love you. We miss you, but we will never forget you, and your legacy will live in the Congress of the United States in this House of Representatives.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), Speaker of the House, for her remarks.

I know ELIJAH felt very strongly about her and his support of her and her leadership and how proud he was that she was from the city of Baltimore that he loved so greatly.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY), my friend, the minority leader, and another good friend of ELIJAH's.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding. I thank him for his words, and I thank the Speaker.

We lost more than just a Member of Congress when we lost ELIJAH CUMMINGS. As the Speaker spoke of his life, she talked about him bringing calmness. I want you to reflect for one moment, when have you ever served in this body that we have been this calm and this quiet and this reflective? ELIJAH's work is still good with us right now.

Chairman CUMMINGS had enormous presence. As many times he would be an adversary, he was a respected adversary because he was tough. He had such a presence on this side of the aisle and an impression that, when we would sit inside our steering committee—and maybe I am breaking the rule; we are never supposed to talk about what we say in there. When we would select a chair or a ranking member, this is the one committee we weighed who we went against.

And every time we spoke of selecting an individual who can rise to the occasion, to be in debate with him, we would look for somebody who was strong. And every time someone was selected, they would come back to be a very best friend of ELIJAH CUMMINGS.

It is a tough committee. It is a committee of accountability. It is a committee of debate. I can't tell you how many friends would call me and be in fear because they got a letter from CUMMINGS. But he was a man of fairness.

You will know this because, in committees, at times, you have these debates. But when you are sitting as a chair and ranking member, what we would talk about is ELIJAH would share with us the life lessons, you know what he would say privately to the chair or the ranking member on the other side, what he would say to JIM JORDAN, what he would say to Trey Gowdy.

Trey shared with me today, he never stopped talking, even though he left Congress.

JIM JORDAN shared with me today that he was talking to ELIJAH just last week about committee business.

Trey talked about a story.

Trey was pretty tough on one person. And Trey is good; that prosecutor in him can get to the point. ELIJAH turned to him and said: She is not a government employee. She has a family, and she has children. You can be a little softer next time.

And that hit on his heart.

And what I fear in the world today, that when they look at us, they get this persona through cameras and social media, but it doesn't show our character. We are the only ones who get the window into one another's character of how we act. We are the ones who should share the message.

Because he was so strong in his beliefs, I am afraid some people in America won't know what type of character he actually had, not as a Member of Congress and not as a political figure, but as a person, because that is how I knew ELIJAH. He was a fighter. So many times in his life people told him no, and he would say, yes, he could.

He was a leader, but not in the sense that America probably thinks as a Member of Congress. His entire life he wanted to overturn racial injustice.

A Member shared with me the first time he got to know him was on a codel down in Mexico. Most of the people on the bus were asleep because it was one of those long trips, and ELIJAH sat and talked to him. This Member was from the South, and he talked about how his grandparents were there, but his grandparents moved him away

because they felt he would have a better chance just because of the color of his skin, that he would get a better education.

ELIJAH was not upset by that. He felt this country gave him the opportunity. That is why he wanted to serve.

So, all those who are here, it was an honor, a fortune, and a privilege to know him. If you are a freshman, I hope you took a few moments with him, because it didn't matter if you were a chair or a ranking member or if you were a Republican or a Democrat, he would spend that time with you.

I feel I am better for having known him, and I want you to know, from this side of the aisle, no matter how hard of a debate we were in, I have only heard respect for how he carried out the business. We respected him because he was good. We respected him because he beat us many times. We respected him because of what he fought for, he believed in.

Our deepest prayers go to Maya, because in those life lessons and in that window that we get to see, it is not the easiest to have a family in these jobs. We have a lot of things pulled on us, but we knew where his heart stood, where his family mattered, and what he continued to believe in.

So, yes, today we lost more than just a Member, but I hope as the days progress, as the times change and our debate gets heated again, that we reflect on this moment of calmness, reflect on this moment of thinking of one another, and we reflect on the idea that, yes, television may give us a different persona of who we are, but, yes, you and I get to see the window of the character within each and every one of us. I think that is what ELIJAH would want us to do.

So in his honor, let's find that tomorrow will be better than today and that this calmness will last longer than the next vote.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

Mr. Speaker, in that spirit, I will ask for a moment of silence. But before I do that, let me mirror the remarks of the leader on the other side of the aisle.

A moment of silence will not be enough to respect the life of ELIJAH CUMMINGS. What will be enough is we follow his example for a lifetime—not for a moment, but for a lifetime—if we give one another the respect that he would give to us, if we give one another the consideration that the leader indicated that he gave to him.

So, Mr. Speaker, I ask that we stand for a moment of silence and a lifetime of following an example.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CLYBURN). The Chair asks that all Members please rise for a moment of silence in remembrance of our good friend and colleague, the Honorable Chairman ELIJAH E. CUMMINGS.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. PINGREE). The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 229, nays 186, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 564]

YEAS—229

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Axne
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brindisi
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Case
Casten (IL)
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Cisneros
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Cox (CA)
Craig
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Cunningham
Davids (KS)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny K.
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Engel
Escobar
Eshoo
Espaillat
Evans
Finkenauer
Fletcher
Foster
Frankel
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
García (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Golden
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Green, Al (TX)
Grijalva
Haaland
Harder (CA)
Hastings
Hayes
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Hill (CA)
Himes
Horn, Kendra S.
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Luján
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McAdams
McBath
McCollum
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Morelle
Moulton
Mucarsel-Powell
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Norcross
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rose (NY)
Rouda
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shalala
Sherman
Sherrill
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (WA)
Soto
Spanberger
Speier
Stanton
Stevens
Suozzi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres Small (NM)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Van Drew
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wexton
Wild
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NAYS—186

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

NOT VOTING—16

Babin
Bishop (NC)
DeLauro
Gohmert
Gooden
Granger
Lawson (FL)
Loudermilk
Marchant
McEachin
Ratcliffe
Ryan
Weber (TX)
Williams
Wright
Yoho

□ 1503

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN ENGROSSMENT OF H.R. 1815, SEC DISCLOSURE EFFECTIVENESS TESTING ACT

Mr. CASTEN of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, in the engrossment of H.R. 1815, the Clerk be authorized to correct section numbers, punctuation, spelling, and cross-references, and to make such other technical and conforming changes as may be necessary to reflect the actions of the House, including the changes now at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the changes.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 8, line 13, after ''Section 23(a)(4) of the Securities'' strike ''6''.

Page 8, line 13, strike ''above''.
Page 9, line 9, strike ''pursuant to''.
Page 9, line 12, strike ''pursuant to''.
Page 9, line 16, strike ''pursuant to''.

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

There was no objection.

EXPRESSING THE PROFOUND SORROW OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES ON THE DEATH OF THE HONORABLE ELIJAH E. CUMMINGS

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 635

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of the Honorable Elijah E. Cummings, a Representative from the State of Maryland.

Resolved, That a committee of such Members of the House as the Speaker may designate, together with such Members of the Senate as may be joined, be appointed to attend the funeral.

Resolved, That the Sergeant-at-Arms of the House be authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary for carrying out the provisions of these resolutions and that the necessary expenses in connection therewith be paid out of applicable accounts of the House.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That when the House adjourns today, it adjourn as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 8 minutes p.m.), pursuant to House Resolution 635, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, October 18, 2019, at 9 a.m., as a further mark of respect to the memory of the late Honorable ELIJAH E. CUMMINGS.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2635. A letter from the Administrator, Specialty Crops Program, Specialty Crops Inspection Division, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — U.S. Standards for Grades of Apples [Document Number: AMS-SC-18-0055, SC-18-330] received October 15, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2636. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel, MRFSPD, Office of the General Counsel, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Rules of Practice and Procedure Governing Formal Rulemaking Proceedings Instituted by the Secretary received October 15, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2637. A letter from the PRAO Branch Chief, Food and Nutrition Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — The Emergency Food Assistance Program: Implementation of the Agriculture Improvement Act of 2018 [FNS-2019-0013] (RIN: 0584-AE73) received October 15, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2638. A letter from the Under Secretary, Comptroller, Department of Defense, transmitting a report of violations of the Antideficiency Act, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1351; Public Law 97-258; (96 Stat. 926); to the Committee on Appropriations.

2639. A letter from the Under Secretary, Acquisition and Sustainment, Department of Defense, transmitting a complete report on the Defense Electronics Industrial Base Report to Congress in response to the requirement of the John S. McCain National Defense Authorization Act for FY 2019, pursuant to Public Law 115-232, Sec. 845(a); (132 Stat. 1881); to the Committee on Armed Services.

2640. A letter from the Director, Regulations Management Team, Rural Development, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Section 538 Guaranteed Rural Rental Housing Program Notice of Funding Availability Elimination [Docket No.: RHS-18-MFH-0027] (RIN: 0575-AD12) received October 15, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2641. A letter from the General Counsel, National Credit Union Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Real Estate Appraisals (RIN: 3133-AE79) received October 15, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2642. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting the Office's report on discretionary appropriations legislation within seven calendar days of enactment, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 901(a)(7)(B); Public Law 99-177, Sec. 251(a)(7)(B) (as amended by Public Law 114-113, Sec. 1003); (129 Stat. 3035); to the Committee on the Budget.

2643. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Education, transmitting a notification of a determination that a section of the Higher Education Act of 1965 is unconstitutional under the First Amendment's Free Exercise Clause, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 530D(a)(1); Public Law 107-273, Sec. 202(a); (116 Stat. 1771); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

2644. A letter from the NACIQI Executive Director, Department of Education, transmitting the Annual Report of the National Advisory Committee on Institutional Quality and Integrity for FY 2019; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

2645. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel, Office of General Counsel, Consumer Product Safety Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment to Requirements for Consumer Registration of Durable Infant or Toddler Products [Docket No. CPSC-2018-0018] received October 15, 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.

2646. A letter from the Chair, United States Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board, transmitting a report titled, ''Preparing for Nuclear Waste Transportation — Technical Issues that Need to Be Addressed in Preparing for a Nationwide Effort to Transport Spent Nuclear Fuel and High-Level Radioactive Waste'', pursuant to the Nuclear Waste Policy Amendments Act of 1987, Public Law 100-203; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2647. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Sudan that was declared in Executive Order 13067 of November 3, 1997, 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.

2648. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to South Sudan that was declared in Executive Order 13664 of April 3, 2014, 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.

2649. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to significant malicious cyber-enabled activities that was declared in Executive Order 13694 of April 1, 2015, 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.

2650. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Somalia that was declared in Executive Order 13536 of April 12, 2010, 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.

2651. A letter from the Assistant Legal Advisor, Office of Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting reports concerning international agreements other than treaties entered into by the United States to be transmitted to the Congress within the sixty-day period specified in the Case-Zablocki Act, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b(a); Public Law 92-403, Sec. 1(a) (as amended by Public Law 108-458, Sec. 7121(b)); (118 Stat. 3807); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2652. A letter from the Director, Human Resources Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting two (2) notifications of a vacancy, a designation of acting officer, and a discontinuation of service in acting role, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

2653. A letter from the Senior Procurement Executive, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's small entity compliance guide — Federal Acquisition Regulation; Federal Acquisition Circular 2020-01 [Docket No.: FAR-2019-0001, Sequence No. 6] received October 15, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

2654. A letter from the Senior Procurement Executive, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation: Definition of ''Commercial Item'' [FAC 2020-01; FAR Case 2018-008; Docket No. FAR-2018-0008; Sequence No. 1] (RIN: 9000-AN68) received October 15, 2019,

pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

2655. A letter from the Senior Procurement Executive, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's summary presentation of a final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; Federal Acquisition Circular 2020-01; Introduction [Docket No.: FAR-2019-0001, Sequence No.: 6] received October 15, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

2656. A letter from the Senior Advisor, Office of the Secretary, Department of Health and Human, transmitting a notification of an action on nomination and a discontinuation of service in acting role, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

2657. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; Atlantic Bluefin Tuna Fisheries [Docket No.: 180117042-8884-02] (RIN: 0648-XT018) received October 15, 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.

2658. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Mackerel, Squid, and Butterfish Fisheries; Specifications [Docket No.: 190729-0006] (RIN: 0648-XG657) received October 10, 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.

2659. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Affairs, NMFS, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries Off West Coast States; Coastal Pelagic Species Fisheries; Annual Specifications [Docket No.: 190409351-9512-02] (RIN: 0648-XG972) received October 10, 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.

2660. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's interim final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Summer Flounder, Scup, and Black Sea Bass Fisheries; Revised 2019 Summer Flounder Specifications [Docket No.: 190312234-9412-01] (RIN: 0648-XG898) received October 10, 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.

2661. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone, Saint Simons Sound, GA [Docket Number: USCG-2019-0794] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received October 10, 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.

2662. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Sikorsky Aircraft Corporation Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2019-0389; Product Identifier 2018-SW-035-AD; Amendment 39-19748; AD 2019-19-12] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received October 10, 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.

2663. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2019-0495; Product Identifier 2019-NM-029-AD; Amendment 39-19752; AD 2019-19-16] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received October 10, 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.

2664. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. International Trade Commission, transmitting the Commission's report titled, ''The Year in Trade 2018'', pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 2213(c); Public Law 93-618, Sec. 163(c) (as amended by Public Law 100-418, Sec. 1641); (102 Stat. 1271); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ: Committee on Small Business. H.R. 4387. A bill to establish Growth Accelerator Fund Competition within the Small Business Administration, and for other purposes (Rept. 116–238). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ: Committee on Small Business. H.R. 4405. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to improve the women's business center program, and for other purposes (Rept. 116–239). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ: Committee on Small Business. H.R. 4406. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to improve the small business development centers program, and for other purposes (Rept. 116–240). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ: Committee on Small Business. H.R. 4407. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to reauthorize the SCORE program, and for other purposes (Rept. 116–241). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ENGEL: Committee on Foreign Affairs. House Resolution 326. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding United States efforts to resolve the Israeli-Palestinian conflict through a negotiated two-state solution; with amendments (Rept. 116–242). 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. GARAMENDI (for himself and Mrs. HARTZLER):

H.R. 4710. A bill to direct the Secretary of Defense to include in each national defense strategy steps to strengthen the United States industrial base and to assure an uninterrupted supply of medicines, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committees on Veterans' Affairs, and Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LIPINSKI:

H.R. 4711. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to deny any deduction for advertising prescription drugs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. DEAN (for herself, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, and Mr. MCKINLEY):

H.R. 4712. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to limitations on exclusive approval or licensure of orphan drugs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GREEN of Texas (for himself and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi):

H.R. 4713. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to make certain improvements in the Office for Civil Rights and Civil Liberties of the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mrs. BUSTOS (for herself, Mr. PANETTA, Ms. SCHRIER, and Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York):

H.R. 4714. A bill to prioritize funding for an expanded and sustained national investment in agriculture research; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CICILLINE (for himself, Mr. CLINE, Ms. NORTON, and Ms. JACKSON LEE):

H.R. 4715. A bill to amend the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 to require more detailed travel disclosure filings from judicial officers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COX of California (for himself and Ms. SEWELL of Alabama):

H.R. 4716. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a safe harbor for high deductible health plans without a deductible for certain inhalers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CRAWFORD (for himself and Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia):

H.R. 4717. A bill to improve swap execution facility administration, swap entity compliance, and other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Ms. GARCIA of Texas (for herself, Ms. NORTON, Ms. ESCOBAR, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. VELA, Mr. CISNEROS, Ms. HAALAND, Mr. EVANS, and Ms. BARRAGÁN):

H.R. 4718. A bill to restrict the enforcement of the immigration laws at polling places, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Homeland Security, and House Administration, 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. GOLDEN (for himself and Mr. YOUNG):

H.R. 4719. A bill to amend the Federal share of the fishing safety standards grants; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. GREEN of Tennessee:

H.R. 4720. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to establish the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Space, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. HILL of California (for herself and Mr. SIRES):

H.R. 4721. A bill to prohibit the authorization of Federal funds to facilitate Russian participation in G7 or reconstituted G8 meetings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. HOULAHAN (for herself, Mr. ENGEL, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. FRANKEL, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. LEE of California, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. MOORE, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. SHALALA, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. NORTON, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. PAPPAS, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. CASTEN of Illinois, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. COOPER, Ms. BASS, Mr. RUSH, Mr. NADLER, Mr. COSTA, Mr. COHEN, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. TONKO, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. WILD, Ms. DEAN, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. POCAN, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. CARBAJAL, Ms. HAALAND, Mr. HIMES, Ms. SCANLON, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. CASE, Mrs. TRAHAN, Mr. RYAN, Mr. EVANS, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. WELCH, Ms. HILL of California, Mr. BERA, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Ms. MENG, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. NEGUSE, Mr. KIND, Mr. KILMER, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. CROW, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. PINGREE, Miss RICE of New York, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. SIRES, Ms. ESCOBAR, Mrs. LEE of Nevada, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. ALLRED, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. TITUS, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. SCHRIER, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. CISNEROS, Mr. SOTO, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. TRONE, Mr. GALLEGO, Ms. SHERRILL, Mr. KEATING, and Mr. LARSEN of Washington):

H.R. 4722. A bill to authorize contributions to the United Nations Population Fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HUFFMAN:

H.R. 4723. A bill to require the identification of salmon conservation areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committees on Agriculture, and Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. JAYAPAL (for herself, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Ms. OMAR, Ms. PRESSLEY, and Ms. TLAIB):

H.R. 4724. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to make for-profit institutions ineligible for Federal student aid and to protect the integrity of nonprofit institutions of higher education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LAMBORN (for himself, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. BUCK, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. CROW, Mr. NEGUSE, and Mr. PERLMUTTER):

H.R. 4725. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 8585 Criterion Drive in Colorado Springs, Colorado, as the ''Chaplain (Capt.) Dale Goetz Memorial Post Office Building''; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. MARSHALL:

H.R. 4726. A bill to help end-users better utilize derivatives markets by refining the definition of financial entity, clarifying how affiliates can utilize the end-user exception, and harmonizing clearing and margin exemptions; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MCEACHIN (for himself and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi):

H.R. 4727. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to establish a mentor-protégé program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Ms. MOORE (for herself, Mr. ESTES, Mr. CISNEROS, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. COLE, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. CALVERT, Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas, Mr. STEUBE, and Ms. HAALAND):

H.R. 4728. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the taxation of unearned income of certain children; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. SPEIER (for herself, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Ms. FRANKEL, Mr. PERRY, Mrs. BUSTOS, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. CISNEROS, Mr. COHEN, Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. NORTON, Mr. RYAN, Mrs. TORRES of California, and Mrs. WAGNER):

H.R. 4729. A bill to protect the rights of crime victims, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. SPEIER (for herself, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. NORTON, Mr. HASTINGS, and Mr. LYNCH):

H.R. 4730. A bill to authorize the Attorney General to carry out a pilot program to make grants to entities to develop gun safety technology, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TIPTON:

H.R. 4731. A bill to authorize the deviation from service level requirement of military aircraft operating outside of designated Department of Defense airspace in the wilderness areas in mountainous regions if necessary to maintain safety of flight; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ (for herself, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD):

H.R. 4732. A bill to establish a Global Climate Change Resilience Strategy, to authorize the admission of climate-displaced persons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, and 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. HOYER:

H. Res. 635. A resolution expressing the profound sorrow of the House of Representatives on the death of the Honorable Elijah E. Cummings; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia (for himself, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. RUSH, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CLAY, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Ms. MOORE, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. BASS, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. COX of California, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mrs. MCBATH, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. COHEN, Mr. HASTINGS, and Mr. RASKIN):

H. Res. 636. A resolution expressing support for the designation of October 17, 2019, as ''National Vitiligo Awareness Day''; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CÁRDENAS (for himself and Mr. TRONE):

H. Res. 637. A resolution expressing support for the designation of October 2019 as ''National Youth Justice Action Month''; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. NORTON (for herself, Mr. TRONE, Mr. HOYER, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. CONNOLLY, and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER):

H. Res. 638. A resolution congratulating the Washington Mystics on winning the 2019 Women's National Basketball Association championship; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

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. GARAMENDI:

H.R. 4710.

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

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. LIPINSKI:

H.R. 4711.

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

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. DEAN:

H.R. 4712.

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

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. GREEN of Texas:

H.R. 4713.

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

Article I, Section 8

By Mrs. BUSTOS:

H.R. 4714.

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

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CICILLINE:

H.R. 4715.

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

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. COX of California:

H.R. 4716.

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

Article 1 Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. CRAWFORD:

H.R. 4717.

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

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the enumerated powers listed in Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Ms. GARCIA of Texas:

H.R. 4718.

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

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section

8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. GOLDEN:

H.R. 4719.

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

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. GREEN of Tennessee

H.R. 4720.

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

Article I, Section 8

By Ms. HILL of California:

H.R. 4721.

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

Article 1, Section 1

By Ms. HOULAHAN:

H.R. 4722.

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

Article I, Section 8, of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. HUFFMAN:

H.R. 4723.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1: The Congress shall have 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; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

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 Ms. JAYAPAL:

H.R. 4724.

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

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. LAMBORN:

H.R. 4725.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 7

By Mr. MARSHALL:

H.R. 4726.

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

Section 8, clause 3: To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes;

By Mr. MCEACHIN:

H.R. 4727.

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

Article 1, Section 8

By Ms. MOORE:

H.R. 4728.

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

Article I, section 8.

By Ms. SPEIER:

H.R. 4729.

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

section 1 of article III of the Constitution & clause 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Ms. SPEIER:

H.R. 4730.

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

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. TIPTON:

H.R. 4731.

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

section 8 of article I of the Constitution

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ:

H.R. 4732.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have Power to . . . provide for the . . . general Welfare of the United States; . . .

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 93: Mrs. HAYES.

H.R. 140: Mr. ARRINGTON.

H.R. 220: Miss RICE of New York.

H.R. 478: Ms. SLOTKIN.

H.R. 566: Mr. BYRNE, Mr. WELCH, Mr. GOLDEN, and Mr. STEUBE.

H.R. 649: Mrs. HARTZLER and Mr. CROW.

H.R. 683: Mr. DIAZ-BALART.

H.R. 727: Mr. SOTO.

H.R. 737: Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 827: Mr. PAPPAS.

H.R. 832: Ms. SPANBERGER.

H.R. 847: Mrs. BEATTY and Mr. NEGUSE.

H.R. 871: Ms. SLOTKIN.

H.R. 919: Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 925: Mr. STAUBER.

H.R. 935: Ms. HAALAND, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, and Mr. LAWSON of Florida.

H.R. 945: Mr. PAYNE, Mr. CROW, and Ms. HOULAHAN.

H.R. 1042: Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 1049: Mr. CARTER of Georgia.

H.R. 1074: Mrs. TORRES of California.

H.R. 1083: Miss RICE of New York.

H.R. 1111: Mr. KIM.

H.R. 1139: Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. FOSTER, and Mr. GOMEZ.

H.R. 1151: Ms. DEAN.

H.R. 1156: Mrs. MILLER.

H.R. 1221: Ms. WEXTON.

H.R. 1225: Mr. TED LIEU of California.

H.R. 1377: Ms. FINKENAUER.

H.R. 1380: Mr. SCHRADER and Ms. WEXTON.

H.R. 1400: Mrs. HAYES.

H.R. 1456: Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. RYAN, and Mr.

Evans.

H.R. 1549: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.

H.R. 1570: Mrs. MILLER.

H.R. 1601: Mr. CRIST.

H.R. 1611: Mr. RESCHENTHALER.

H.R. 1695: Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 1709: Mrs. TRAHAN, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. HORSFORD, Mr. PHILLIPS, Ms. FRANKEL, Ms. ADAMS, and Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma.

H.R. 1788: Mr. RASKIN.

H.R. 1846: Mr. SMITH of Washington.

H.R. 1865: Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. CRIST, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. HECK, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. NADLER, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. LEWIS, Ms. WEXTON, Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana, Ms. SCHRIER, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. CLINE, Mr. BANKS, Mr. BIGGS, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. BERGMAN, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. HOLDING, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. REED, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. WALTZ, Mr. PENCE, and Ms. SHALALA.

H.R. 1897: Mr. BERA.

H.R. 1903: Ms. FINKENAUER and Mr. VELA.

H.R. 1923: Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. RYAN, Mr. NADLER, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, and Mr. MEEKS.

H.R. 1982: Mr. VELA.

H.R. 2013: Ms. WILD and Mrs. LURIA.

H.R. 2038: Mrs. LESKO.

H.R. 2048: Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 2146: Mr. PALLONE, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Mr. CLAY, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 2168: Mr. EVANS and Mr. COOPER.

H.R. 2178: Mr. CORREA.

H.R. 2179: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.

H.R. 2184: Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Ms. FINKENAUER.

H.R. 2200: Mr. DELGADO, Mr. VAN DREW, and Mr. COX of California.

H.R. 2201: Mr. DELGADO, Mr. SCHNEIDER, and Mr. LAHOOD.

H.R. 2214: Mrs. LURIA, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, and Mr. NEAL.

H.R. 2215: Mr. DESAULNIER.

H.R. 2245: Ms. TITUS, Ms. ESHOO, and Mr. DESAULNIER.

H.R. 2256: Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER and Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 2350: Ms. SHERRILL, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, and Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma.

H.R. 2386: Mr. PENCE.

H.R. 2407: Mr. DESAULNIER.

H.R. 2420: Mr. NEGUSE, Ms. WEXTON, and Mrs. RADEWAGEN.

H.R. 2423: Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. BERGMAN, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Ms. SCANLON, Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. MALINOWSKI, Mr. ROSE of New York, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana, Mr. VISCLOSKY, and Ms. SHERRILL.

H.R. 2435: Mr. CURTIS, Mr. RICHMOND, Ms. DELBENE, and Ms. SCHRIER.

H.R. 2501: Ms. FINKENAUER.

H.R. 2577: Mr. LEVIN of Michigan.

H.R. 2651: Ms. FINKENAUER.

H.R. 2674: Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 2689: Ms. FINKENAUER.

H.R. 2694: Ms. SCHRIER.

H.R. 2719: Miss RICE of New York.

H.R. 2731: Ms. MENG and Mr. WRIGHT.

H.R. 2771: Mr. WITTMAN and Mr. HECK.

H.R. 2778: Ms. FUDGE and Mr. KEATING.

H.R. 2812: Ms. SLOTKIN.

H.R. 2895: Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico.

H.R. 2909: Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 3001: Mr. RUIZ.

H.R. 3043: Mr. COSTA.

H.R. 3068: Mr. KIM and Ms. BARRAGÁN.

H.R. 3073: Miss RICE of New York.

H.R. 3107: Mr. TURNER and Mr. RUTHERFORD.

H.R. 3114: Mr. BERA and Mrs. DAVIS of California.

H.R. 3116: Ms. SCHRIER.

H.R. 3165: Mr. SOTO and Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER.

H.R. 3189: Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma.

H.R. 3192: Ms. NORTON, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 3195: Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma and Mr. STIVERS.

H.R. 3219: Mr. CRIST and Miss RICE of New York.

H.R. 3220: Ms. SCHRIER and Mr. GARAMENDI.

H.R. 3222: Mr. DEFAZIO.

H.R. 3232: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 3238: Mr. GAETZ and Miss RICE of New York.

H.R. 3250: Mr. CONNOLLY.

H.R. 3252: Mr. LAWSON of Florida.

H.R. 3296: Ms. DELBENE.

H.R. 3391: Mr. SMITH of Washington.

H.R. 3414: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York and Mr. VAN DREW.

H.R. 3446: Mrs. LEE of Nevada.

H.R. 3463: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ and Ms. BARRAGÁN.

H.R. 3510: Ms. SLOTKIN.

H.R. 3562: Ms. SCHRIER.

H.R. 3654: Mr. SMITH of Missouri.

H.R. 3708: Mr. TIPTON.
H.R. 3884: Mr. HECK.
H.R. 3910: Ms. DELBENE.
H.R. 3956: Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 3957: Mr. MCNERNEY.
H.R. 3968: Mr. CARTER of Georgia and Mrs. WAGNER.
H.R. 4032: Mr. PHILLIPS.
H.R. 4044: Mr. BUCHANAN.
H.R. 4051: Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 4108: Mr. CASTEN of Illinois.
H.R. 4116: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.
H.R. 4148: Mr. DESAULNIER.
H.R. 4165: Mr. CASTEN of Illinois.
H.R. 4220: Mr. HARDER of California.
H.R. 4227: Mr. WITTMAN.
H.R. 4230: Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 4255: Mr. EVANS.
H.R. 4304: Mr. DESAULNIER.
H.R. 4305: Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. LESKO, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. RIGGLEMAN, Mr. WELCH, Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. STEUBE, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. WRIGHT, Mr. BANKS, and Mr. NEGUSE.
H.R. 4327: Mrs. DINGELL and Ms. HOULAHAN.
H.R. 4341: Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, and Ms. JACKSON LEE.
H.R. 4348: Ms. SLOTKIN, Mr. KILDEE, and Mr. LANGEVIN.
H.R. 4405: Ms. STEVENS.
H.R. 4428: Ms. HOULAHAN.
H.R. 4509: Mrs. MCBATH.
H.R. 4524: Mr. WELCH.
H.R. 4577: Mr. DESAULNIER.
H.R. 4587: Mr. SWALWELL of California.
H.R. 4615: Mrs. MCBATH.
H.R. 4618: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.
H.R. 4639: Mrs. HAYES.
H.R. 4650: Ms. CASTOR of Florida and Ms. BARRAGÁN.
H.R. 4659: Mr. TIPTON and Mr. SCHWEIKERT.
H.R. 4660: Mr. EVANS.
H.R. 4670: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
H.R. 4692: Mr. FULCHER, Mrs. RODGERS of Washington, and Mr. WRIGHT.
H.R. 4694: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana and Mr. BALDERSON.
H.R. 4697: Mr. MORELLE, Mr. KING of New York, and Mr. SUOZZI.
H.R. 4705: Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.
H. J. Res. 2: Mr. THOMPSON of California.
H. Con. Res. 20: Mr. VISCLOSKY.
H. Con. Res. 67: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. SMITH of Washington, and Ms. NORTON.
H. Res. 49: Mr. PALMER.
H. Res. 134: Miss RICE of New York and Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma.
H. Res. 230: Mr. GRAVES of Georgia.
H. Res. 242: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
H. Res. 323: Mr. BERA.
H. Res. 337: Mrs. MILLER.
H. Res. 418: Ms. DELBENE.
H. Res. 493: Mr. KEVIN HERN of Oklahoma.
H. Res. 536: Mr. GAETZ.
H. Res. 538: Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. BARRAGÁN, and Ms. MOORE.
H. Res. 546: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. SHERRILL, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. CISNEROS, and Ms. JACKSON LEE.
H. Res. 585: Mr. ENGEL, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. WELCH, Mr. NEAL, and Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.
H. Res. 628: Mr. HECK, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, and Mr. PERLMUTTER.
H. Res. 633: Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. SPANO, and Mr. MEUSER.

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 165 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, OCTOBER 17, 2019 No. 164

Senate

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable JOHN BOOZMAN, a Senator from the State of Arkansas.

PRAYER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Today's opening prayer will be offered by Dr. Robert Lewis, of Fellowship Bible Church, Little Rock, AR.

The guest Chaplain offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Heavenly Father, we give thanks for this new day and the hope that lies within it. We have been a blessed nation, not by accident but by this: In You, God, we trust. Thank You for the men and women of this distinguished body, who will again rise to face the immense challenge that will mark this day along with the special opportunities that it holds for good. I pray You will make this body ready for both.

In these turbulent times, empower their work with Your Spirit. Give them a difference making wisdom only You possess. Protect them from small ambitions. Call each heart here up to the higher ways of humility, understanding, and much needed unity. Help these leaders seek what is right and best for all in this Nation: the weak and the strong, the rich and the wanting, the great and the small; and let their work here today end tonight as a credit, not a deficit, to our Nation's life-giving legacy of liberty and justice for all.

Bless this Chamber, Father. Make us better through them, and lead us all forward in the ways of righteousness for Your greater glory.

We pray this in Jesus' Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Presiding Officer led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

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

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. GRASSLEY).

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, October 17, 2019.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable JOHN BOOZMAN, a Senator from the State of Arkansas, to perform the duties of the Chair.

CHUCK GRASSLEY,
President pro tempore.

Mr. BOOZMAN thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH). The Senator from Arkansas.

WELCOMING DR. ROBERT LEWIS

Mr. BOOZMAN. Madam President, I would like to take a moment, first of all, to thank Chaplain Black for all that he does here. The Senate is a much better place as a result of having him around.

I would also like to take a moment to thank Dr. Robert Lewis for delivering the opening prayer in the Senate today.

Robert and I had the opportunity to play football together at the University of Arkansas. He was a very good football player and had the gift of smack. He would hit you. He had a tremendous work ethic and character, and we all knew that he would do well in whatever he decided to do.

Robert is, today, a renowned pastor, a best-selling author, a passionate speaker, and a Christian visionary. He has developed a curriculum that has reached over 1 million men worldwide in churches, on college campuses, in corporate boardrooms, and in correctional facilities.

Robert's program, the Men's Fraternity, provides men with an encouraging process of teaching them how to live lives of authentic manhood, as modeled by Jesus Christ and directed by the Word of God. The program was designed to help men come together and strengthen each other through weekly sessions that combine biblical teaching and small group interaction.

For 21 years, Robert served as the directional leader of the Fellowship Bible Church of Little Rock. During that time, the church grew from a few hundred members to over 5,000, and it was widely recognized as being one of the most innovative and influential churches in America.

Robert helped to bring Downline, which is a citywide discipleship ministry, to Little Rock, where he continues to serve as a part-time instructor. He continues to be involved in his local church and beyond, and he ministers nationally and across the world.

Robert and Sherard, his wife, have been married for over 40 years. They have four children and three grandchildren.

Serving as the guest chaplain is an incredible honor. I am thankful for Robert's ministry, and I am so pleased that he could be here to offer an invocation of asking God to guide and bless the efforts of Congress and America's leaders.

I yield the floor.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

REMEMBERING ELIJAH CUMMINGS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, first, this morning, I join colleagues on

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

Printed on recycled paper.

both sides of the Capitol in expressing our grief and sadness at the passing of our House colleague, Chairman ELIJAH CUMMINGS.

In his over more than two decades in the House of Representatives, CUMMINGS became a living legend in his native Baltimore. By all accounts, he was a powerful and passionate voice on the national stage and was a strong advocate for his neighbors, his district, and his values. He counted close friends and admirers from all across the political spectrum.

The Capitol will lower its flags today to mark this significant loss and remember a life well lived. The Senate unites our prayers with those in the House for Maya, ELIJAH's wife; for his children; and for all of the colleagues, friends, and staff who will miss him greatly.

TURKEY AND SYRIA

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, on an entirely different matter, I was encouraged to see yesterday's display of bipartisan concern in the House of Representatives for sustaining America's global leadership and, specifically, over the damaging impact of hastily withdrawing that leadership from Syria.

Back in January, I led a forward-looking debate here in the Senate on these very issues. I sponsored an amendment to S. 1 that earned the support of a bipartisan supermajority—70 Senators. We went on the record as opposing a premature exit from Syria or Afghanistan and emphasized the need for sustained American leadership in the fight against terrorism.

I was disappointed when a number of leading Democrats, including my counterpart, the Democratic leader, and most of our colleagues who are running for President, voted against this bipartisan consensus, but, overall, a huge majority of the Senate spoke up strongly.

I know many of us are keen on engaging in these important issues further in light of recent events. As the Senate debates our Middle East policy and contemplates what action to take, I believe it is important that we make a strong, forward-looking, strategic statement.

For that reason, my preference would be for something even stronger than the resolution the House passed yesterday, which has some serious weaknesses. It is so narrowly drafted that it fails to address the plight of imperiled Sunni Arab and minority Christian communities in Syria. It is backward-looking, and it is curiously silent on the issue of whether to actually sustain a U.S. military presence in Syria, perhaps to spare the Democrats from having to go on the record on this key question.

So my first preference is for something stronger than the House resolution. I look forward to continuing to engage with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle as we chart the right course, and I expect many of us will have much more to say on the subject very soon.

S.J. RES. 53

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, on one final matter, this week, I have been discussing how Washington Democrats have sought for 3 years to effectively nullify the Trump Presidency. They have tried to cancel out the voters' decision in 2016 and dodge the consequences of Secretary Clinton's defeat whether it be through the 3-year-old impeachment parade that the House Democrats have been leading or through the unprecedented delays and obstruction that has been visited on the President's nominations here in the Senate.

Well, our Democratic colleagues will today mount yet another effort to fire up the time machine. They want to move forward with legislation that would undo a major regulatory reform success story of the Trump administration's and reopen the Obama administration's disastrous War on Coal. Specifically, they want to try and revive the so-called Clean Power Plan, which is a dangerous, misguided policy that the Trump administration has rightly done away with. We will be voting on this resolution later today.

The basic facts haven't changed since this job-killing scheme was first put forward back in 2014. This relic of the Obama administration would have further buried the producers of affordable American energy under a mountain of stifling redtape. It would have created overlapping local, State, and Federal standards, unrealistic compliance deadlines, and would have set up a Washington bureaucracy that would effectively root for American energy to fail. It is no wonder, by one analysis, that 125,000 jobs would have been on the chopping block had President Obama gotten his way.

The workers in my State know better than anyone the true costs of the last administration's misguided War on Coal. Kentucky workers know what happens when plants that create jobs and generate affordable electricity at the same time are simply shut down.

That is why I have been proud to lead the fight in ending the regulatory War on Coal. It is why I wrote every Governor in the country in 2015 and raised my concerns about the Obama administration's dangerous Clean Power Plan scheme, because, even today, nearly 3 years into an administration that is not at war with American energy, Kentucky miners continue to feel the effects of the previous administration's policies.

We also know that the full effects of the Clean Power Plan would have stretched far beyond coal country. The ripples of this harmful proposal would have been felt across the country by Americans in paying their power bills.

One independent report predicted that consumers in 40 States, including Kentucky, would have seen double-digit percentage increases in their electricity costs, and by the Obama officials' own admissions, the proposal would have hit low-income and minority communities the hardest. Let me say that again: Low-income and minority populations would have been hit the hardest by the double-digit electricity bill increases in four out of every five States. That is quite a rap sheet for a Federal policy.

In a nation in which carbon emissions have already been trending downward, this proposal would have sold off our economic edge to overseas competitors whose emissions are, actually, steadily climbing. It would have taken the legs out from under American job creators while some of the world's leading polluters would have continued to roar right past us. It would have literally shipped our economic competitiveness to places like China and India.

Here is how experts estimated the effect of all of this self-inflicted economic damage on the climate: a one one-hundredth-of-1-degree difference by 2050. Here is the impact estimated to have happened if it had gone forward—a one one-hundredth-of-1-degree difference by 2050. Think how deeply you would have to be in the grip of leftwing ideology for that trade-off to sound like a good deal for American families.

Today's effort to revive this bad policy is being pushed by the same Senate Democrats who, overwhelmingly, could not bring themselves to vote against something as absurd as the Green New Deal back in March. Unfortunately, we know there is a considerable appetite among Democrats to inflict huge economic harm on American workers and American families just so we can better comply with this new green religion.

But here is the good news for my constituents in Kentucky and for hard-working Americans across the Nation: Senate Republicans are on the case, and we will not let far-left fashions take precedence over the common good of our country.

The American people have elected an administration and a Senate majority that trusts workers and job creators, not Washington bureaucracies. We have spent years cleaning up the mess of overregulation that the Obama era has left behind, and we will continue to stop the Democrats from reenacting that damaging history.

So I would urge all of my colleagues to join with us today and oppose these efforts to nullify a Presidency and take us backward.

Let's vote to keep this ill-conceived, leftwing policy on the shelf, where it belongs.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—S.J. RES. 58 AND H.J. RES. 77

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I understand there are two bills at the desk due a second reading en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the titles of the bills for the second time en bloc.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S.J. Res. 58) expressing support for freedom of conscience.

A resolution (H.J. Res. 77) opposing the decision to end certain United States efforts to prevent Turkish military operations against Syrian Kurdish forces in Northeast Syria.

Mr. MCCONNELL. In order to place the bills on the calendar under the provision of rule XIV, I object to further proceedings en bloc.

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

Mr. MCCONNELL. 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. SCHUMER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

REMEMBERING ELIJAH CUMMINGS

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, we woke up this morning to learn with profound sadness that our friend and colleague Congressman ELIJAH CUMMINGS, the son of sharecroppers who became the chair of the House Oversight Committee, passed away last night at the age of 68.

It was the first thing I saw when I read the paper this morning, and it hit me like a punch in the stomach.

In his 23 years in Congress, ELIJAH amassed a legacy that will live on long after his sudden passing. He served the people of his Maryland district with selflessness, passion, and grace.

Since it only happened this morning, I can't do justice to the legacy of ELIJAH CUMMINGS, but I would like to share a few reflections, and I know that my dear friend Senator CARDIN was close like this—like brothers—with ELIJAH CUMMINGS, and they had worked together on so many things for Maryland and the country. I know he is here sharing our deep sadness.

Now, truly, ELIJAH CUMMINGS was not just a great Congressman. He was a great man. He had a presence—a commanding presence—when he entered the room, and he could be strong when he had to be, and he had to be strong quite often. But he also was always kind and decent and caring and honorable.

It is a rare combination, that inner strength and that decency and that kindness. ELIJAH had it. If we had lived in happier times, maybe the public would have seen this kind side more often, but ELIJAH was never one to shrink from the moment.

I talked to him frequently. We would talk about the goings-on in the House or the Senate or the political trivia of the day. Sometimes we would talk about Maryland politics. He was an expert.

ELIJAH was revered by his constituents and indeed by the entire State of Maryland. Liberal or conservative, Democrat or Republican, Black or White, you went to ELIJAH CUMMINGS for advice. His loss is an enormous one for his constituents, for his staff and, above all, his family. I pray for them this morning, as I pray for our country when people like ELIJAH CUMMINGS of the world are no longer with us.

TURKEY AND SYRIA

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, on Syria, yesterday, the U.S. military carried out airstrikes to destroy what only a few weeks ago had been the headquarters of the American campaign to destroy ISIS in Syria. Nothing encapsulates the failure of President Trump's decision to stand aside for Erdogan more than the fact that we are now bombing our own bases rather than allow them to fall into the hands of Assad, Erdogan, or Putin.

If Erdogan, Putin, and Assad are such great allies or no problem, as President Trump told us yesterday at the White House, then why do we have to bomb our own headquarters after American troops evacuated so it doesn't fall into Syrian or Turkish or even Russian hands? That one thing encapsulates the absurdity, the awfulness of President Trump's lack of policy and erratic, impulsive, and whimsical movements on the Syrian front.

Yesterday the President said this withdrawal was a ''strategic move.'' It certainly is not that because this is not the action of a military that carried out a deliberate withdrawal. It is the action of a military that was given a fly-by-the-seat-of-his-pants decision of the President contrary to the recommendations of the commanders on the ground.

Donald Trump has the nerve, the gall, to think he knows more about the military than these generals who have served our country for decades. It is appalling. How does America put up with this? How do our Republican colleagues put up with this? He doesn't consult the generals. What a blunder, and it seems to be the result of the President's inability to say no to dictators. He seems to like a Putin and an Erdogan and even a Kim more than our allies. This is also a clear demonstration of the President's fecklessness and recklessness, both, or as my colleague Senator LINDSEY GRAHAM, and one of the President's staunchest allies in Congress, said, ''I fear that this is a complete and utter national security disaster in the making.''

Yesterday afternoon, congressional leaders went to the White House, at its request, to meet with the President about the rapid disintegration of the situation in northern Syria. Speaker PELOSI and I talked about it ahead of time, and we talked about it with Senators REED and MENENDEZ as well. We had a serious purpose: to find out if the President actually had a plan to contain ISIS and fix the mess precipitated by his decision to green-light Erdogan's military incursion into Syria.

Alarmingly—alarmingly—President Trump had no plan. The greatest insult that occurred in that room was not any of the name-calling that Trump did. A far greater insult to America, to all of us, was the lack of any policy guidance, any policy decisions, any direction from the President and his top national security advisers on how to contain ISIS.

I reminded the President that as two New Yorkers, we probably knew better than most the damage a small band of terrorists can do, even from a half a world away. I asked: What is your plan to prevent ISIS from regrouping and resurging? He didn't have one. Secretary of Defense Mark Esper didn't have a plan.

After we pushed them and pushed them, I said: Who is going to take care of all these prisoners? The President said there were 70,000 ISIS prisoners and their families. Who is going to take care of them, make sure they don't escape, as some have already?

They finally said: Well, the Syrians and the Turks will do that. So I asked the group if they had any intelligence or assurances that the Turks and Syrians would do a decent job. Secretary Esper himself said there was no evidence of that.

This is amazing. Terrorists whom we have spent a decade fighting—we have spent billions of dollars and lost lives to fight them—are finally in prison. The Kurds are guarding them. The Kurds are leaving, understandably, because they have to fight the Turks now. What is the plan? There isn't any, except to rely on Syrians, Turks, who have not even close to the interest we have in curbing ISIS.

Assad is much more interested in gaining back his Syrian homeland. Erdogan is focused on hurting the Kurds, whom he is fanatically against. So they are not going to pay much attention to ISIS.

It was appalling, just appalling. President Trump has stepped aside for Putin, Assad, and Erdogan. Our allies, the Kurds, are being slaughtered as a result of our betrayal. Most importantly, as Secretary Mattis said, ''if we don't keep the pressure on [in Syria], ISIS will resurge. It's absolutely a given that they will come back.''

The President didn't like hearing Mattis's words, but all of America should. He is one of the most respected military minds, one of the most respected leaders on both sides of the aisle—liberals, Independents, conservatives. Here is what he said, again repeating:

[I]f we don't keep the pressure on [in Syria], ISIS will resurge. It's absolutely a given that they will come back.

So make no mistake, the President's incompetence, his impulsiveness, his erraticness has made Americans less safe—Americans here in our homeland. Congress, today, must make the fact clear to the President in a bipartisan fashion.

We have the opportunity, my colleagues. The House passed a resolution condemning the President's decision by an overwhelming vote of 354 to 60. That means the vast majority of House Republicans—129 to be exact—condemned the President's decision in Syria. Leader MCCARTHY, Whip SCALISE, and No. 3 CHENEY all voted for it. They are as loyal to President Trump as anybody, but they saw the danger, the real danger. Today the Senate should, and I hope will, follow suit. We can quibble about the language, but I have no doubt we can agree on the basic message, and there is no reason we can't vote on a Senate resolution today.

Time is of the essence. To say, well, I would like to add this word or add this sentence, as Kurds are being slaughtered, as ISIS terrorists are escaping—no, no, no. No, no, no. We should move to the House bill immediately because we all know there is only one person who can reverse this, and that is the President. The greatest ability to make him reverse is an overwhelming message from the Republican side—House and Senate—that this is wrong. He doesn't hear that publicly too often from our Republican friends. He has heard it from the House, correctly and courageously.

Please, my friends, my Republican friends in the Senate, let's put politics aside. Today let's vote the House bill passed yesterday by them. There is no time to waste. Time is of the essence because the President still doesn't get it. Our meeting at the White House demonstrated that to all who were present. Hopefully, an overwhelming bipartisan vote in the Senate will break through to him. I strongly, strongly—in the strongest of terms—urge my friend Leader MCCONNELL and our Republican colleagues to allow a vote on the Syrian resolution today. Security, justice, fairness demand no less.

S.J. RES. 53

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, now on climate, as Senator CARDIN well knows, later the Senate will vote on his resolution of disapproval to repeal the Trump administration's so-called affordable clean energy rule. This is one of the few opportunities where the minority can force a vote on the Senate floor, and there may be no more worthy an issue than protecting our environment.

Four years ago, the Obama administration put in place new standards and safeguards for CO_2 and fossil fuel emissions from powerplants—the first of their kind intended to meet the threat of climate change. Earlier in July, by employing shady science, the Trump administration so violently obliterated these safeguards protecting our globe, our world, and frankly a lot of the forests in my home State of New York. In its place, the Trump administration enacted a new rule that will allow big polluters to wreck our air, dirty our water, and poison our Earth with little or no accountability.

Thanks to this new rule, commonsense limits on carbon emissions have been blurred, and deadlines for implementing the reductions have now been tripled or even quadrupled, but time is running out for the United States to meet the existential threat posed by climate change. That is why this rule is such a grave mistake.

Thankfully, in this case, the minority can do something under the Congressional Review Act. We are allowed to overturn some of the rules this administration unilaterally put in place. Later this morning, we will vote on Senator CARDIN's resolution of disapproval, which, if passed, will repeal the Trump's administration's destructive rule and reinstitute the safeguards that were originally in place.

Our Republican colleagues have a choice. They can either stop the rollback of lifesaving environmental protections or they can side with energy companies that put their fortunes ahead of our future. The choice is theirs.

TRUMP ADMINISTRATION

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, one final note. Today marks 1,000 days of President Trump's time in office. If we were to summarize his administration over the last 2½ years in a single phrase, it would be this: broken promises to working people.

When Candidate Trump ran for office, he promised to drain the swamp, but after 1,000 days as President, this place is the swampiest it has ever been, with conflicts of interest crippling this administration and inexperienced billionaires running our government.

Candidate Trump promised health insurance for everybody, but after 1,000 days as President, costs are higher, coverage is skimpier, and his administration is suing to repeal the healthcare we have in place and send prices skyrocketing for millions.

President Trump promised a tax bill that would be a middle-class miracle, but the only miracle this has been has been to corporate America, which uses it for stock buybacks instead of increasing salaries for their workers, increasing their investments in plant and equipment. So much of these tax breaks went to buybacks. Shame.

One thousand days in, President Trump has failed to follow through on promise after promise to working Americans, but he isn't the only one at fault. Democrats have fought to do the work of the American people, but as the House passes things, Leader MCCONNELL and my Senate Republican colleagues have simply turned this Chamber into a legislative graveyard, where good ideas that would help the middle class and those trying to get to the middle class just come to die.

We could be reauthorizing the Violence Against Women Act; we could be voting on election security; we could be voting on background checks, but Leader MCCONNELL has buried hundreds of House bills in his legislative graveyard.

After 1,000 days since President Trump took office, he and his Republican colleagues have made clear whose side they are on. If you are ultrarich, you are very powerful, you have great connections, it has been a great few years, but for everyone else, it has been a string of disappointing, broken, and heartbreaking promises. Come next year, the American people will have a chance to vote for real change.

I yield the floor.

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.

MEASURE DISCHARGED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, S.J. Res. 53 is discharged from committee.

There being no objection, the committee was discharged.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL UNDER CHAPTER 8 OF TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE, OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY RELATING TO ''REPEAL OF THE CLEAN POWER PLAN; EMISSION GUIDELINES FOR GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS FROM EXISTING ELECTRIC UTILITY GENERATING UNITS; REVISIONS TO EMISSION GUIDELINES IMPLEMENTING REGULATIONS''

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, I move to proceed to S.J. Res. 53.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the joint resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 53) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Environmental Protection Agency relating to ''Repeal of the Clean

Power Plan; Emission Guidelines for Greenhouse Gas Emissions From Existing Electric Utility Generating Units; Revisions to Emission Guidelines Implementing Regulations''.

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, I know of no further debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate?

If not, the question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The clerk will report the joint resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 53) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Environmental Protection Agency relating to ''Repeal of the Clean Power Plan; Emission Guidelines for Greenhouse Gas Emissions From Existing Electric Utility Generating Units; Revisions to Emission Guidelines Implementing Regulations''.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time until noon is equally divided.

The Senator from Maryland.

REMEMBERING ELIJAH CUMMINGS

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, as the senior Senator from Maryland, I want to comment on the remarks by Leader SCHUMER about the great loss we had that we learned about early this morning—the death of Congressman ELIJAH CUMMINGS. I found out about this as I awoke this morning. It is a sad day for Baltimore, for Maryland, and for our country.

Two days ago, I had a chance to talk with Maya Rockeymoore Cummings, Congressman CUMMINGS' wife, to inquire as to how the Congressman was doing. She explained to me that he was still in the hospital but he was using every ounce of energy he had to carry out his responsibilities as chairman of the Oversight Committee and as a Member of the House of Representatives. We all know that he used his energy every day on behalf of the people he represented.

Our Nation has lost one of the great champions for social justice. What a powerful voice he was for those whose voices would otherwise not have been heard. It is a great loss. It is a great loss for the people of Baltimore—his record of accomplishment on behalf of our city and our region is well known—and it is a personal loss for me.

I first got to know ELIJAH CUMMINGS when he was elected to the Maryland General Assembly. I was speaker of the house. I recognized that here was a person coming in with incredible talent. I gave him an opportunity to use that talent, and he used it so effectively on behalf of the people of his district as a member of the Maryland General Assembly.

Congressman CUMMINGS and I have a lot in common. We both attended the same public high school in Baltimore City, Baltimore City College High School—different years. He graduated from the University of Maryland Law School, and I also graduated from the University of Maryland Law School. We served together in the Maryland General Assembly, and we served together in the House of Representatives.

God gave him the talent to communicate like no one I have heard. There was incredible passion in his voice. I had the opportunity to see firsthand what he was able to accomplish on behalf of the people. What a legacy. He used every moment. He achieved the high position of chairman of the Oversight Committee but never lost his sense of purpose for the people he represented. He went home to Baltimore every night. You could see him in the community every day at schools and at church. He never lost the passion for the people he represented.

What a legacy he has left for all of us. We can't fill the void that has been created by Congressman CUMMINGS' passing, but all of us need to step up and help carry out that legacy of public service. It is a terrible loss for the people of our community and a terrible loss for our Nation.

Our prayers go out to Maya Rockeymoore Cummings and his family in this incredibly difficult time. We will commit ourselves to carrying on the legacy of a great American, our friend ELIJAH CUMMINGS.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip.

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, before I begin, I, too, want to join with my colleagues who have preceded me and just say how sad I was to hear of the death of ELIJAH CUMMINGS. We joined the House together. He got there a little before I did in a special election in 1996. I came in January of 1997. I always admired his fire and his dedication. He was a fierce advocate for his constituents and for the causes he believed in. The House will be a lesser place for his absence.

Our prayers are with his family and all those who had the opportunity to know him, his constituents, those he represented in Baltimore and the State of Maryland who are going to mourn his loss today and miss his presence for many, many days in the future.

UNITED STATES-MEXICO-CANADA TRADE AGREEMENT

Madam President, farmers and ranchers have gotten some good news on the trade front in recent weeks with the signing of a trade deal with Japan.

U.S. farmers depend on access to the Japanese market. It is the fourth largest market for U.S. agricultural producers. This agreement will remove barriers to the sale of a variety of products, from cheese to sweet corn, beef, pork, and wheat.

While this is very good news for farmers and ranchers, we have a lot more work to do on the trade front to help our ag community and to increase demand for American agricultural products around the world, and we should start by passing the United States-Mexico-Canada Free Trade Agreement. Canada and Mexico are the No. 1 and No. 2 markets for American agricultural products, and preserving and expanding access to these markets is key to improving the economic outlook for America's farmers. Over a year ago, the administration finished negotiating a strong deal with these countries that will help boost our struggling agricultural economy.

To start with, the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement will provide farmers with certainty about what these important markets are going to look like going forward. One of the biggest challenges facing farmers on the trade front right now is the uncertainty about what markets around the world are going to look like. The United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement will give farmers and ranchers clarity on what trade is going to look like with these two key trading partners.

In addition to providing certainty and preserving American access for American farmers and ranchers, the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement makes a number of improvements to the status quo. Of particular interest to South Dakota are the agreement's dairy provisions. If you drive the I–29 corridor north of Brookings, SD, you can see firsthand the major dairy expansion South Dakota has experienced over the past several years. The U.S.-Mexico-Canada Agreement will preserve U.S. dairy farmers' role as a key dairy supplier to Mexico, and it will substantially expand market access in Canada. The U.S. International Trade Commission estimates that the agreement will boost U.S. dairy exports by more than $277 million.

The agreement will also expand market access for U.S. poultry and egg producers. It will make it easier for producers to export wheat to Canada and much more.

I have just focused on the benefits for farmers. In fact, the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement will benefit almost every sector of our economy, from the automobile industry to digital trade and e-commerce. It will create 176,000 jobs, and it will raise wages for workers.

Given the major benefits not only for farmers but for the economy as a whole, why hasn't Congress passed this agreement yet? That is a good question, and the answer really is quite simple. By law, the House of Representatives has to take up the agreement first, but the House has unfortunately been more focused on political theater of late than on collaborating on measures that would actually help American families, and unfortunately it doesn't look like that is going to change.

I heard the Democratic leader down here earlier sort of attacking the current administration for not doing enough on this or that. Well, the fact is, if you look at the economic statistics over the past couple of years, they

are pretty remarkable. Unemployment is at a historically low rate—3½ percent. Those are numbers we haven't seen in a very long time—about 50 years, as a matter of fact. The number of jobs that have been created since the President took office is about 6.4 million jobs. In fact—a very important data point—the number of people looking for work juxtaposed against the number of job openings in our economy—for the 17th month in a row, we have more jobs available—about 7.3 million jobs available—than those people looking for work—about 5.9 million people. That is a historically sort of unprecedented, if you will, statistic.

So if you look at the overall economy, things are in the right place. They are moving in the right direction. Wages are up—the highest level in a decade. The American people's pocketbooks, the things they care about, the things they talk about over the kitchen table in terms of their wages, their jobs, their prospects, their certainty about the future—those things have all improved over the past couple of years because of the policies this administration has put in place, coupled with the work this Congress has done to try to create conditions that are favorable to economic growth.

What does that mean? Well, his tax policy. We have cut tax rates for individuals and families. We have cut tax rates for small businesses that are trying to expand. We allowed them to accelerate their cost recovery. Those are both key incentives when it comes to investment and expansion. And we have seen the results of that.

We have seen regulatory changes made by the administration—in some cases cooperating and coupled with the steps we have taken here in the Congress—that have lessened the burden for businesses that are trying to invest and grow and expand and create more jobs.

If you look at the energy changes, energy policy, we have become energy independent—something that a decade ago or two decades ago, nobody ever anticipated was possible. As a nation, we are now actually an exporter of energy—a remarkable change over a short period of time. I would argue that is largely due to changes in policy that have enabled and encouraged that kind of investment in energy, regulatory changes that have lessened the regulatory burden and made it less expensive and less difficult to create jobs in this country rather than more expensive and more difficult, which is what we particularly saw in the past administration, and lowered the tax burden in a way that provides incentives for people to invest, to grow their company, to pay better wages, and to add jobs.

Those are the types of policy changes that have been made that have resulted in the economic data and statistics we are looking at today. They are not just data and statistics; they are actually being felt by people across this country. So it begs the question as to why, then, another step that we could take on that road to economic progress hasn't been taken yet. Why, 320 days after the President signed the U.S.-Canada-Mexico Free Trade Agreement, has that not been taken up and passed by the House of Representatives? I would argue that if they would take that up and send it to the Senate, we would vote on it here. We would pass it. We would send it to the President. He would sign it into law, and farmers and ranchers in places like South Dakota and other agricultural States across this country would get the benefit from that. And it is not just farmers and ranchers. As I mentioned earlier, it is pretty much every sector of our economy. It is manufacturing. It is digital.

There are benefits in this trade deal that translate into a stronger, more robust economy that will keep this expansion going forward and will continue to create these good-paying jobs and higher wages and create that better standard of living and quality of life for people in this country. The reason it hasn't moved is because it is up to the House of Representatives. They have all the control on this. The Speaker of the House can move this whenever she wants to. What they are trying to do now is renegotiate the deal all over again.

Unfortunately, they are very much obsessed at the moment with other types of activities in the House. If you look at what is happening over there right now, it doesn't look like that is going to change anytime soon. With even the Speaker of the House joining the far left's now impeachment crusade, I don't think it is likely that Democrats are going to wake up one morning and decide they should spend less time on partisan politics and more time working with Republicans to pass real solutions for the American people. But I do hope they will not destroy this trade agreement. There are thousands of farmers in my State of South Dakota and around the country who are waiting for the relief that the United States-Mexico-Canada Free Trade Agreement would bring.

Irrespective of what the distractions are in the House of Representatives at the moment and much of the partisan rush toward impeachment that is underway there, I hope they will figure out a way to multitask and will do what they should have done a long time ago, and that is to pick up this free-trade deal, pass it through the House of Representatives, send it to the U.S. Senate, where we can pass it, and send it to the President, where it can be signed into law, and the American people can continue to see the benefits of policies that are good for this economy, that will create more growth in our country, faster growth in our economy, better paying jobs, and a better quality of life for people not just in South Dakota but all across America.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

DEFENSE SPENDING BILL

Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, I come to the floor today to discuss the current partisan blockade. It is a blockade of critical military funding for our troops at home and abroad.

Last month, Senate Democrats blocked a key vote on the defense spending bill. We need to pass this bill to fully fund the Defense Department. By blocking the bill, Democrats are denying America's troops the pay raises that they have earned and that they deserve.

To add insult to injury, both parties in both Houses agreed a couple of months ago to give the troops this raise. We did it more than 2 months ago. In fact, it was part of the bipartisan budget deal that was signed in August.

By moving the Defense spending bill, Republicans are keeping their promises to our all-volunteer American force. Still, Democrats have broken their promise to the troops.

Why on Earth would the Democrats want to play political games with the paychecks of our troops? Under the harshest conditions, these brave men and women defend our cherished freedoms 365 days a year. America's servicemembers—our servicemembers—help keep us safe. They keep us strong, and they keep us, as a Nation, prosperous. Without question, they deserve our full support, and that support should be bipartisan. Why it isn't right now is beyond me.

Recently, I had the privilege of visiting Wyoming troops, our Wyoming National Guard. We have a very large deployment, our largest in 10 years. They are serving in Kuwait, in the United Arab Emirates, and in Kosovo. We have troop members serving, as well, in Afghanistan.

We have about 1,500 members in the Wyoming National Guard, and, right now, about 400 of them are serving overseas. They are from towns like Casper, Cheyenne, Guernsey, Laramie, Sheridan, Lovell, Moorcroft, Wheatland, and brothers from Sheridan and Casper. I met with all of them. Some 370 Wyoming Guard members are currently serving in Afghanistan, the Middle East, and in Europe. It is our largest deployment in a decade.

I was honored to spend time with these dedicated servicemembers from my home State. First, I visited the 115th Field Artillery Brigade Forward in the United Arab Emirates. It is in the desert across from the Strait of Hormuz. From there, I traveled to Kuwait to meet with our 2nd Battalion, 300th Field Artillery. My father-in-law, Bob Brown, was a member of this group during Korea. He had also served in World War II, as I know, Mr. President, your father was part of the D-day invasion. I finished visiting with the troops in Kosovo, the C Company, 1st Battalion, 297th Infantry Regiment in

Kosovo, up near the Serbian border. In service to our country, these soldiers now find themselves far from home, and we owe it to them to give them the raise that they have earned and that they deserve.

You know, before I left, I gave every one of our soldiers a challenge coin. It is a challenge coin for me, as a Senator, and it is something I learned about through the military. It is something you give to somebody for camaraderie and a job well done. The coin shows the Wyoming iconic cowboy sitting on a bucking bronco. I gave it to each one of them saying: You are from Wyoming, you are a cowboy, and cowboys never quit and never complain, and neither will the U.S. military.

So when it comes to a raise, they are not quitting, and they are not complaining. It seems to me that it is the Democrats who have quit. The Democrats have quit. They have gone back on their word to approve the pay raise that they approved a couple of months ago and now are blocking us moving forward with this piece of legislation.

You know, the troops I met invited the cowboy spirit. They love to see it. They don't need to see it for long because they have a lot to do. They are working 7 days a week, 24 hours a day, and 365 days a year. They wanted to talk about what is happening at home. They wanted to talk about Wyoming football. They wanted to talk about the hunting season. They wanted to talk about the weather at home, where we have already had snow. The day I was in one of the locations, it was 108 degrees, and the heat index was higher than that, and they are, of course, in full uniform. They are there doing the job of keeping us safe and keeping us free, and they deserve the pay raise that they have earned.

They are on the frontlines. They are defending our freedoms. They are doing it every day.

I had a meal with them, as you see here right now, visiting with these men and women. It is a time for camaraderie. We talked about the challenges they are facing overseas.

I toured each of their bases. They know that the world is a very dangerous place in which they are living and serving, and they know what is happening in the threats to Iran, which to this group was only a little over 100 miles away, across the Strait of Hormuz.

Look, clearly, the best way to protect Americans at home is to keep up the pressure on our enemies abroad. Our presence there is restraining evil in the region. That is why our troops need our full support, and they need it right now. They shouldn't be placed at a point where they have to tolerate and wait for the Democrats to come back to the table and come to an agreement that they had reached and made promises on earlier this year.

With growing threats from abroad, the Defense funding bill delivers critical resources that our military needs to keep us safe. One thing is crystal clear from my visit: The best way to honor our troops is to honor our commitments to them.

So let's give these men and women in uniform the raise that they have earned, that they deserve, that they are entitled to, and let's give our troops the state-of-the-art tools they need to protect the American people in a dangerous world. It is time for Democrats to lift their hold on this blockade that they have had on our Defense funding bill. We must work together, in a bipartisan way, to complete the regular Defense appropriations process and fully fund our military, as our Nation demands and our troops certainly deserve.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCOTT of Florida). The Senator from New Mexico.

BORDER SECURITY

Mr. UDALL. Mr. President, last month, both the Senate and the House of Representatives resolved, on a bipartisan basis, to terminate the President's declaration of a national emergency along our southern border. I was proud to lead the charge before this body to terminate that declaration—a declaration the President is using to raid congressionally appropriated military construction funds to build this border wall. Plain and simple, the President's emergency declaration is an end-run around Congress's spending powers and the Constitution.

Last week, a Federal district judge agreed and concluded that the President's declaration is ''unlawful.'' Article I, section 9, of the Constitution could not be clearer. It reads: ''No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law. . . .''

The Founders gave Congress the power to appropriate—the power of the purse. This is one of the most consequential powers. Congress has this power to make sure that decisions about how public dollars are spent have widespread support and are not the product of an extreme minority, let alone one man.

Our power to appropriate is part of the system of checks and balances built into our Constitution. The Founders made sure that the three branches of government exercised their own separate and limited powers, and they made sure that no one branch and no one person could exercise too much power, especially over the use of taxpayer money.

The President's emergency declaration is an unconstitutional power grab. Congress has not fully funded his requests for border wall funding. We set different budget priorities. Our priorities include the $3.6 billion worth of 127 military construction projects across 23 States, 3 Territories, and 20 countries, and the President canceled them.

But this President will not accept Congress's judgment or our constitutional authority. His emergency declaration is an exercise of power that is just not his under the Constitution.

Our system of checks and balances only works if each branch has the will to check the other branch if there is encroachment. We have seen some good bipartisan pushback, but this is the point where we need more of that. It is up to Congress, the legislative branch, to guard our constitutional authority and to exercise the will to do so.

The President has now vetoed Congress's resolution, and it is up to this body to assert our constitutional authority and override that veto. Not only is a fundamental constitutional principle at stake, but the President's emergency declaration has real life impacts—impacts to our national security and impacts to the 23 States whose projects are now gone.

My home State of New Mexico is one of those 23 States. We are home to two military bases that will be hit by the President's raid on military construction projects to fund his wall.

Scuttled is an $85 million project at Holloman Air Force Base that would improve drone pilot training facilities that are aging, have sinkholes, and bat infestation. Training our military to pilot drones is mission critical in this day and age. The Air Force is battling a shortage of these pilots.

At White Sands Missile Range, a $40 million project designed to replace an aging and fire-damaged information systems facility has been cut. This project was to prepare the range to take on the next generation of missiles and weapons testing, including future hypersonic testing.

Twenty-two other States are losing military construction projects, from Alabama to Arizona, North Carolina to Texas, and Maine to Florida. In Utah, the Air Force has sought a new control center at Hill Air Force Base to replace ''structurally deficient'' and dilapidated World War II-era warehouses for mission control. In Louisiana, the Air National Guard sought to replace an aircraft parking ramp in a New Orleans facility that exposes the public to an ''unacceptable risk'' of being impacted by an explosive accident.

In Indiana, Army servicemembers have worked in violation of safety standards for handling explosives and need additional space for munitions. In Kentucky, the military seeks to repair ''substandard, deficient, inadequate, and undersized facilities'' at a middle school at Fort Campbell that ''impair the overall education program'' for the children of servicemembers.

Not only is New Mexico one of the States hit by the President's canceling important military construction projects, but we are one of four States that borders Mexico. We are ground zero for the President's border wall and the havoc it will wreak on our communities, our way of life, the local economies, landowners, and the environment. New Mexico and Mexico share a 180-mile border. This border passes

through three counties—Dona Ana, Luna, and Hidalgo—that are home to 11 percent of our State's population. A majority of the population in those counties is Hispanic. We have vibrant communities along the border and near the border, including our second largest city, Las Cruces, 45 minutes from Mexico.

We have two ports of entry—in Columbus and Santa Teresa—that are bustling with commerce, international trade, and hundreds who cross the border daily to visit family and friends, to go to school, and to shop.

I know our border communities. I can tell you for a fact, there is no justification for the diversion of military construction funding away from our troops and to this wall.

Now, I support smart border security and have voted many times to fund smart investment. New Mexico knows what real border security is: well-funded, well-trained, adequate resources; mobile assets; surveillance technology combined with well-staffed ports of entry that welcome commerce, visitors, and also asylum-seekers seeking refuge from horrific persecution.

The President's wall, at upward of $25 million per mile, is not a smart investment. It is antiquated and is not designed for today's challenges. This wasteful approach contrasts to the sound investment we made in the Columbus port of entry. Commerce, personal vehicle traffic, and foot traffic have increased exponentially over the years. Customs and Border Protection needed more secure facilities. We pushed to expand and update this New Mexico port. For $90 million, we greatly enhanced border security and added to economic growth. Now, that is a wise investment of taxpayer dollars.

In New Mexico, we are concerned about the land grab underway by this administration. They are pushing to expropriate private lands for the President's wall, and there are lots of landowners who don't want their lands cut in half or made unusable.

We can't get answers from the administration about what they are doing, and so Senator HEINRICH and I, along with Senator SCHUMER and Senator DURBIN, requested the Government Accountability Office to investigate the number of citizens who could have their land seized, the cost of property acquisitions, and the time it will take. I am pleased the GAO has opened an inquiry. Not only is there concern that the Trump administration will skirt eminent domain laws, but there is a real threat that environmental laws will be tossed out the window in the administration's rush to fulfill the President's campaign promise to build 500 miles of wall.

The wall would run through hundreds of miles of untouched, pristine lands that are home to wildlife like antelope, deer, and javelina. A wall will tear up these lands and their vegetation, cause erosion and flooding, and cut off migratory paths for wildlife.

The Department of the Interior is set to transfer 500 acres of lands in New Mexico, Arizona, and California to the Army for the President's wall, and 213 of those acres are in my State. The Department of the Interior is supposed to protect our natural resources, not endanger them with a border wall that will compromise their ecological value, destroy habitat connectivity, and harm wildlife.

The President's wall and his divisive rhetoric toward immigrants is deeply offensive to New Mexicans. We have strong family, cultural, and economic ties to Mexico. We are a proud multicultural State. Our diversity does not divide us; it defines us. It is our strength.

This body holds the power of the purse, not the President. Now is the time to affirm this constitutional power and affirm the appropriations decisions we have made for our own States and the Nation.

We should override the President's veto and make sure that legitimate national security interests are protected by seeing that the 127 military construction projects go forward on schedule.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, the next vote, the vote we will take in less than an hour, is a vote that would exercise the Congressional Review Act, of which I am a supporter. The idea that we should use the Congressional Review Act is a good thing for us to look at what any administration does and determine if that is the right way to go.

Today, I certainly intend to vote to maintain the position that the administration has had on the affordable clean energy rule. This is a rule that will have a very positive impact on our State, just like the rule that it replaces would have a very negative impact. We are in the top five coal-using States for energy in our State.

With the Obama administration's rule, the massive energy regulations would have imposed billions of dollars in compliance costs that would have been passed along every single time that someone harvests a crop, flips on a light switch, shops for groceries, or walks into the door at work. Under the Obama-era rules, families in Missouri would have faced double-digit utility price increases; in fact, the average Missourian's average utility rate would have doubled in approximately a decade. A vote for this Congress review act would put that rule into effect, as opposed to the rule that replaces it.

These rules always have good titles. The current rule that the Trump administration has put into place, the Affordable Clean Energy Rule, would replace the clean power rule. That is significant. They both propose to do the same thing. One rule states they will have clean power; the other rule states it will have clean energy. The difference in the title is actually the difference in effect, which is one proposes affordable clean energy. It doesn't seem like a very tough decision: You either want affordable clean energy or clean energy that, in my view, is clearly not affordable.

What the new rule would do would be to look at individual sources of energy and decide from a selection of things that can be done, what can be done at those individual sources.

I was on this floor many times talking about this rule prior to the 2016 elections. It had been held in abeyance by courts that said, no, it went too far. The administration didn't have the ability to do what they were trying to do. When I was on the floor all those times talking about what this rule would do to our State and our economy and similar things all over the country, what I said was, the next time you write your utility check, just write it out of your checkbook again because, within a decade, you would be paying twice as much in Missouri for utilities as you are paying right now. The cost would have gone up, and it would have happened quickly.

Thankfully, President Trump and the administration—with the support, frankly, I believe, today, of Senate Republicans—will have charted a new course resulting in huge strides toward American energy independence. We are doing that on other fronts. In fact, September and August were the first 2 months in 37 years that we have been a net exporter of energy, not an importer of energy. Energy self-sufficiency is important, particularly when there is an all-of-the-above strategy with oil, natural gas, nuclear, wind, and solar as a part of the portfolio of energy that needs to grow, but doesn't need to grow in a way that cripples American families when they try to pay their bills or when they try to get a job. To become a net exporter of energy, we have done all those things while we were still cutting emissions. Carbon dioxide emissions in the power industry are down 28 percent since 2005, without the Clean Power Plan ever having gone into effect.

The EPA's Affordable Clean Energy Rule strikes exactly the right balance—in my view and, I believe, today in the view of a majority of my colleagues—between reducing emissions and ensuring that Americans can still continue to have access to reliable, affordable energy.

For many families, the cost of energy is one of the biggest items to think about when they think about their budget. In fact, for many families, there is not much to think about. You pay whatever you are paying for your housing, then you pay your utility bill, and you see what is left over. The luxury of having a technical budget with how you are going to do all the things your family would like to do doesn't happen all too often now. It would happen much less often if the utility bills are twice what they are today.

The action we take here today, supporting the affordable energy rule and

walking away from the clean power rule, will make a difference for those families. It makes a difference in the utility bill at home, and it makes a difference in the utility bill at work. Lots of jobs simply just don't work at twice the cost of today's utility bills. It is a foolish rule and has been properly replaced with a rule that makes sense. I urge my colleagues to maintain the rule we are headed to, rather than the one we are running away from.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

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

TRUMP ADMINISTRATION

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I come to the floor today because our Nation is at a crossroads that strikes at the heart of our democracy. The increasingly outrageous actions of this President and his administration have brought us to this moment where we, as a nation, must make a decision about who we are, what we stand for, and what kind of behavior we will allow at the highest levels of our government.

As we continue down this road paved by the President's reckless actions and his complete disregard for our Nation's laws and democratic norms, I want to take a moment to step back and talk about how we got here and how much is truly at stake for our country and our democracy if we don't get this right.

Let's start by considering what we know for sure. The President has repeatedly sought foreign interference in our elections, which we should all find appalling. We know that President Trump and his associates pressed the Ukrainian Government to meddle in our democratic process, pushing them to launch an investigation without basis into the President's political opponents in an effort to help his election.

We know that he has made overtures to China—out in the open—to do the same. This is important. We don't have to take anyone else's word for it. We saw President Trump's call record with the Ukrainian President, and we all heard the President and his associates admit to the surreptitious actions from their own lips on camera.

These facts are indisputable and can't be spun. President Trump and his circle of friends have been clear about their actions and their intentions, and it is clear they are unacceptable, but even more seriously, there are still many questions about the extent of President Trump and his associates' actions and their potential impact on our democracy, questions for which the American people undoubtedly deserve answers.

That is why the House is right to begin impeachment proceedings to determine if President Trump has committed high crimes and misdemeanors, and why months ago I, too, called on the House to open an inquiry to investigate the President's deeply distressing actions because, for me and for so many other people across the country, this is not about partisan politics or any politics. This is about maintaining our Nation's security and defending the rule of law. It is about nothing less than the future of our democracy. Let me be clear: Because of President Trump, all of this is on the line. That is how serious this is.

I have news for my Republican colleagues: As much as you would like to stay silent on this, it is not an option. Our forefathers warned us against the power of foreign interference to undermine the foundations of our democracy, and their cautions echo as clearly and as strongly today as they did more than 200 years ago.

As Members of Congress, as representatives of the American people, we took an oath to defend our Nation's security and our democracy. That is why the Constitution gives authority to Congress and the immense responsibility to provide oversight of the President's actions. Based just on what we know, it would be a dereliction of duty for Congress not to investigate the grave threats to our country's safety and to our democratic institutions.

If President Trump and his administration have nothing to hide, they should stop obstructing. Let Congress do its job and find the facts. Furthermore, if Congress fails to investigate these issues, it would set its own dangerous new precedent, essentially green-lighting this President's unethical behavior and his attacks against our democratic institutions for future generations of our Nation's leaders. That is a frightening notion.

We are now at the crossroads, and we have to make a decision. Over the coming weeks, the actions of the House and possibly each individual in this body will in large part determine which path we take. Will we allow foreign actors to interfere in our elections and undermine our security or not? Will we stand by it and allow this President and perhaps future Presidents to ignore our Constitution and mangle our democratic norms or not? Will we be a nation of laws or not?

I believe that this country is a country of laws, that our elections must be completely free from foreign interference, and that every elected official should ensure that these fundamental principles come before party or partisanship as this process moves forward.

There are other priorities Congress needs to focus on, important work we have to continue doing to secure our elections, which is all the more paramount given this President's actions. We will, of course, continue, as well, our efforts to lower healthcare costs and address the climate crisis and the epidemic of gun violence and more, but we cannot ignore what President Trump and his associates have done and said and the impact their actions can have on our elections, our democracy, and the future of this country.

I sat in this Chamber as a juror in an impeachment trial before. It was a deeply serious undertaking, and one each Member took seriously before rendering a decision. That is the same seriousness that is required in this moment at this crossroad. If and when the House elects to accuse the President of an impeachable offense or offenses, the Senate right here will host the trial, and as Senators, we will all serve as jurors. If and when that time comes, I know I will approach it seriously, and I deeply hope each of my colleagues will, as well. Each of us will have to put aside every other consideration beyond the facts and focus solely on preserving the integrity of our democracy and upholding our solemn obligation to defend the Constitution. History will record where we all stand.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, there is very little question today that our democracy is under attack. The threat is not only from outside our country but from within with the threat to our rule of law, our basic values, and our democratic institutions.

From outside the country, that threat is reaffirmed by the Senate Intelligence Committee, which recently released a bipartisan report offering a sobering warning of fresh signs of interference by Russia and other foreign actors in the upcoming election.

The fact is that the lights are flashing red. The warning has come to us from multiple sources. Our intelligence community has warned us. The FBI has warned us. Our national security professionals have warned us. Still, the majority leader has refused to permit us a vote on commonsense measures that will better guarantee election security.

We need to move forward on these measures that safeguard our democracy from outside interference—cyber attack and social disinformation. And, of course, I have sponsored some of these bills. Many of them are bipartisan. We can move forward with that effort even as we confront the challenge and the obligation, which we must do in the ongoing impeachment proceedings.

What saddens and angers me is that in the midst of this crisis and the threat from outside our Nation from Russia and other countries, our Commander in Chief has essentially refused to believe that threat exists. He has in fact and in effect denied that there is any threat. That is what happened when the President used the power and authority of the Oval Office to pressure a foreign leader, President Zelensky of Ukraine, to investigate a political opponent, Joe Biden. This action is not only a breach of his oath of office and his constitutional duty, it is unpatriotic, immoral, criminal, and it is a

threat to our national security because, again, it invites interference. In fact, it pressures interference in our democracy. It validates and strengthens Vladimir Putin, not this Nation.

That is why the impeachment inquiry is being conducted by the House and why it is so important. Impeachment is not a remedy we take lightly or happily; it is a serious, last-resort remedy for the worst abuses of power and an unchecked, rogue President who cannot be held accountable in any other way. But the President has given us no choice. He may not be upholding his oath of office, but we must uphold ours.

The most powerful proof here comes from the words of the President himself in that July 25 conversation. There is no Member of this body who is unfamiliar with those words inviting, soliciting, in fact extorting the President of a foreign nation to interfere in our democracy. He involved officials at the highest level who joined in trying to cover it up, who now have a whistleblower complaint, as well as those call notes between President Trump and President Zelensky that repeat the President's own words. The transcript of that call is truly chilling and frightening almost beyond words.

When Mr. Zelensky mentioned that Ukraine was ''ready to buy more Javelins from the United States for defense purposes,'' President Trump responded with, ''I would like you to do us a favor though.'' That is a quote: ''I would like you to do us a favor though.'' And the favor was, of course, interference in our election.

That kind of invitation emboldens not only the President of Ukraine but every other autocrat and tyrant who might seek similarly to interfere. Let us remember that what the Founders feared most was exactly that kind of interference, whether it was from the imperial powers that we had just fought and successfully won our freedom or dictators like Vladimir Putin or other nations that will be emboldened to interfere.

My Republican colleagues' silence will not age well. Not only are they unwilling to stand up to this President's abuses and threats to our democracy, the majority leader has refused to put those bills on the floor. He has outright refused to give us a vote on security legislation.

My bill, the duty to report bill, would require campaigns, candidates, and family members to immediately report to the FBI and Federal Election Commission any offers of illegal foreign assistance. It codifies into law what is already a moral duty and a patriotic duty. It is basic common sense. The law already forbids soliciting and accepting that kind of foreign assistance during a campaign; this measure, very simply, would require it to be reported.

I have told this body—and I have repeated it numerous times—that when FBI Director Wray came before the Senate Judiciary Committee, he warned that the Russians are still actively trying to interfere in our election. But President Trump just said that if offered foreign assistance, ''I'd take it.''

Congress must pass this Duty to Report Act, along with other commonsense measures that support election security. Not only can we do it while we are considering impeachment, we must do it because the impeachment offense, in fact, involves foreign interference that these election security measures would help to stop.

Likewise, I want to mention gun violence protection. Senator GRAHAM and I and others in this body have worked hard over months on negotiating emergency risk protection order legislation. It could be passed along with background checks, and the two should go together.

The ball is in the White House's court. The President has shifted ground one way and the other, unpredictably and uncertainly, but I feel we can muster a consensus here. Even as we consider impeachment, we can move forward on a comprehensive set of measures that would help make America safer.

My goal, eventually, is to save as many lives as possible and as quickly as possible through those kinds of measures that would include not only background checks made universal and emergency risk protection orders passed by States with the incentives we would provide with this bill but also a ban on assault weapons and safe storage in honor of Ethan Song, a young man who was killed in Guilford, CT, because of improper storage of a gun that he and a friend were playing with. They would include a ban on high-capacity magazines and a reversal of the sweetheart deal that gave the gun manufacturers near-complete immunity. These commonsense measures can be done even as we consider impeachment.

Likewise, to take another guarantee of our values and the rule of law, forced arbitration clauses cause harm to millions of Americans every year. These clauses are often tucked into the fine print of lengthy consumer contracts and employee handbooks, with workers and consumers having no meaningful choice but to consent to the terms. These forced arbitration clauses, like that immunity for the gun manufacturers, denies basic justice. They deny Americans their day in court, and they deny public accountability. Consumers and workers are forced into unfair arbitration clauses where corporations can write the rules. They write the rules. Everything can be done in secret, and there is no meaningful judicial rebuke. In many cases, these clauses are paired with provisions that block Americans who have suffered similar harm from banding together in seeking accountability together in a class action lawsuit.

At the start of this Congress, 34 Senators joined me in sponsoring the FAIR Act. This bill would render invalid or unenforceable any arbitration agreement between workers and consumers and corporations that governs employment, civil rights, consumer, or antitrust disputes. It has an exception for those arbitration agreements that are the product of real collective bargaining agreements. It is hardly a radical proposal; it is a reform to give Americans access to the justice system again. Yet Senator MCCONNELL regrettably has blocked this bill and others from a vote. Senator MCCONNELL said: ''As long as I am majority leader of the Senate, I get to set the agenda.'' Meanwhile, corporations are cheating workers, consumers, children, and families out of their day in court.

We need to move forward on these matters: gun violence protection, election security, the FAIR Act. We can do it because America wants it. We will go back to our constituents in this next election, and my colleagues who will face them will be asked: What have you done? We can answer with real action if we come together and move forward.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

S.J. RES. 53

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. President, before we vote, I want to take a few minutes to express my strong opposition to what our colleagues on the other side of the aisle are doing with their Congressional Review Act resolution. They are asking the United States to give up a very good, responsible, and Affordable Clean Energy Plan and replace it with the old, Obama-era, illegal, and unconstitutional Clean Power Plan.

Prior to being elected to Congress, I spent nearly 10 years in North Dakota as an energy regulator and oversaw both economic and environmental policies and regulations in our State. I know something of this issue. For the American people, a fully implemented Obama-era Clean Power Plan would result in much higher electricity costs, less money in their pockets, fewer well-paying jobs, and just a lot less freedom. Across the country, their plan would reduce household spending by $79 billion. It would increase electricity prices in my State of North Dakota by 43 percent, and it would cost over 125,000 jobs over the next decade.

Perhaps one of the most disturbing things about the Clean Power Plan that was presented by the Obama administration—one of the reasons, frankly, that it was deemed to be unconstitutional and illegal and had a stay put on it by the U.S. Supreme Court—was that in my State, under the proposed rule, we had a CO_2 reduction target of 11 percent. Yet, in the classic bait-and-switch maneuver, the final rule increased that 11 percent by 400 percent. The 11 percent, while illegal, was doable, but the 400 percent was ridiculous.

So make no mistake, right now, here in the U.S. Senate, the Democrats are asking us to vote to eliminate good

jobs, to raise the cost of living, and to take more money out of the pockets of the American people. For what? The United States does not need an unconstitutional Federal power grab, like this one, in order to lead the world in reducing our emissions. In fact, we already do. Emissions have been declining in the United States for nearly 50 years. We don't need to apologize for our action or inaction. In fact, we need to start honoring the innovators who have made these reductions possible in the first place. We should be encouraging them and incentivizing them to continue their work in order to pave the way for responsible energy production that will be used for generations to come not just here in the United States but across the world.

In the context of several issues, I often speak about needing to follow a Federalist model, the cooperative federalism that our Founders envisioned when they created the States. That is a model of State control, with Governors being in charge, not Presidents. This is under the umbrella, of course, of good Federal oversight and, of course, some authority. Yet States need to have primacy. Put those who are closest to the people in charge, give them the authority and the resources they need, and this model will produce the best results nearly every time, if not every time. The Obama era's Clean Power Plan is exactly the opposite of that. It is a Federal power grab that the States have rejected and, yes, that the Supreme Court has ruled a stay on.

By stark contrast, the affordable clean energy rule that has been put forward by the Trump administration, which is the rule the Democrats want to overturn today in favor of the unconstitutional plan that hurts the American people, is a win for North Dakota and for States across the country. It respects the law and restores the proper balance between States and the Federal Government. It also promotes energy security. Maybe one could even say it promotes energy dominance.

ACE, as it is called, gives States the flexibility to set their own emission standards. It focuses on energy efficiency improvements at individual powerplants, and it incentivizes increased efficiency for coal powerplants, which allows them to remain open. We have that important base of low-cost, reliable electricity in the form of clean energy.

This simple, responsible plan is what the Democrats find so abhorrent. With the vote today, they are asking us to scrap the affordable clean energy rule and return to a rule that is unconstitutional, that tramples on States' rights, that kills jobs, that raises electricity rates, and that does nothing substantial to reduce emissions.

I applaud President Trump and EPA Administrator Wheeler for having included Governors and States and innovators in the discussion before having made the final rule.

We cannot let this happen today, and I urge my colleagues to join me in voting no.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak before the vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

TURKEY AND SYRIA

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I rise to express my outrage with regard to President Trump's decision to withdraw U.S. troops from northeast Syria. This decision is dangerous, premature, and wholly inconsistent with what the facts on the ground in Syria and the advice from everyone—from our diplomats to our military advisers.

In just 1 week, President Trump has managed to undo 5 years of hard-fought stability in northeast Syria. Just 1 week ago, over 10,000 ISIS fighters, including high-value prisoners who targeted American victims, were secured in prisons throughout northeast Syria. We face, today, a very different picture. Several ISIS prisons are already unmanned as a result of Turkey's incursion, and it is estimated that over 100 ISIS prisoners have been released already. We don't know what will happen in those other detention centers that have housed ISIS prisoners.

One week ago, a limited U.S. troop presence of 1,000 Special Forces stabilized a population that was once terrorized by the Syrian regime and later by ISIS. These forces secured a region of Syria that controls over two-thirds of Syria's natural resources. American troops have, today, either left or are preparing to leave this area, and the Syrian regime is moving in.

Russian troops have moved into U.S. military bases, and over 160,000 Syrian civilians have already fled their homes as a result of the spike in violence that has been instigated by Turkey. It is so hard to watch the videos on television that show Turkey-affiliated fighters assassinating Kurdish forces—Kurds with their hands tied behind their backs.

I traveled to Syria a year ago last summer. LINDSEY GRAHAM and I saw firsthand the work of the combined joint task force, Operation Inherent Resolve. We saw the work its partner forces, the Syrian Democratic Forces, were doing, and it was truly remarkable. The United States owes a huge debt of gratitude to the men and women of the SDF who sacrificed over 11,000 of their own lives in fighting ISIS so we didn't have to sacrifice our own.

Because of this sacrifice, when we were in northeast Syria last summer, we witnessed communities like Manbij steadily recover and rebuild after 3 years under ISIS's brutal occupation, and the widespread appreciation of the U.S. presence among local, multiethnic residents was a testament to the importance of our partnerships and our willingness to lead in times of crisis. As we drove down the roads, we saw kids flashing victory signs at our troops. When we were in the marketplace, we had people come out and tell us how relieved they were that the United States was there to help ensure that peace was being kept. We saw local governance taking place on the ground.

So it is incredibly difficult now to see images coming out of Manbij and the other places we visited in northeastern Syria. The Syrian regime has already moved troops back into this region, and Turkey's proxies, who are seemingly undeterred by the Syrian presence, continue to move into the city of Manbij with heavily armed vehicles. Meanwhile, Russia has spent the last few days touring and posting videos of abandoned, taxpayer-funded U.S. bases.

What is taking place in Manbij and in so many cities across northeast Syria is an insult to the thousands of American servicemembers who have risked their lives to help stabilize that region and support the fight against ISIS, and it could have all been avoided.

This really began in December of 2018 when the President said he planned to withdraw troops from Syria. That was after holding up for months the stabilization dollars that could have been used to make it very clear that we were committed to the region—to ensuring that ISIS wouldn't rebuild there and that there would be stability in northeastern Syria. We were committed to making sure the United States was at the table when Russia and Iran and Assad moved in and carved up Syria.

I ask unanimous to have printed in the RECORD the recommendations on the best way forward in Syria that were issued last month by the bipartisan Syria Study Group, which I helped to create.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The United States cannot avoid or ignore the conflict in Syria. From the outset of hostilities, minimizing American involvement in the war and safeguarding U.S. national security interests have proven to be incompatible goals. This will remain the case for the foreseeable future. The essential question before American policymakers is not whether the United States should keep or withdraw its forces in Syria, but what strategy and mix of tools will best protect the United States from the conflict's reverberations and advance American interests. This report sets out such a strategy.

THE SYRIAN CONFLICT AND AMERICAN INTERESTS

From the conflict's beginning in 2011 as a peaceful domestic uprising, experts warned that President Bashar al-Assad's brutal response was likely to have serious, negative impacts on U.S. interests. Given Syria's central location in the Middle East, its ruling regime's ties to terrorist groups and to Iran, and the incompatibility of Assad's authoritarian rule with the aspirations of the Syrian people, many worried about the conflict

spilling over Syria's borders. These concerns are now a reality. The Syrian conflict spawned a refugee crisis that has encumbered Syria's neighbors and roiled European politics, strained U.S.-Turkish relations to the point of crisis, led to direct hostilities between Iran and Israel, provided a vector for Russia's resurgence in the Middle East, and challenged international norms around weapons of mass destruction and the protection of civilians. Areas of Syria have become safe havens for al-Qaeda and its fellow travelers and home to the largest concentration of foreign terrorist fighters since Afghanistan in the 1990s. The conflict also fueled the rise of ISIS, prompting an ongoing U.S.-led military intervention. Eight years in, the conflict has not been meaningfully contained, nor has the United States been sheltered from its effects.

Events on the ground disprove the narrative that the conflict has been won by the Assad regime. The Syrian war, far from ending, is entering a new phase. As of this writing, the Assad regime and its patron Russia are pressing an offensive against Idlib that could spur a new humanitarian catastrophe and outflow of refugees. Tensions are simmering between the Kurdish element that dominates the U.S.-trained Syrian Democratic Forces (SDF) in northeastern Syria and the Arab populace of some of the areas under SDF control. Turkey is positioning troops to invade northeastern Syria, which would divert the SDF away from the essential task of preventing ISIS's resurgence. ISIS itself, down but not defeated, is already resurfacing as an insurgency and may yet attempt to retake territory in both Syria and Iraq. Iran and Israel, already locked in a low-level conflict in Syria, may escalate to open conflict, especially in the Golan Heights. The Assad regime and its partners may seek to cross the Euphrates River, which could in turn breathe life into the ISIS insurgency and allow Iran to consolidate its land routes from Iraq to Lebanon. All of these scenarios become more likely without U.S. forces in Syria and without committed U.S. leadership to avert these scenarios.

The Syria Study Group uncovered no easy solutions in Syria; optimal outcomes were left behind long ago. Yet the Group determined that the threats the conflict in Syria poses—of terrorism directed against the United States and its allies and partners; of an empowered Iran; of an aggrandized Russia; of large numbers of refugees, displaced persons, and other forms of humanitarian catastrophe; and of the erosion of international norms of war and the Western commitment to them—are sufficiently serious to merit a determined response from the United States. The United States and its allies retain tools to address those threats and the leverage to promote outcomes that are better for American interests than those that would prevail in the absence of U.S. engagement. Using those tools effectively, however, will require better alignment of ends and means—the former must be more realistic and the U.S. investment of the latter increased—as well as clear, consistent, and high-level political leadership. Sharp shifts and reversals in American policy, and the failure of senior U.S. government officials to prioritize the issue with their counterparts, have undermined American credibility and the effectiveness of U.S. policy.

ASSESSMENT OF THE CURRENT SITUATION IN SYRIA

While the conflict in Syria is often characterized as winding down, it is the assessment of the Syria Study Group that this is incorrect; in fact, the conflict remains dynamic and dangerous. In particular:

The liberation of ISIS-held territory does not eliminate the group's threat to the United States. ISIS no longer holds significant territory in Syria or Iraq, but it is not defeated. The group has morphed into an insurgency with the will, capability, and resources to carry out attacks against the United States. ISIS will seek to take advantage of any opening, whether a reduction in U.S. counterterrorism pressure or discontent among eastern Syria's Arab population, to recruit new fighters and mount attacks. ISIS's terrorist ideology, or ''brand,'' continues to hold global appeal.

The ISIS detainee population is a long-term challenge that is not being adequately addressed. Although ISIS has suffered significant casualties, many of its fighters—including thousands of foreign fighters—remain in detention under SDF management. If released, they will form the core of a new iteration of ISIS or a similar group. In addition, tens of thousands of family members of ISIS fighters are residing in camps in eastern Syria. The SDF has custody of both groups but lacks the resources and outside support to hold them indefinitely. U.S. and allied efforts to deal with this problem have suffered from a lack of political will.

Al-Qaeda and other terrorist groups remain active in Syria and threaten the United States. Although ISIS has received far more attention, other terrorist groups are active and control territory, especially in Idlib. Al-Qaeda offshoot Hayat Tahrir al-Sham has formed a government in Idlib, which is home to numerous other groups, including al-Qaeda's Syrian affiliate, Hurras ad-Din, and a large number of foreign terrorist fighters. The United States lacks freedom of action to conduct a full-fledged counterterrorism campaign in these areas.

Despite Israeli air strikes and U.S. sanctions, Iran continues to entrench itself in Syria; Russia and Iran show few serious signs of divergence. Iran appears to be pursuing a two-track policy of military entrenchment and political and economic activity designed to enhance its power and influence in Syria for the long term. Iran's activities have reportedly caused discontent among Syria's population, but the Assad regime is heavily dependent on Iranian support. Israeli officials believe that Israel's air strikes have disrupted Iran's attempts to move sophisticated weapons systems into Syria, but Iran's overall objectives appear unchanged and the risk of broader Iran-Israel conflict remains high. Although Russia has acquiesced to the Israeli campaign against Iran, there are few signs of a wider divergence between Moscow and Tehran regarding aims or tactics in Syria.

Assad has not won the conflict in Syria. The regime has recaptured large swaths of territory and now holds 60 percent of the country. However, its control outside Damascus is tenuous, in part because it lacks the forces to secure the areas it retakes, but also because it pursues punitive policies against local populations. In much of regime-held areas, civilians are subject to conscription as well as arbitrary arrest, torture, and execution at the hands of the regime. Crime and warlordism are rampant. The Assad regime is determined to retake Idlib and is receiving Russian assistance to do so, but so far it has struggled to recapture territory without the help of Iranian ground forces

Progress toward a political settlement to the Syria conflict has stalled, and Assad shows no willingness to compromise with his opponents. Neither the UN-led ''Geneva process'' based on UN Security Council Resolution 2254 nor the ad hoc ''Astana process'' comprising Russia, Iran, and Turkey has yielded progress toward a political settlement to the conflict. While the United States is leading a new effort to break the stalemate, the fundamental obstacle remains the Assad regime's unwillingness to countenance meaningful reform. Presidential elections in 2021 are unlikely to produce a legitimate electoral outcome, because there is little chance that the regime will permit free and fair elections or the credible participation of the Syrian diaspora.

The United States underestimated Russia's ability to use Syria as an arena for regional influence. Russia's intervention, beginning in 2015, accomplished its proximate aim—the preservation of the regime in defiance of U.S. calls for Assad to ''go''—at a relatively low cost. Russia has enhanced its profile and prestige more broadly in the Middle East. The extent of Russia's success in Syria is debatable—it has yet to translate Assad's military gains into the political victory Moscow seemingly seeks—but Russia has nevertheless reestablished itself as a crucial player in the region's politics for the first time in decades.

U.S.-Turkey relations are strained in Syria by starkly diverging views of the SDF. A Turkish incursion into northeastern Syria would represent a major setback to U.S. aims in Syria and a new crisis for the U.S.-Turkish relationship. The United States regards its decision to partner with the SDF to fight ISIS as having been necessitated by the lack of credible and timely Turkish alternative; Turkey regards the SDF as a grave security threat due to its links to the Kurdistan Workers' Party (PKK), a threat made more dangerous by U.S. training and equipping of the SDF. This dispute has played a significant role in the erosion of U.S.-Turkish relations and may yet prompt a third Turkish incursion into Syria, which would severely complicate the U.S. military campaign against ISIS. There is little sign that Turkey intends to relinquish control of the two Syrian areas it currently controls—Afrin and the ''Euphrates Shield'' area.

Although the SDF has been a highly effective partner in the fight against ISIS, it must undergo a transition to ensure stability in northeastern Syria. The SDF is regarded by the U.S. military as a highly effective partner in the conventional military campaign against ISIS. That partnership faces new challenges with the shift from fighting to governing. The SDF remains dominated by Syrian Kurds—specifically by the People's Protection Units (YPG)—despite its control over large stretches of predominantly Arab territory. This disparity, and the YPG's heavy-handed approach to governing and resource allocation, has led to unrest in Arab tribal areas. Minimal U.S. civilian engagement and the halt in U.S. stabilization funding in northeastern Syria have diminished American influence.

The Assad regime's systematic targeting of civilians and civilian infrastructure constitutes war crimes and demands accountability, as well as enhanced efforts to protect civilians. The Assad regime and its patrons, including Russia, have systematically targeted civilians and civilian infrastructure. A UN commission found the regime guilty of crimes against humanity. Syrians have been subjected to arbitrary detention, torture, and execution at the hands of the regime. Although prospects for accountability are dim in the near term, efforts to document the regime's atrocities are under way.

Syria's humanitarian crisis, not least the challenges posed by internally displaced people and refugees, will reverberate for decades. Most refugees are unlikely to return voluntarily given current conditions in Syria. The Syrian conflict has provoked the most serious human displacement since World War II, 6 million Syrians are internally displaced, and nearly 6 million more are registered as refugees outside the country. Refugees have placed a heavy economic

burden on host countries, especially Syria's neighbors; pressure is increasing, particularly within Lebanon and Turkey, for nonvoluntary returns. Inside Syria, a large proportion of the population relies on humanitarian aid, over which the regime seeks to exercise control in order to enhance its power.

Despite these challenges, the United States maintains leverage to shape an outcome in Syria that protects core U.S. national security interests. The Group identified several key points of leverage held by the United States, particularly if used in coordination with allies and partners: influence over northeastern Syria; sanctions against the Assad regime and its backers; the withholding of reconstruction assistance desired by Assad and Russia; and the ongoing diplomatic isolation of the Assad regime.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR U.S. POLICY

Despite its daunting assessment of the situation in Syria, the Group believes that the United States is still able to exercise influence over the conflict's trajectory, and that it must do so given the threats the conflict poses to American interests. The Group believes that the best end state in Syria is one in which a Syrian government is viewed as legitimate by its own population and has the will and capability to end Syria's dependence on foreign forces and to prevent terrorist groups from thriving on Syrian territory. This in turn requires conditions in which Syrian citizens live free from fear of the Assad regime and of Russian, Iranian, and ISIS brutality and within an updated political and social compact based on decentralized governance and equitable resource allocation.

Recognizing that such an outcome is a distant prospect, the Group recommends a strategy that makes a negotiated political settlement in Syria more likely yet also allows the United States to defend its interests even if a political solution is not found. None of those consulted by the Group believe that withdrawing U.S. forces would make ISIS less likely to regroup, Iran less likely to entrench itself, or a negotiated settlement more likely. Although the U.S. military mission in Syria is often lumped together with the Iraq and Afghanistan missions in the ''forever war'' category, the Syria case offers a different—and far less costly—model. A small U.S. military footprint, supported by U.S. air power and other high-end capabilities, reinforced by a global coalition of like-minded allies and partners, rallied a local partner force many times its size to liberate territory from a terrorist group. What U.S. forces and their partners have gained in Syria should not be discarded with a premature withdrawal.

To that end, the Group recommends that the United States, working in concert with allies and partners, continue its military mission in order to maintain pressure on ISIS and other terrorist groups while maintaining and strengthening pressure on the Assad regime and its backers until conditions are conducive for a political settlement that ends the Syria war. In particular, the Group recommends that the United States:

Halt the U.S. military withdrawal; consolidate gains following the territorial defeat of ISIS; and support communities liberated from ISIS in forming an alternative model for governance, resource allocation, and security in Syria. The Group recommends that the United States (1) update its military mission to head off an ISIS insurgency; (2) adequately prepare for various contingencies and escalation scenarios; (3) return a U.S. civilian presence and stabilization funding to northeastern Syria; (4) press the SDF to govern more inclusively; (5) elevate the ISIS detainee problem set; and (6) prioritize diplomatic and military engagement in Iraq.

Until conditions inside Syria improve, deny the Assad regime and its backers all avenues for normalization by enforcing the regime's diplomatic isolation and a rigorous sanctions architecture. Among other steps, the United States should continue to press allies and partners to refrain from reestablishing diplomatic ties with the Assad regime, to withhold reconstruction assistance, and to strictly enforce sanctions and seek to expand them. In addition, the international community should begin preparing the ground now for the eventual accountability of those responsible for war crimes in Syria, without imposing accountability as a precondition for a political settlement.

Test and verify Russian willingness to support political settlements acceptable to the United States but continue activities that increase the costs to Russia for its actions in Syria. Many observers believe that agreement between the United States and Russia is a prerequisite for progress toward a political settlement, yet Russia has consistently failed to deliver on its commitments in Syria. The United States should require concrete actions of Russia pursuant to any discussions of a political settlement and, absent such actions, should avoid making concessions to Moscow or legitimizing its positions. Concurrently, the United States should pressure Moscow, in part by highlighting Russian complicity in war crimes.

Remain focused on expelling Iranian forces and proxies from Syria but recognize that this is best accomplished in phases. The key near-term goal should be to prevent further entrenchment of Iran and its many partners and proxies while raising the cost to Iran for its actions in Syria. To this end, the United States should continue its support of Israeli air strikes; enforce sanctions aimed at undermining Iran's ability to fund its proxies and partners in Syria, Lebanon, and Iraq; maintain the U.S. military presence at the al-Tanf military base; and support efforts to expose Iranian influence efforts in Syria. The United States should insist that any political settlement require the withdrawal of Iranian forces and proxies from Syria.

Seek areas for cooperation with Turkey and address legitimate Turkish security concerns while pressing Turkey to avoid any incursion into northeastern Syria and to improve conditions in the Afrin and Euphrates Shield areas. U.S. efforts to reach agreement on a security zone or security mechanism along Turkey's border with northeastern Syria should continue, and every attempt should be made to isolate Syria from other problems in the U.S.-Turkey relationship. The United States should encourage the resumption of Turkey-PKK peace talks, which hold the best possibility of leading to a détente between Turkey and the SDF. The United States should press Turkey to improve conditions and access in the areas of Syria it controls.

Seek to avert a humanitarian catastrophe in Idlib while addressing the presence there of terrorist groups. The United States should explore avenues to increase the pressure on terrorist groups in Idlib that may be plotting external attacks. At the same time, the United States should seek to deter the Assad regime and its partners from continuing to target civilians in the territory. In preparation for a renewed humanitarian and refugee crisis in Idlib, the United States should press Turkey to facilitate the work of nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) serving the population.

Energize efforts to address the humanitarian crisis inside Syria while taking steps to shore up countries hosting Syrian refugees. The United States should work to ensure the continued provision of humanitarian aid to vulnerable populations inside and outside Syria. The United States should press for the renewal of the UN ''cross-border resolution,'' rally other states to fund humanitarian appeals for Syria, and work with international financial institutions to support refugee-hosting countries. The United States should stand firmly against efforts to forcibly repatriate Syrian refugees and should resume accepting Syrian refugees in the United States.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. The report read that the United States should make the most of its gains and hold this critical piece of land until a negotiated settlement was reached between all parties. Moreover, the report, which was bipartisan—that had Representatives appointed by Members of Congress and by the administration—read that withdrawing U.S. troops would not make ISIS less likely to regroup or Iran less likely to entrench itself.

President Trump's ill-informed and hasty decision will not only breathe new life into the terrorist groups—into ISIS, which is really just al-Qaida by another name—and cede America's hard-fought gains in the region to Russia, Iran, and Assad, but it will erode U.S. credibility in the long term. It will cede America's hard-fought gains in the region.

I wish there were alternatives that we as a country could pursue. Sadly, I don't think we can put the genie back in the bottle. Here in Congress, though, I hope we will look at ways to hold Turkey and President Erdogan accountable for his actions.

I certainly hope President Trump will revoke his invitation to President Erdogan to visit the United States. President Erdogan needs to hear an unequivocal message of opposition to this incursion from the United States, and it makes no sense to extend hospitality and niceties during this moment of crisis.

Republicans and Democrats must come together and ensure that the administration understands the consequences of these actions. We have to do more to ensure that such mistakes never happen again.

I yield the floor.

S.J. RES. 53

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I rise today in support of the resolution of disapproval sponsored by Senator CARDIN that would block the Administration's harmful Affordable Clean Energy Rule.

In Maine, our economy is inextricably linked to the environment. Our State, which is situated at the end of the Nation's air pollution tailpipe, has made substantial progress in reducing harmful emissions by increasing energy efficiency, adopting clean energy technologies, and improving air quality and public health. While I am pleased by the progress our country has already made in reducing air pollutants, the administration's rule to repeal and rewrite the Clean Power Plan is a step in the wrong direction.

Climate change is a significant risk that threatens Maine's working forests, fishing, and agricultural industries, as well as tourism and recreation and our coastal communities. I will continue to work in Congress to support realistic, responsible solutions that help reduce harmful emissions and protect our environment and the health of our citizens.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to complete my remarks prior to the vote.

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

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I rise in strong opposition to the Congressional Review Act resolution that has been put forward by the Democrats on which we will soon be voting.

The Democrats' resolution would eliminate President Trump's affordable clean energy rule. The President's rule is commonsense policy. It protects our air, and it allows our economy to grow at the same time. The affordable clean energy rule would replace the Obama administration's so-called Clean Power Plan. The punishing plan would have damaged our economy, and what I have here is a map to go over some of that. It would have closed powerplants. It would have put energy workers on unemployment. It would have reduced the reliability of our electricity. It would have increased energy bills for American families and for small businesses.

The results would have been dramatic. There would have been dramatic increases in electricity bills all across the country. The plan would have devastated communities, certainly in my home State of Wyoming. It would have raised electricity bills by 42 percent in the State of Wyoming, and they would have gone up in every State.

Wyoming is America's leading producer of coal. It supports thousands of good-paying jobs all across the State. Across Wyoming, the punishing power plan would put hard-working men and women out of work. The rule would be a massive roadblock for States. Instead of working collaboratively with State governments, it would put the EPA in the driver's seat of setting a national energy policy.

States would be told what energy sources were allowed within their borders and how to regulate them.

Worst of all, the so-called Clean Power Plan would have barely reduced carbon emissions, it would have crippled our economy, and done very little, if anything, to help the environment.

President Obama's plan wasn't just bad policy, it was illegal. Twenty-seven States, including Wyoming, filed a lawsuit to stop the regulation. The Supreme Court ruled that Obama's EPA went way beyond its legal authority. The Court blocked the overreaching rule.

Now President Trump has put forward a commonsense replacement to protect America's air. The affordable clean energy rule follows the law, and it is good news for the people of Wyoming and the rest of the country. It recognizes that the EPA is not supposed to pick winners and losers.

Under the new rule, powerplants can make reasonable changes like improving efficiency. The rule promotes the use of new cleaner technologies to generate electricity so energy companies can modernize their powerplants without having to shut them down completely.

The rule also respects the role of States under the Clean Air Act. It gets rid of ''Washington knows best,'' which is an approach we deal with—a top-down approach of unelected, unaccountable, heavyhanded bureaucrats. States understand how to protect the air their citizens breathe. They know it is an important thing to do. The end result will be cleaner air and more affordable energy for America's households.

Now Senate Democrats want to play politics once again and uproot the affordable clean energy rule. Democrats want to resurrect a rule that the Supreme Court took unprecedented action to stop. That would be bad for our environment, bad for our economy, and bad for our country.

Under the Congressional Review Act, if Congress repeals the affordable clean energy rule, the administration couldn't replace it with a similar rule.

The administration put forward a commonsense rule to protect our air quality, and now Democrats want to kill it. That is the proposal on the floor today.

Democrats have become hostages to the far-left agenda, even when it doesn't make any sense. It is not good policy, and we have seen this before.

The Environment and Public Works Committee, which I chair, recently passed legislation to help reduce the amount of plastic pollution in our oceans. The bipartisan bill follows up on the previous bipartisan Save Our Seas Act that passed and was signed into law last Congress.

Instead of supporting the legislation, extreme environmentalists oppose the bill—a bipartisan bill we got passed last Congress. We are going on to the next level now. Now the extreme environmentalists, of course, oppose the bill because we are not banning all plastics. Can you imagine something so ridiculous? But that is what they want.

Working together in a bipartisan way—even when we are doing things that to me make sense, to others make sense, to bipartisan Senators make sense, to the House make sense, the extreme environmentalists say it is still not enough for them and their extreme measures and approaches.

These extreme activists want to do the same thing with our air. Instead of finding common ground, their goal seems to be to shut down our economy because that is what they are promoting.

Democrats in the House of Representatives, regrettably, have followed a similar pattern. House Democrats refuse to work with Republicans to pass commonsense bills to protect our air and address climate change, which we are promoting—an effort to actually address it. Apparently, it is not going far enough for the extreme Democratic environmentalists.

Bipartisan legislation to support carbon capture technologies, which we passed in this body, sits in the House of Representatives waiting for a vote.

The USE IT Act—which I introduced along with Senator WHITEHOUSE, who gives speeches each week on climate change on the floor of the Senate. We have worked together. It has passed our committee unanimously. It has passed the Senate unanimously. Yet, with overwhelming bipartisan support in the Senate, it is still being blocked in the House. The bill has bipartisan support in the House as well, but it hasn't gone anywhere. It is being stopped because Democratic leaders in the House refuse to move a commonsense bill that would lower carbon emissions and help address carbon climate change.

They are climate alarmists. They want things done drastically, unilaterally, immediately, when we are trying to take commonsense steps in the right direction.

Killing commonsense policies, like the affordable clean energy rule and the USE IT Act, makes no sense to me.

President Trump's rule respects the law, and it helps the environment. It is a win-win for our country. Americans deserve clean air. They also deserve clear rules, and the affordable clean energy rule gives us both.

I urge every Senator to oppose the resolution that is coming up to the floor.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. FISCHER). All time is expired.

The clerk will read the title of the joint resolution for the third time.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the joint resolution pass?

Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) would have voted ''nay'' and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) would have voted ''nay.''

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER),

the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), 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 41, nays 53, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 324 Leg.]

YEAS—41

Baldwin	Gillibrand	Rosen
Bennet	Hassan	Schatz
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Schumer
Brown	Hirono	Shaheen
Cantwell	Kaine	Smith
Cardin	King	Stabenow
Carper	Leahy	Tester
Casey	Markey	Udall
Collins	Menendez	Van Hollen
Coons	Merkley	Warner
Cortez Masto	Murphy	Warren
Duckworth	Murray	Whitehouse
Durbin	Peters	Wyden
Feinstein	Reed	

NAYS—53

Barrasso	Graham	Portman
Blackburn	Grassley	Risch
Blunt	Hawley	Roberts
Boozman	Hoeven	Romney
Braun	Hyde-Smith	Rounds
Burr	Inhofe	Rubio
Capito	Johnson	Sasse
Cassidy	Jones	Scott (FL)
Cornyn	Kennedy	Scott (SC)
Cotton	Lankford	Shelby
Cramer	Lee	Sinema
Crapo	Manchin	Sullivan
Cruz	McConnell	Thune
Daines	McSally	Tillis
Enzi	Moran	Toomey
Ernst	Murkowski	Wicker
Fischer	Paul	Young
Gardner	Perdue	

NOT VOTING—6

Alexander	Harris	Klobuchar
Booker	Isakson	Sanders

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 53) was rejected.

RELATING TO A NATIONAL EMERGENCY DECLARED BY THE PRESIDENT ON FEBRUARY 15, 2019—VETO

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the pending business.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Veto message to accompany S.J. Res. 54, a joint resolution relating to a national emergency declared by the President on February 15, 2019.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate Democratic leader.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H.J. RES. 77

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I am going to speak for a minute before I make my unanimous consent request.

Now, we have a crisis here in this world and here in America. Because of the President's precipitous action to take a small number of American troops out of northern Syria and greenlight Erdogan's invasion, we are in real trouble. We are in trouble in a whole lot of ways.

Most importantly, we, in New York, know that a small group of bad people can cause terrible terrorism with huge loss of life, even when they are 7,000 miles away. There are about 70,000 ISIS prisoners and their families now being guarded by the Kurds, but because of the President's action, they will no longer be guarded.

When we went to the White House yesterday and asked the President and his military folks what is the plan to prevent many of these ISIS would-be terrorists from escaping, they didn't have one. They didn't have one because the Kurds have left, and the only people who might guard them are the Syrians or the Turks, and neither of them have a great interest in stopping ISIS.

In fact, I asked the Defense Secretary Esper: Is there any intelligence that shows that either the Syrians or the Turks would do a good job at guarding the ISIS prisoners and preventing them from escaping?

No, there was no intelligence to that effect. As a result, ISIS prisoners are escaping, will continue to escape, and America will pay an awful price—an awful price. The Kurds will pay an awful price. They have fought alongside our soldiers. They are our allies.

I talked to my friend from Kentucky who said the Kurds are better off with the Syrians. Well, the Kurds sure don't think so. They would rather be back to the status quo. Talk to their leaders. Certainly, America will not be better off at all with ISIS prisoners escaping.

Who did this? The President. The President's incompetence has put American lives in danger—simply, starkly put but accurate. In New York, as I said, we know well how a small group of fanatics halfway around the world can do incredible damage and kill thousands of Americans here on our soil.

It should shake every Member of this body, regardless of their ideology and regardless of their views on Turkey, that the President made this decision so abruptly without heeding the advice of our commanders on the ground and now has no plan to manage the consequences.

After meeting with the President yesterday, it was clear to both Democrats and Republicans in the room that he does not grasp the gravity of the situation. He doesn't understand it. The most important thing we can do right now is send President Trump a message that Congress, the vast majority of Democrats and Republicans, demand he reverse course.

I am asking this as a unanimous consent to not go through a long regular process because the bottom line is, the longer we wait, the more Kurds will die—our allies—the more ISIS prisoners will escape, and the greater danger, hour by hour, day by day, America falls into. We should move this resolution. We need unanimous consent.

I spoke to my good friend from Kentucky. He said he wanted to put a resolution on the floor about military aid to Turkey, something many on my side would be sympathetic to. I offered him the ability of moving his resolution—we would have to, of course, get permission of all Members, but I would work through that—in return for us moving our resolution. He still said no. He still said no. I think that is a horrible decision. I think it could well risk the lives of Americans down the road. I think it will certainly risk the lives of many more Kurds, who are our allies.

We will return to this issue. I wish we could pass it now—the same bill that passed the House with the vast majority of Republicans, 2 to 1, with Leaders MCCARTHY and SCALISE and CHENEY voting for it—and go forward. I understand the motivations of my friend from Kentucky are sincere and real. He has had these positions consistently. They are not the positions of the majority on his side nor on our side on many issues. On some, we have worked together and agreed, but I think it is so wrong not to move forward. It is so wrong to let the man, both Democrats and Republicans saw in the White House yesterday, stay in control without pressuring him to do better—without pressuring him to do better.

There is no better, quicker, or more powerful way to pressure the President to undo the damage he has caused than to pass a bipartisan joint resolution that will go directly to his desk. We will come back to this issue. It will not go away. It cannot go away for the safety of America, for the safety of the Kurds, for some degree of stability, not chaos in the Middle East that the President, President Trump, precipitously caused.

I plead with my colleague from Kentucky and anyone else who might object to let us have the vote. Let us make our arguments and prevail. We are willing to do debate time. Let us not say it has to be my way or the highway when so many lives and such danger is at risk.

I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 246, H.J. Res. 77; that the joint resolution be read a third time and the Senate vote on passage with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. PAUL. Madam President, reserving the right to object. The Constitution is quite clear on this subject. If the minority leader wishes to engage in the civil war in Syria that has been going on for nearly a decade, we should obey the Constitution. He should come to the floor and say we are ready to declare a war, we are ready to authorize force, and we are going to stick our troops in the middle of this messy, messy five-sided civil war, where we would be ostensibly opposed to the Turkish Government that has made an incursion. We would then be opposed to our NATO ally. It would be the first time in history that we would be inserting ourselves militarily against a NATO ally.

None of this is to excuse Turkey's action. In fact, today I will offer a resolution that would actually do something.

The resolution that is being offered is simply a way to have petty, partisan criticism of the President infect this body. Mine, actually, would have the force of law and would prevent any arms from being sold to Turkey, which would be a serious rebuke to what they are doing in Syria.

The Constitution is quite clear. No authorization has ever been given for the use of force in Syria. There was no authorization of declaration of war and no permission to be there at all. So if they want to insert themselves in this civil war, by all means, let's have a debate. Let's have a constitutional debate, but I, for one, am not willing to send one young man or one young woman, one soldier over there without a clear mission.

There is no clear mission. There is no clear enemy. In fact, the war is largely over. Assad is going to remain, for better or worse. So we have a despot on one side, Erdogan. We have another despot on the other side, Assad. Here is the deal: The Kurds have to live there. It is despairing that they have to live there, but you know what, their best chance for survival is having an ally inside of Syria.

If they become allied, and it appears they are—if they become allied with Assad, you know what, there is a possibility of a Kurdish area within Syria. There may well be an opportunity for a Kurdish area similar to what has happened in Iraq.

So I object to this resolution because this resolution does nothing to fix the problem. My resolution would stop arms sales to Turkey, so I will object to this resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG). Objection is heard.

The minority leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. I believe history will show that the country, the Senate, and even the Senator from Kentucky will regret his blocking of this resolution.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 2624

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, at this time I want to ask unanimous consent that we introduce S. 2624, Turkey arm sales, which would eliminate any further sale of arms to Turkey and, instead of sending a fake message or a sense of the Senate resolution, would actually be a binding resolution and would tell the Turks: Yes, we are serious. We object to your incursion into Syria. You need to respect the territorial integrity of Syria, and we therefore are no longer going to be selling you arms.

I ask unanimous consent that this be passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. RISCH. Reserving the right to object, colleagues, this is a very fluid situation, as we all know, and, certainly, Americans who are watching this from home are confused about the parties. Then, when laying politics on top of it, where you have a level of animus toward the Commander in Chief that there is at this point, it becomes very difficult to sort this out. So as chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, I want to try to lay out some fundamentals that we need to deal with.

As has been pointed out by everyone—and I think everyone agrees—the situation on the ground in Syria is an incredibly complex situation. It is difficult to understand and impossible to manage at some point because of the fact that there are dozens and dozens of tribal entities that share religious or cultural or tribal affiliations either together or in opposition. The result of that is the mess that we have had in Syria for so long.

On top of that, in northern Syria we have a situation where the Kurds and the Turks are at odds with each other. This has happened just recently, and as everybody in this body—House and Senate, Republicans, Democrats—knows, it is a very serious situation, but this is not new. The animosity and fight between the Turks and the Kurds have been going on for centuries. This fight between these two groups has been going on for centuries.

Who are these two groups? First, we have the Turks on one side, on the north of the border, who are members of NATO and are at the very least theoretical allies of the United States, although in recent years that alliance has been strained, and that is an understatement of what the situation is.

Recently, they negotiated a deal with the Russians to buy S–400 missiles, which is a horrendous problem for a member of NATO. NATO was formed, of course, to push back against the Russians, and now you have a member of NATO that is engaging with the Russians in this fashion. This has caused us real grief.

Those of us who deal with it have dealt with it for months. We have been pressing the Turks as hard as we can about the mistake they have made and the consequences it is going to have. They have an order for F–35s. They make a number of parts for the F–35. We have told them clearly, in no uncertain terms, for months that they can have the F–35s or they can have the S–400s, but they cannot have both. They insisted that they can. That is simply not going to happen. I think they are starting to believe that.

Fast forward to where we are now. The Turks have amassed 30,000 troops on the border with Syria and are ready to come in and take on the Kurds, who had moved into the northern part of Syria due to the failed-state status of Syria.

To say that the President of the United States is responsible for this is simply a political statement that isn't true. You can dislike the Commander in Chief, you can dislike the calls that he makes, but this is a war that has been going on between these two groups for centuries. It was going to happen.

The fact that Erdogan had amassed 30,000 troops on the border was a clear indication that it was going to go forward. We had about 28 troops between the two standing armies and admittedly the President of the United States pulled those 28 troops out of harm's way.

In any event, you can argue about what got us here, what the triggering factor was, whether it was or wasn't going to happen anyway, but what you can't argue about is what the situation is today. There isn't anyone in this body that would disagree that this is a very serious situation.

Turkey is alone on this, by the way. With the possible exception of the Qataris, they are alone on this. The world has been watching this, condemning what Turkey is doing. They have done a cross-border incursion, and they are facing their age-old enemy, the Kurds, inside of Syria.

So what do we do about this? Well, the House has passed a matter that the minority leader has talked about and wanted to pass. Senator PAUL has brought his idea to the floor. But I want to tell you that the Foreign Relations Committee has been working on this since it blew up.

I want to thank my staff, and I want to thank Senator MENENDEZ' staff, the ranking member, who pulled an ''all-nighter'' last night, putting together a piece of legislation, and an ''all-morninger'' to get to the point where we are.

This piece of legislation is going to be dropped very quickly. Risch-Menendez is a bipartisan piece of legislation that addresses the issues that all of us are concerned about. It addresses the issues with Turkey. It addresses the issues with the Kurds. It addresses the issues that the minority leader addressed regarding the ISIS prisoners who are being held. It is a good piece of legislation.

It is going to have numerous—and I mean numerous—cosponsors to the bill from both sides of the aisle. So with that in mind, I am going to enter an objection to Senator PAUL's piece of legislation, not because I object to it as it stands by itself but because we have a comprehensive piece of legislation that does address this that is the result of consultation between both the majority and the minority and the administration to get us a bill that could actually become law.

From my own standpoint, I am always at a point where I want to reach an objective and want to get to a result. Senator PAUL's and the other legislation cannot become law. This bipartisan piece of legislation, Risch-Menendez, which addresses this very, very serious issue can become law. As a result of that, Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I applaud President Trump for the restraint, the

resolve, and the commitment to constitutional principles that he demonstrated when he decided not to have the United States go into Syria, not to continue to involve our troops in a looming conflict in Syria.

I agree that it is a horrible situation. I agree that we have people running both Syria and Turkey who are not our friends and who have shown significant hostility toward us. It is precisely because of that and not in spite of it that we shouldn't be there, especially when you take into account that we do not have a declaration of war relative to Syria. We do not have an authorization for the use of military force with regard to Syria. Under our system of government, the U.S. Constitution placed the power to declare war or otherwise authorize the use of military force in Congress. This was no accident. It is the branch of the Federal Government most accountable to the people at the most regular intervals.

This was a significant break from our previous system of government—the one that was based in London. In Federalist No. 69, Alexander Hamilton explained that this was no accident, that under the British model, the King, as the chief executive, had the power to take the country to war. It was Parliament's job, then, to follow along, to figure out what to do about it and how to fund it.

This would not be the case in the American Republic. This is not the case under our Constitution. Yet, sadly, for decades we have had a Congress consisting of Republicans and Democrats, Senators and Representatives who have allowed the legislative muscle to atrophy, who have refused and declined to exercise the power to declare war.

In that context, I have heard Republicans and Democrats, Senators and Representatives alike, defer again and again and again to Presidents of every conceivable partisan combination, saying: Let the President decide what we do.

Through our own inaction, we have essentially relinquished the power to declare war.

Why does this matter? This is the only connection the American people have to the power to declare war. When we send their brave sons and daughters into harm's way, we owe it to them to have an open, public robust debate and discussion in which we make a deal with them, in which we outline the terms for our engagement.

We don't have that in Syria. There are those who are upset that we don't, and I understand that they are upset that we don't. If they are upset that we don't, it is not as though we are a victim. We are the actor, not the acted upon. We have the power right here and right now to bring up a proposal. If they want to declare war with regard to Syria, let's have that discussion.

I am not a fan of war. I am not a fan of war starting on behalf of the United States anywhere in the world right now, but if somebody wants to make that discussion, let's have it, and let's debate it.

But what people shouldn't be doing is criticizing President Trump, who has shown restraint and shown deference to the American people, who wants to protect our sons and daughters who would be protecting us. He is saying: Maybe, just maybe, when you have a bad guy in Turkey, wanting to do some things in Syria with regard to the Kurds, maybe, just maybe, when you take into account the fact that Turkey is, in fact, a NATO ally and we have a NATO article 5 obligation to do something about that, that is going to lead to full-blown war. We should therefore respect him. We should be grateful to him for taking that step of restraint.

This President has been unique in modern history in not blindly deferring to the military industrial complex. I thank him for that and salute his willingness to stand behind our brave men and women.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. BRAUN. I rise to speak today because I just finished up visiting all 92 counties in our home State, and every one of them, especially at the tail end, have backed what we have been doing here, especially following the lead of President Trump.

When it comes to the particular issue of Syria, I think it begs the question when people say it green-lighted what occurred there. What would the reaction have been had we not gotten out of harm's way? I am guessing it would have been a bigger fiasco in many different dimensions.

The minority leader indicated that Mr. PAUL's idea was horrible. I want to make the point that, collectively, over the last 40 to 50 years, we have been engaged all the way back to the Vietnam war, where we have been adventuresome and have done it where we have not paid for it, and we are now in a pickle. That is why I was for what the President decided to do. You cannot continue being engaged like this when running trillion-dollar deficits—$22 trillion in debt. Hoosiers understand that, and most Americans do as well.

So I am going to support RAND PAUL's amendment, and I am glad that the President finally had the guts to do what most Americans have been for, and I am disappointed that the other side in any other situation would have been for that exact action.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator for Wisconsin.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 2598

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I rise today on behalf of nearly 25,000 workers and retirees in Wisconsin who have paid into the Central States Pension Fund. More than 4 years ago, thousands of Wisconsinites started receiving letters in the mail telling them that their pensions—which they had worked for, planned on, and earned—would not be paid out in full as was promised to them.

Instead, those letters said their pensions would be slashed by 50 percent, 60 percent, or sometimes 70 percent. Since then, those retirees have organized. They have organized at home. They have called on their Members of Congress. They have come to Washington countless times to remind us of the promises that were made when they earned their pensions and to fight for a solution to the pending crisis.

I have been proud to work side-by-side with these Wisconsin workers and retirees, and with my colleague Senator BROWN to introduce the Butch Lewis Act.

This legislation will put failing multiemployer pension plans, including Central States, back on solid ground, and it does so without cutting the pensions that retirees have earned. It does so without cutting the pensions retirees have earned. This is not just good policy for workers and retirees because putting these pensions back on strong footing would also protect the small businesses that employed them from the threat of closing their doors if these plans are allowed to fail.

Compounding this looming crisis is the reality that the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, known as the PBGC—the government's insurance for multiemployer pension plans like Central States—is on its own path to insolvency by 2025. This week, I reintroduced legislation to help address the financial challenges of the PBGC. The Pension Stability Act would add funding to the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation's multiemployer program by imposing a fee on financial firms convicted of financial crimes.

This weekend, I was in Endeavor, WI, with retirees who meet once a month at the fire station to update one another on our progress here in Washington. I have been to many, many such meetings like that across the State. In the months since the House passed the Butch Lewis Act, there hasn't been much other progress to speak of. The Senate hasn't taken up the bill, no other proposals have been offered, and all the while, retirees and workers in the Central States Pension Fund continue to doubt their retirement security.

Today, I am asking my colleagues in the Senate to join me and pass my Pension Stability Act and to help generate new revenue to help safeguard the retirement security of millions of Americans. If Washington does not act, workers and retirees will face massive cuts to the pensions they have earned over decades of hard work. I have come to the floor many times to remind this body about the retirees—some of whom stand to lose more than 50 percent of their pensions—and still, nothing has been done. So I am here once again to remind my colleagues that this is about a promise that must be kept.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the HELP Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. 2598 and the Senate proceed to its

immediate consideration; further, that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I thank and commend my friend and distinguished colleague, the Senator from Wisconsin, for her work on this effort. I am not familiar with this legislation. I don't serve on the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee. I have friends who do. I have friends who couldn't be here today but who have asked me to voice objection on their behalf.

On behalf of the senior Senator from Tennessee, Senator ALEXANDER, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Wisconsin.

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. President, my message to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle today is simple: If you will continue to object to my proposal to help shore up the PBGC and the proposals from me and other Democratic colleagues to put failing multiemployer pensions back on solid ground, then please bring up your own plans. Bring your ideas to the table, and let's work together to solve this pension crisis and protect the retirement security of Americans because just objecting to our plans is not an option for the 25,000 workers and retirees I am representing here today. Doing nothing is not an option. If we don't act, we will be breaking a promise made to 1.5 million workers and retirees nationwide. Pension promises must be kept.

Once again, I will say Washington needs to act, and we need to do it now.

I yield back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H.R. 1044

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I rise yet again today to speak about an issue near and dear to my heart and an issue that has become the focus of many of my passions here in the Senate, and that is the Fairness for High-Skilled Immigrants Act. This is an important and overwhelmingly bipartisan piece of legislation. It is a piece of legislation that passed the House in July by an overwhelming vote of 365 to 65.

Two of these things should strike the American people as remarkable: No. 1, that something with that much of a bipartisan margin passed in the House of Representatives, and No. 2, that it deals with immigration, and it was still that overwhelmingly bipartisan.

As I explained in this Chamber before, the concept of this legislation is simple. Our current method for allocating green cards caps the total number of green cards that nationals of any one country may receive. In practice, this results in severe de facto discrimination on the basis of country of origin. Immigrants from countries with large populations are restricted to receiving the same number of visas as immigrants from smaller countries. Their wait times have ballooned, in some cases stretching out literally for decades. The problem compounds over time, and it has become even more unfair than it was many decades ago when it was first enacted into law.

I repeat, this happens for absolutely no reason other than the country in which the immigrant was born. Let's say that two immigrants—one from India and the other from Germany—with the exact same skills, the exact same degrees, and the exact same job experience apply at the same hour of the same day for an employment-based green card. The German might wait maybe 12 months to receive a green card. Well, the Indian applicant will almost certainly wait a decade or far more. This kind of system is antithetical to American values and to the interest our country has in recruiting the very best and the very brightest from around the world irrespective of race, religion, or country of origin.

It is simply unacceptable that in 2019 our immigration system still contains country-of-origin discrimination as a defining feature. The per-country caps simply must go. They are wrong. They were never good policy. Whatever policy they might have had in mind decades ago, it escapes me—except, in fact, that the policy itself was wrong at the outset. It has become more wrong over time as these problems have compounded.

The obviousness of the moral error embedded within this legislation is more profound and easily visible today than it has ever been. If you were to describe this to anyone, they would scratch their head and say: Why would you want to do that unless you are engaging in some type of discrimination that we as a country understandably abandoned a long time ago and should no longer embrace?

The harm inflicted by any kind of invidious discrimination, whether it be on the basis of race or sex or country of origin, does not exist simply in the abstract, in the ether; the human suffering caused by it happens to be real and heartbreaking.

Although, in the time we have here this afternoon to discuss this, I am sure I can't come anywhere close to doing justice to all the people who are being harmed by the per-country cap system, I would like to share at least a few of their stories so that you understand how this law operates. I find that when you tell stories about a law, people understand the law and they understand what needs to change about the law a lot more than they would have otherwise.

Agna Hingu is a registered nurse who lives in South Jordan, UT, currently working at a nonprofit healthcare organization in Utah. She received her bachelor's degree in this country. She has lived in this country for the past 10 years. Languishing in the decade-long backlog, she is now being forced to consider leaving the United States due to the continuous uncertainty of her immigration status and the incessant renewals of temporary visas. If she leaves, she will take her talents and her training with her, depriving Utah's residents of a smart, skilled, kind, and caring nurse.

Ashish Patel first came to Utah legally in 2005 on a temporary high-skilled work visa. Since that time, he has worked hard at his job, paid taxes, followed the law, got married, and had two kids, both of whom were born as American citizens. In February of 2011, Mr. Patel's petition to earn a green card was approved. Despite this and despite the fact that 8, going on 9 years have now elapsed, his green card remains unissued. Why? Well, solely because of the arbitrary, wrong, discriminatory per-country caps. Ashish Patel is still in the backlog even as immigrants of other countries who have applied years and years after he did and years and years after he received his approval have already been granted permanent resident status. If Mr. Patel had emigrated from any country in the world other than India, he would already have his green card today.

Dr. Chaitanya Mamillapalli is an endocrinologist who has been serving in central Illinois for the past 9 years. He came to the United States in 2007. He will likely not receive his green card for at least another decade. His daughter was 1 year old when she came with her parents to this country. In a few years, she will age out of her temporary visa, and Dr. Mamillapalli will face a decision that confronts many people stuck in the backlog community: Does he separate from his daughter as she loses her temporary status, or does he abandon his life in the United States in order to keep his family together?

Dr. Priya Shanmugam lives in Louisiana and is an aerospace engineer who studied at the University of Alabama and at UCLA. She dreams of working for NASA. After 13 years in the backlog, she is still waiting for a green card. As a result of that, she cannot fulfill her dream of joining America's space team and helping put the first person on Mars. Until she finally gets her green card, our country will continue to lose out on her talent.

Dr. Krishnendu Roy is a professor of computer science and head of the Department of Computer Science at Valdosta State University in Georgia. He studied for his degree in Louisiana and has lived in the United States for over 16 years. During that time, he shaped the lives of countless students in Georgia through the classes he teaches by organizing computing camps for K–12 students and by mentoring the robotics team in his community. He has followed the law, and he has done exactly what is required of him under our immigration system in order to earn his green card. Yet he remains stuck in the

backlog, with no end to his wait in sight.

Dr. Sri Obulareddy is an oncologist working just outside Dickinson, ND, who came to the United States in 2006. She moved to North Dakota because the area is experiencing a shortage of specialized physicians. Her impact on the community has been invaluable. Recently, she tried to return from a trip to India, but approval for her visa was delayed for 6 weeks, forcing her patients to travel as far as 100 miles as they scrambled the find a temporary physician. The pain this caused her patients would never have come about if she had not been subjected to an arbitrary, discriminatory cap based on her country of origin and had already received her green card.

Ash Kannan lives in Oklahoma. His story is a heartbreaking example of the devastating effects of the long wait for a green card and the effects that a family can endure under this system. Ash and his wife lost their toddler son to a congenital disease about 3 years ago. The illness that took their son could have been treated had they been able to move to a different home, one closer to the medical facility that provided the necessary treatment. They were unable to do so, and their son was thus unable to receive the care he required, that he needed, because Ash was forced to remain with the same employer while he waited in the green card backlog and, consequently, was unable to move.

These are just some of the names and stories of some of the hard-working, law-abiding immigrants who have come to the United States to build lives and to contribute to our communities but who have been told that because of the countries in which they were born, they have to wait decades in the green card backlog before they can start living the American dream.

These stories stir us to action, and they darned well should. They should remind us that while policymaking is often messy and complicated, it is sometimes simple and straightforward because sometimes you stumble across something that is a good idea. Sometimes you stumble across something that was a bad idea that was put into law decades ago that should be taken out of the law. Sometimes the solution to our problems is clear and beyond question. In those cases, all we need is the will to act.

I have yet to hear someone offer a reasoned defense of the per-country caps as meritorious or sound public policy on their own terms, and that is because there is no such defense, at least not one that anyone would be willing to defend in public. Country-of-origin discrimination, whether it be in our immigration system, in our justice system, in the employment context, or in housing, is wrong and inconsistent with the values upon which our country was founded. It becomes even more repugnant when its human consequences are as obvious and tragic and focused on people of a particular country of origin as they are here.

With respect to the ancestors of the people now serving in this body, what if there had been something in place that had arbitrarily and unfairly discriminated against people from England, Ireland, Scotland, Wales, Denmark, or other countries from which people have been immigrating to America for centuries?

We should think about that for a moment and think about how we would never have been able to have enjoyed the blessings of America. I think it is equally wrong for us to identify a single country that we punish, that we exclude uniquely against other countries of origin in the context of employment-based immigrant visas.

I understand and recognize that while the per-country caps themselves are completely indefensible—and they are—some people have concerns about how eliminating the caps might impact fraud and abuse within the H–1B system. That is a legitimate concern.

To address those very concerns in this Congress, I have negotiated with Senator GRASSLEY an amendment to the Fairness for High-Skilled Immigrants Act to include some new protections for American workers in how we process applications for H–1B visas.

The amendment does three things. First, the Grassley amendment would strengthen the Department of Labor's ability to investigate and enforce labor application requirements. In addition, it reforms the labor condition application process to ensure the complete and adequate disclosure of information regarding the employers' H–1B hiring practices. Finally, it closes off loopholes by which employers could otherwise circumvent the annual cap on H–1B visa workers.

These are important and worthy reforms that I was happy to add to the bill. Indeed, we saw an example just last month of the positive impact these reforms would have. In September, Immigration and Customs Enforcement announced a $2.5 million settlement with an Indian consulting firm for H–1B visa fraud. That firm was exploiting the so-called ''B–1 in lieu of H–1B'' loophole. One of the new provisions we added to the bill this Congress would help close that specific loophole.

Importantly, the Grassley amendment, like the underlying bill, consists of provisions that have long enjoyed support from Members of both sides of the aisle. They are drawn primarily from an H–1B reform bill that has been championed by both Senator GRASSLEY and Senator DURBIN. They are also modeled, in large part, on an amendment to the Fairness for High-Skilled Immigrants Act that Senator SCHUMER negotiated with Senator GRASSLEY in a previous Congress.

I am grateful that Senator GRASSLEY was able to come to the table and work with me and others in good faith on a reasonable compromise to this bill. I believe the deal we struck is a fair and even-handed way to address longstanding concerns about our H–1B system, while eliminating country-of-origin discrimination in how we allocate skills-based green cards.

As I have said in the past, there is no question that immigration, if not the single most politically fraught issue, is one of the most politically fraught issues in Congress right now. That makes it all the more important for us to at least come together to get something done in those areas in which we can find common ground. It is a little bit like eating an elephant. You can't swallow the whole thing at once, either the elephant or the donkey. You have to do it one bite at a time. Why not start with an area in which there is broad-based, bipartisan agreement? That is what this bill is. The Fairness for High-Skilled Immigrants Act is an important step toward common ground.

Unquestionably, there are broader debates on immigration policy being had in Congress and across the country right now. Some wish to reform our immigration system by increasing the number of green cards we issue while others wish to move to a more merit-based system. That debate is almost certainly not going to be resolved this day, today, or this month or this year or, perhaps, even during this Congress.

Notably, however, many Senators on both sides of that debate—ardent champions of both liberal and conservative immigration reforms, who ordinarily could not be farther apart when it comes to immigration policy—are cosponsors of the Fairness for High-Skilled Immigrants Act. The reason this is the case is that they recognize that regardless of what else we might do to reform our immigration system, country-of-origin discrimination is outdated, outmoded, immoral, morally indefensible, and inconsistent with our values. It is also a problem that we can solve right now.

The other reason the Fairness for High-Skilled Immigrants Act has been so successful in attracting support from both sides of the aisle and from every end along the political continuum is that we have scrupulously avoided the typical poison pill provisions that so often doom attempts at immigration reform. We have also quite carefully avoided this becoming about so many things that it is going to become controversial no matter what.

This bill is not comprehensive immigration reform. It is not anything close to that. That is, in fact, why this bill is something that we can get done right now. It is the reason it was able to pass the House of Representatives with 365 votes.

While it does not fix many of the other flaws that plague other components of our broken, outdated, outmoded, Elvis Presley, Buddy Holly-era immigration law system, it is a great and important step toward reform. If we are ever going to have a chance at

modernizing and repairing our immigration laws, we need to recognize that we cannot necessarily solve all of our problems at once. The fact that this is the case should not stand in our way of starting the work the American people sent us here to do.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 1044 and that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration. I ask unanimous consent that the Lee amendment at the desk be agreed to, that the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time and passed, and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, in reserving the right to object, as I understand it, we have only 6 minutes until the rollcall vote, and I don't want to inconvenience my colleagues.

I would like to ask permission from the Senator of Utah to make my unanimous consent request the first item of business after the rollcall vote is announced.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the Senator for Illinois' request?

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, in reserving the right to object, I want to make sure I understand that the Senator wants to make his live UC request after the rollcall vote.

Mr. DURBIN. That is correct.

Mr. LEE. There is no objection.

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

Is there objection to the original request?

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, in reserving the right to object, I would say the following: I have been on the floor of the Senate more often than any other Senator to ask for immigration reform. Our system is broken. As we debate this important issue, the Galleries are filled with people who are following this debate personally because it literally affects their lives and their families and their futures. This Senator has been willing to move forward on comprehensive immigration reform. Sadly, the Senator on the other side has not supported that. I hope he will consider doing it.

In the meantime, though, what are we going to do about the current issue of an annual quota of no more than 140,000 EB immigrant visas and more than 500,000 applicants of Indian descent who are asking for permission to move forward with EB–2 green cards and their lives?

What the Senator from Utah has suggested is that we shouldn't increase the 140,000 annual cap. I think that is wrong. If you follow Senator LEE's proposal and do exactly what he says—give these visas only to those who are waiting in line who are of Indian descent and give no visas to the rest of the world—in 10 years, there will still be over 165,000 people of Indian descent waiting in line, and the rest of the world will have been excluded. This is unfair. It doesn't make sense.

I will offer a unanimous consent request to lift that 140,000 cap, and within 5 years, all who are waiting in line will get their chances for green cards—5 years—but not at the expense of the rest of the world. Let's do this in a fair fashion. While we are at it, it is unfair that your spouses and children are being counted when it comes to the 140,000. My bill exempts that. They are no longer going to be bound by any quota.

Secondly, if your children are aging out, if they are reaching the age of 21—a new legal status and new worries for you and your family—I eliminate that problem completely. My approach is one that will solve the problem by lifting the legal immigration for talented people like many who have gathered here today.

The Senator from Utah says he can't support that. I hope he will reconsider. Lifting that cap is what we need to do—lifting the country quotas, making certain that those in line finally get their chances. This is all within 5 years, which is something the underlying bill does not do. So I hope the Senator from Utah will agree to my bill that I will be offering as an alternative after this rollcall vote.

I object to this bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, how much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I will be brief.

Just as the per-country cap system is a quintessential example of the poorly designed, broken system and of what a poorly designed broken system looks like, the objection that we have heard today is, I fear, emblematic of the broken state of affairs that we face when it comes to the immigration process.

I mentioned earlier that one of the reasons this bill has been able to achieve as much support and as many cosponsors as it has and why it was able to pass the House of Representatives with 365 votes is that we have avoided poison pill efforts. The adjustment of the overall numbers that my friend and distinguished colleague from Illinois has proposed would doom this bill. He knows that it would doom this bill.

To what avail? To what end? What good would it do to doom this bill?

The fact still remains that regardless of where we put the overall number for employment-based green cards, we still have a problem in that we are treating people from India unfairly, arbitrarily, and discriminatorily. This has impacts everywhere. In Illinois today, there are over 40,000 green card applicants, plus their spouses and children, who are stuck in an interminable green card backlog that is morally indefensible.

We must change this. I hope and I encourage my colleague to change his mind. We can pass this today. We could make our country a better place as a result.

Thank you.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, is there any time remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is no time remaining.

S.J. RES. 54

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, in February of this year, Senator UDALL and I joined in introducing a resolution to terminate the national emergency declaration. On March 14, 59 Members of this body joined together in a strong bipartisan majority to pass the companion House Resolution and send it to the President. Unfortunately, the President chose to veto that resolution, and the House vote to override the veto fell short.

Last month, a bipartisan majority again came together in the Senate to pass a resolution introduced by Senator UDALL, Senator SHAHEEN, and myself to reverse the President's national emergency declaration. Unfortunately, but not unexpectedly, the President has chosen to veto this resolution again, and we will be voting shortly on whether to override that veto.

Before we do so, I would like to take a few minutes to speak to the fundamental issue raised by the emergency declaration: It directly conflicts with the ''power of the purse'' vested in Congress by the Framers of our Constitution.

The question presented by this veto of the resolution is not whether you are for a border wall or against a border wall, nor is the question whether you believe security at our southern border should be strengthened or whether it is sufficient.

In fact, the question is, simply; Do we want the executive branch, now or in the future, to hold the power of the purse, a power the Founders deliberately entrusted to Congress?

Throughout our history, the courts have consistently held that ''only Congress is empowered by the Constitution to adopt laws directing monies to be spent from the U.S. treasury.'' This view is central to several ongoing cases challenging the President's national emergency declaration.

I have consistently supported funding for the construction of physical barriers and strengthening security on our southern border. I will continue to support those efforts and believe that they are important, but I cannot support the President unilaterally deciding to take money that has been appropriated for one purpose and diverting that money for another purpose.

The system of checks and balances established by the Founders gives Congress the power to protect our authority on our own. That is what this resolution does, and I urge my colleagues

to support it by voting to override the President's veto.

VOTE ON S.J. RES. 54

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 54) pass, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding?

The yeas and nays are mandatory.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY), the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN), the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN), and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) would have voted ''yea,'' the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY) would have voted ''nay,'' the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) would have voted ''nay,'' and the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) would have voted ''nay''.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), 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 36, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 325 Leg.]

YEAS—53

Baldwin	Hirono	Rosen
Bennet	Jones	Rubio
Blumenthal	Kaine	Schatz
Blunt	King	Schumer
Brown	Leahy	Shaheen
Cantwell	Lee	Sinema
Cardin	Manchin	Smith
Carper	Markey	Stabenow
Casey	Menendez	Tester
Collins	Merkley	Toomey
Coons	Murkowski	Udall
Cortez Masto	Murphy	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Murray	Warner
Durbin	Paul	Warren
Feinstein	Peters	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Portman	Wicker
Hassan	Reed	Wyden
Heinrich	Romney	

NAYS—36

Barrasso	Fischer	McSally
Blackburn	Gardner	Risch
Boozman	Graham	Roberts
Braun	Grassley	Rounds
Burr	Hawley	Sasse
Capito	Hoeven	Scott (FL)
Cotton	Hyde-Smith	Scott (SC)
Cramer	Inhofe	Shelby
Crapo	Johnson	Sullivan
Daines	Kennedy	Thune
Enzi	Lankford	Tillis
Ernst	McConnell	Young

NOT VOTING—11

Alexander	Cruz	Moran
Booker	Harris	Perdue
Cassidy	Isakson	Sanders
Cornyn	Klobuchar	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 53, the nays are 36.

Two-thirds of the Senators voting, a quorum being present not having voted in the affirmative, the joint resolution, on reconsideration, fails to pass over the veto of the President of the United States.

The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I asked unanimous consent before the rollcall to be recognized to make a unanimous consent request. I would like to take that opportunity now, unless there is some other item of business before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is none.

The Senator from Illinois.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 2603

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, let's start with math, basic math, Andrew Yang math. Here is what it boils down to. Each year, we have 140,000 employment-based visas issued in the United States—140,000. A decision was made several years ago that politicians were playing favorites, picking countries that would get more of one and more of another, and so they put in country quotas, country caps—7 percent. I will do the math, being a liberal arts lawyer. It is about 10,000 per year, per country—no more than 10,000 per country, per year, if 7 percent of the total is our cap.

The problem is obvious. There are some 520,000 people of Indian descent in the United States who came here legally on H–1B visas, for example, who have worked here for a period of time, and who now want to stay in the United States. From this Senator's point of view, you are welcome. We need you. You brought extraordinary skills that we need to our country. I want you to stay. But many have found that they get into a queue that is so long, and because of the limitations of the cap, they can't even imagine living long enough to ever get the green card they are waiting for, the green card that can ultimately lead to citizenship.

Senator LEE comes to the floor with a bill, and his bill says as follows: We are going to take care of those waiting in line, which is primarily over half a million of Indian descent, and we will close down immigration from other countries during this period of time, EB–2 visas. So it would be to the benefit of those of Indian descent, who are the vast majority of those waiting in line, but at the cost of every other country in the world that has anyone who can come in and qualify for an EB–2 visa. Even his approach that I just described—if you follow it through, at the end of 10 years, there would still be 165,000 people of Indian descent still waiting in line in 10 years. That is not fair. It is not right.

Last Sunday, I had a meeting in Schaumburg, IL. As I came to the meeting—it was a Democratic Party breakfast—there were about 200 people standing with signs with my name on them. That will wake you up on a Sunday morning. They were there to say: DURBIN, don't stop LEE's bill.

I met with many of them afterward. I would have met with all of them. I am prepared to. One of them told me a story. He is a physician from my hometown of Springfield, IL. He brought his 12-year-old daughter along with him, a beautiful young girl.

He said: Senator, I am waiting in line. I don't know if I will ever get a green card. What is going to happen with my daughter when she reaches age 21? She can no longer be my dependent and stay in the United States. What is going to happen to her? Is she supposed to go back to India? In the meantime, how is she going to go to college? What is her status in this country?

These are perfectly legitimate questions. I have an answer for all of these questions, and I will tell you what it is.

First, we lift the 140,000 cap. That is what is holding us back here. Why is 140,000 of these EB visas a year a magic number? It is not. We are a nation of 350 million people. We have at least a million legal immigrants coming in each year. To expand the cap for those who are seeking the EB visas beyond 140,000 to people with skills who are already living in the United States and who want to stay here and continue to work is perfectly reasonable to me.

That is what my bill proposes, and it does two other things. This bill also says that we are not going to count your dependents when it comes to the annual quotas. So if it is 140,000, we are talking about the actual breadwinners—140,000. If you are married, have a spouse and two children, you are not seeking four of these visas—only one—and your spouse and dependents automatically come along with you, in my bill. They are not counted against the 140,000.

The third point: When you make application, it freezes in place, for legal reasons, the status of your dependents. So if it takes 2 or 3 years, and that daughter of yours becomes 21 years of age, it is no different—she is still going to come in with you based on your application.

To me, that is a reasonable way of approaching it. I have said to my friends in the Indian-American community, in the Indian community in Illinois: I am not against your being here. I want you to be here. I have an approach that will allow you to be a part of our future. You have been an important part of America to this point. I want you to continue to be, and my approach will allow it.

Senator LEE of Utah comes to the floor and says: DURBIN, if you lift that 140,000 cap, you will doom this bill.

I have just spoken to him, and I have several times. I will not doom this bill if he will support it. If he, as a Republican, will gather support for this bill, we can lift the number of people who will be eligible under these skilled immigrant visas to be part of America's future. We can do that together.

I am finding, even as I talk to Republican colleagues here, that they feel we should be opening up the skilled visa opportunities for legal immigration.

The sentiment is growing, and it should. I want people who have real skills that they either learned in the United States or earned in the United States to be part of the growth of our economy and the future and part of America. When it comes to diversity, count me in.

My mother was an immigrant to this country, brought here at the age of 2. Her son stands right here with a full-time government job. That is the American dream, right? I basically believe in immigration, and I believe in the diversity of America. But what will not work and what will not succeed is the notion that we can somehow favor just one group from one country at the expense of every other country.

We found that what has happened since Senator LEE started moving forward with this is we have people from a variety of different countries around the world saying: You mean you are going to cut us off entirely? We can't have any EB–2 visas for 10 years? You are saying that is going to apply to Canada, Mexico, the European nations, and all of Asia as well? That is unfair. Why would you cut us off to give opportunity to those from India? That isn't fair.

We have to have a more balanced approach. I think my approach resolves that and will solve that. I ask Senator LEE to consider it.

I would also say to him—in the course of bringing this measure to the floor, Senator LEE has been negotiating with Members of his own political party. That is all right. I understand that. I have been in this business for a while. But he should be talking to people on both sides of the aisle. What he has given are so-called carve-outs to the 140,000. I probably wouldn't argue with any single carve-out in substance if he wants to give them to nurses or medical professions, but each time he makes a carve-out to the 140,000, he lengthens the long waiting period for those of Indian descent.

As far as I am concerned, the real answer is to increase legal immigration to the United States. My bill would do that. It will take the country caps off, take the 140,000 cap off. It would open the door for those who have been waiting in line—and many have for years, if not decades. Stop discriminating against their children. Through no fault of their own, they have been stuck in the line with them. Their legal status shouldn't change. And don't count the dependents—the spouses and children—against the quota, whatever the number might be in the future.

I think that is a reasonable way to do this, but to do that, you have to accept one premise: that immigration is good for America. I believe it is. I believe it always has been. I think the diversity of this country is its strength. People come from every corner of the Earth, ready to make great personal and family sacrifices so that they and certainly their children will have a chance they never would have had where they were born. That is the key to what is different about this country and why we should honor it.

Let's not apologize for increasing legal immigration, particularly of people with proven skills. Let's celebrate that they want to be part of America's future.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Judiciary Committee be discharged from S. 2603 and that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration; further, that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, the request the Senator is describing is not one that can pass the body and certainly is not one that can pass this body unanimously.

He is absolutely right. My friend and distinguished colleague from Illinois is correct in noting that I have had conversations and negotiations with Republicans, and I have also had conversations and negotiations with Democrats. I have been working on this for nearly 9 years. At every moment, we have made concessions to people on both sides of the aisle.

I wish the solution he is offering today were something that could allow us to pass the Fairness for High-Skilled Immigrants Act. Alas, it is not.

I would note that it is not as though this is something new or objectionable or even something that the passage of which would amount to a concession on his part. For one thing, the Fairness for High-Skilled Immigrants Act is a bill that he was an original cosponsor of in a previous Congress. This is his bill. You might ask what is different about the bill he championed a few years ago and the substitute amendment I put forward earlier today. The answer is that, aside from a short subsection that temporarily alleviates nursing shortages in parts of this country, the only thing we have changed is that we have added a variety of new provisions to combat some abuse in the H–1B program.

As I have said, these provisions are drawn almost verbatim from the Durbin-Grassley H–1B reform bill, of which my colleague from Illinois has long been the lead Democratic cosponsor.

The only other thing that has changed from the time when the Senator from Illinois would have stood by my side instead of in opposition and helped to pass this bill is the problem that he sought to solve when he supported this bill. That very same problem still exists and has gotten worse.

As I indicated earlier, there are 40,000 green card applicants in Illinois alone, plus there are thousands of children stuck in this awful backlog. These are individuals whose children are aging out of their temporary visas, and they are forced to return to a country they left behind long ago—a country that, in many cases, their children don't know and have never known.

To repeat, the amendment that I offer today and that has been the subject of some of my colleague's remarks this afternoon in his unanimous consent request consists of nothing more than the Fairness for High-Skilled Immigrants Act, of which my colleague from Illinois was once a leading sponsor, and a series of H–1B reforms that he himself has long sought to enact. If passed, it would provide relief to many hard-working families from both his State and for mine. Yet he objects. As he objects, he offers up something else that he knows cannot possibly get close to passing this body by unanimous consent. Yet we can do that today. We can do that right now if he would lift his objection. He knows that I cannot, and I will not, and on that basis, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I would like to make two points regarding the comments from my friend from Utah. I know he has to leave for another appointment.

The first point I want to make is that what I support today is what I introduced and voted for when 68 Senators, Democrats and Republicans, passed a comprehensive immigration reform bill, which he opposed.

I hope that shows my good faith and intent when it comes to this issue. I am not just thinking of something today that has never been considered on the Senate floor. It has passed on the Senate floor in a previous Senate, and I think it can pass again with your active support.

The second point I want to make is this. For us to have dueling unanimous consent requests and both to object in this debate is really unfair to the people who have gathered in this Gallery today, as well as those who are following this debate on television with literally the fate of their family and future again in our hands.

I would like to ask you a favor to consider the following. When Senator KENNEDY objected on your behalf yesterday, or the day before, in a similar manner, he suggested that we push this issue forward for a hearing in the Subcommittee on Border Security and Immigration of the Committee on the Judiciary where we both serve. That committee is not overworked. It considered one bill this year and no amendments. So let us try to prevail on the chairman of that subcommittee to have a hearing on this subject and to bring out all the facts before the subcommittee and the full committee in the hopes that we can find some sort of reasonable, bipartisan compromise. If you will join me in that request, I hope we can prevail on Senator GRAHAM and Senator CORNYN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I thank my colleague for his constructive observations there. With respect to the Gang of 8 legislation, yes, it passed through this body, and, yes, I voted against that, as did a number of my colleagues. My view is, that was a piece of legislation that while it entailed a lot of work by a lot of people who were trying to make things better, it was doomed at the outset for failure because the message of that bill and of those who were pushing it was essentially you either pass all of this bill and all of its reforms—a large number of which and the majority of which I agreed with—or you pass nothing. We were literally told that. It is either this entire package or it is nothing. We spent weeks in the Committee on the Judiciary debating it and discussing it. I personally proposed dozens of amendments to that.

What emerged at the end of that from the committee was a—this has been 6 years, so my colleague will forgive me if I don't remember the exact numbers. It was about a 700-page bill. When we got to the floor, what we debated and discussed was substituted out at the last minute. What we ended up getting was another bill that was, as I recall, 1,200 pages long. It was a different bill.

The message was the same with both of them. This is a package deal. You either reform all of what this bill reforms and do it at once or you get none of it. Many of the sponsors of that legislation made clear that they would oppose any smaller effort.

I believe this is exactly the opposite of the type of solution that will work. What is going to work here is if we start with incremental, step-by-step legislation. If we start with something the Senator from Illinois has himself in the past sponsored, both as to the Fairness for High-Skilled Immigrants Act itself and as to the substance, the nuts and bolts of the Grassley amendment—he has been on the cutting edge of supporting both of those things. If not here, where? If not us, who? If not now, when? This is what we need to do. I am going to continue to come to the floor. I am going to continue to seek unanimous consent and to pass this every way I can.

As to my colleague's suggestion with regard to a committee hearing. This hasn't, of course, been the topic of committee hearings in the past, and it has been fully discussed. I would, of course, welcome any further committee action that the chairman might choose to hold, and I would be happy to have any committee action that, of course, isn't mine to offer or give, but I would always prefer more consideration of the Fairness for High-Skilled Immigrants Act than less. So if that is what we have to do, great, but I don't believe any further factual development is necessary here.

Just for the record, I want to state this bill is ready to pass right now. This bill has 365 votes on the House floor right now. This bill would become law right now, would pass out of the Senate and would pass out of the Senate in a form that would be passed out of the House of Representatives, ultimately, right now but for this objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. The Senator from Utah is my friend, and we have worked closely together on important legislation. I trust him and respect him, though we disagree on some of the merits on this issue.

What I think I heard was an offer, which I am going to accept, of a good-faith, bipartisan request of the Committee on the Judiciary to have a hearing on this measure. It will be the first hearing on it, and I think it is long overdue.

In terms of the comprehensive immigration reform, I don't want to dwell on history, but we went through hundreds of amendments in Judiciary and scores of amendments on the floor. Everyone had their day in court and their opportunity to come up with a good idea, and, yes, it did come down to one bill at the end. You had to vote yes or no. I voted yes, and he voted the other way.

This bill is not even close to it in terms of deliberation and in terms of amendments and that process. So let's start the right way. Let's have a hearing. You have the majority party on the committee, so I am not going to pull anything over on you, but let's do it.

For the people who are following this and saying: Well, how did that end? Let us say to them it ended by both of us agreeing to pursue a committee hearing on this important subject as soon as possible and appealing to the chair of the Committee on the Judiciary to ask for that hearing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I thank my friend, the Senator from Illinois, and I appreciate his dedication to detail and to the hard work he has put into the area of immigration and reform.

Yes, you are right. That was a difficult process. It went through 6 years ago, and I commend you, even though you and I reached different conclusions as to the ultimate outcome of that legislation.

My point there is simply to say: It is, and properly should and always is, going to be the case that it can be easier to get something done that is more narrowly focused. In this case, we have a bill the Senator from Illinois has himself cosponsored in the past. It has been modified by another provision that he has also sponsored in the past. We should be able to do this one.

It is not my place to commit on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary or its chairman whether we are going to have hearings. I reiterate my view that no further factual development of this is necessary. I don't believe a hearing is necessary.

I am never going to object to simply holding more hearings on it, and if that is what the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary is inclined to do, I am certainly not going to interfere with that. In the meantime, I am going to continue to do everything I can to get this thing passed. It is ready to pass. It is ready to pass right now. I am going to continue to find every way possible to get this the consideration it deserves.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I am coming to the floor to speak on a different subject, but I do want to acknowledge that this is an issue I follow as well. I actually cosponsored Senator LEE's bill. I do hope what my friend from Illinois proposed, in terms of a process—that that process will take place and that we can get this legislation, or a variation thereof, passed through the Senate; that we deal with this issue is something I hear a lot from my constituents in Virginia—specifically, Northern Virginia.

Again, although no piece of legislation is perfect, I think the direction Senator LEE has put forward is one I carefully considered before I cosponsored the legislation. Again, the only way we are going to get this resolved is if we go through this process. Nobody on the Senate works harder on immigration issues and with more passion and willingness to get to yes on an issue than the Senator from Illinois, so I thank him for his work as well.

TRIBUTE TO VICTORIA BRAHM

Mr. President, I came down here today to address the question I came for, to actually continue the tradition of my friend Senator Ted Kaufman. I had the distinction of serving here as a staff member for a long time and filled in for a few years when Senator Biden became the Vice President of the United States.

What Senator Ted Kaufman did was he came, during his tenure in the Senate, on a regular basis, came to this floor and highlighted the contributions of exceptional Federal employees. He highlighted the work they do every day to make our Nation and communities safer, healthier, and stronger.

I came to the floor earlier this year to congratulate three Virginians who were recognized by the Partnership for Public Service as finalists for the Service to America Medals. Within the world of Federal employees, this award may not be as well known as the Oscars, but the award, the Service to America Medals, are known as the ''Sammies.''

During my time on the floor earlier, when I spoke about the Virginians who were nominated, I spoke about Ambassador Michael Kozak from Arlington, Kara De Castro from Haymarket, and John Wagner from Ashburn. Each of these public servants have made significant contributions to our national

security, as well as to global peace and human rights. We are indebted to them for their contributions, and I congratulate them again for their much deserved recognition as finalists.

Unfortunately, none of this year's winners hail from Virginia. Still, I want to congratulate the 2019 Federal Employee of the Year, Victoria Brahm from Wisconsin. Ms. Brahm is a career public servant who has spent more than 37 years working in the VA system.

Since 2015, she has served as the director of the Tomah VA Medical Center. When she arrived, the center was struggling with unsafe medical practices, high staff turnover, and other issues impacting the quality of care that veterans were receiving. In the years since her arrival, there has been a rise in patient satisfaction and a dramatic drop in the use of opioids and other prescription pain relievers.

Under Director Brahm's leadership, preventable inhospital complications have also dropped significantly, and the center has risen from one of the worst ranked hospitals in the VA system to the top 10 percent. This remarkable turnaround that is making life better for our veterans is due in many ways to the work of Ms. Brahm. Congratulations, Ms. Brahm, and thank you for your service.

Congratulations, as well, to all of this year's award winners who hail from around the country, not just Washington, DC. While the Federal workers we recognize today are exceptional, the truth is they are not the exception. Federal employees across the country dedicate their lives to serving the country, to protecting its people, and to making sure our tax dollars are properly spent.

Unfortunately, this commitment has not been honored by the Trump administration. In addition to the longest government shutdown in history, Federal workers have endured pay freezes, hiring freezes, bad-faith collective bargaining, and other efforts to dismantle our nonpolitical civil service. This is wrong. It is also unsustainable, and ultimately it will be everyday Americans who suffer the consequences of this administration's actions. If you drive out and drive down the morale of our workforce, the American people end up with a less good product.

I commit that I will continue fighting in the Senate to ensure this country is keeping its commitment to Federal workers because they deserve so much better than the treatment they have received recently.

FUTURE ACT

Mr. President, let me now, for a couple of moments, turn to another important issue where I fear we are not keeping our commitments, and that is our commitment to our Nation's historically Black colleges and universities, also known as HBCUs.

I will talk briefly in support of legislation introduced by my colleague from Alabama, Senator JONES, and my colleague from South Carolina, Senator SCOTT. The legislation they introduced is called the FUTURE Act.

The FUTURE Act would provide a 1-year reauthorization of the mandatory funding for HBCUs and other minority-serving institutions that already expired on September 30. This is a commonsense bipartisan fix that is fully paid for, and it would allow us to keep our commitment to institutions across the country that are educating historically underrepresented and underserved students.

Virginia is home to five outstanding HBCUs whose funding would be preserved by this legislation: Virginia State University, Norfolk State University, Hampton University, Virginia Union University, which I was proud, prior to my tenure in government, to serve on the board of, and Virginia University of Lynchburg. All told, these institutions received nearly $4 million in funding last year that is now at risk unless we pass the FUTURE Act.

I have letters of support here from the Presidents of Hampton, Norfolk State, and Virginia Union. These letters highlight the FUTURE Act and the importance of this funding to the representative universities.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these letters be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HAMPTON UNIVERSITY,
Hampton, VA, July 16, 2019.

Hon. MARK WARNER,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR WARNER: I am writing to request that you cosponsor S. 1279, the Fostering Undergraduate Talent by Unlocking Resources for Education (FUTURE) Act sponsored by Senator Doug Jones (D–AL) and Senator Tim Scott (R–SC). This bipartisan, bicameral bill was written to extend important mandatory funding for education in the sciences, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) in Title III, Part F of the Higher Education Act of 1965 until September 30, 2021.

Title III, Part F, benefits Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs) and other Minority-Serving Institutions (MSIs) by providing mandatory funds that allow these institutions to better serve their students in the STEM fields. As I am sure you are aware, a STEM education is crucial to the growth and continued development of our economy. Hampton University and other institutions have benefited greatly from the availability and usage of these funds.

A report released by the White House National Science and Technology Council stated that the ''national benefits of a strong STEM foundation cannot be fully realized until all members of society have equitable access to STEM education and [until] there is much broader participation by those historically underserved and underrepresented in STEM fields . . .'' The report goes on to highlight the importance of diversity in the workplace leading to more engaged, innovative, and higher-performing organizations. Hampton serves all students, some of whom are low-income, first generation post-secondary students of color; an underserved population. One benefit of funding through Title III, Part F is that it dlrectly helps achieve the goal of diversifying our workforce and ensuring more underrepresented students are entering STEM fields.

The mandatory funds included in Title III, Part F, were originally established by the College Cost Reduction and Access Act for the years of 2008–2009, retained in the Higher Education Opportunity Act of 2008, and then extended until 2019 in the Health Care Education and Reconciliation Act of 2010. All three pieces of legislation were passed in the House and Senate on a bipartisan basis showing support for this crucial stream of funding.

However, this stream of funding is scheduled to expire September 30, 2019. Therefore, it is imperative that this bill passes both Chambers and becomes law before the expiration date. Again, I ask that you cosponsor S. 1279 and help institutions of higher education, HBCUs in particular, continue to provide the much needed services to the students on our campuses.

With all good wishes,

WILLIAM R. HARVEY,
President.

NORFOLK STATE UNIVERSITY,
September 5, 2019.

Hon. MARK WARNER,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR WARNER: On behalf of Norfolk State University, I ask your support in cosponsoring S. 1279, the Fostering Undergraduate Talent by Unlocking Resources for Education (FUTURE) Act sponsored by Senator Doug Jones (D–AL) and Senator Tim Scott (R–SC). This bipartisan, bicameral bill would extend important mandatory funding for education in the sciences, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) in Title III, Part F of the Higher Education Act of 1965 until September 30, 2021.

The mandatory funding included in Title III, Part F, was established in 2008 by the College Cost Reduction and Access Act. The funding was later extended through authorizations in the Higher Education Opportunity Act of 2008, and the Health Care Education and Reconciliation Act of 2010. All three pieces of legislation passed in the House and Senate on a bipartisan basis with strong congressional support. Current funding will expire on September 30, 2019.

Title III, Part F, benefits Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs) and other Minority-Serving Institutions (MSIs) by providing mandatory funds that allow these institutions to support their students in the STEM fields. Whether it be innovations in cybersecurity, or emerging research in deep space exploration, Norfolk State University has a longstanding history of preparing students to excel in the STEM fields. Title III, Part F is a critical resource that has played an important role in NSU's success.

Continued funding for Title III, Part F is crucial to the growth and continued development of our economy and this University. Your cosponsorship and vote of support for S. 1279 is very much needed, and will represent a sound investment in America's future.

Sincerely,

JAVAUNE ADAMS-GASTON, PH.D.,
President.

VIRGINIA UNION UNIVERSITY,
August 6, 2019.

Hon. MARK WARNER,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR WARNER: I write to you today to ask you to cosponsor S. 1279, the Fostering Undergraduate Talent by Unlocking Resources for Education (FUTURE) Act sponsored by Senator Doug Jones

(D–AL) and Senator Tim Scott (R–SC). This bipartisan, bicameral bill was written to extend important mandatory funding for education in the sciences, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) in Title III, Part F of the Higher Education Act of 1965 until September 30, 2021.

Title III, Part F, benefits Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCU's) and other Minority-Serving Institutions (MSIs) by providing mandatory funds that allow these institutions to better serve their students in the STEM fields. STEM education is crucial to the growth and continued development of our economy, and my institution has benefited greatly from the availability and usage of these funds.

A report released by the White House's National Science and Technology Council said that the ''national benefits of a strong STEM foundation cannot be fully realized until all members of society have equitable access to STEM education and [until] there is much broader participation by those historically underserved and underrepresented in STEM fields . . .'' The report goes on to highlight the importance of diversity in the workplace leading to more engaged, innovative, and higher-performing organizations. Like my institution, HBCUs and MSIs serve all students, but primarily serve students who are low-income, first generation, and students of color, which would directly help achieve the goal of diversifying our workforce and ensuring more underrepresented students are entering the STEM fields.

The mandatory funds included in Title III, Part F were originally established by the College Cost Reduction and Access Act for the years of 2008–2009, retained in the Higher Education Opportunity Act of 2008, and then extended until 2019 in the Health Care Education and Reconciliation Act of 2010. All three pieces of legislation were passed in the House and Senate on a bipartisan basis showing support for this crucial stream of funding.

This stream of funding is scheduled to expire September 30, 2019, so it is imperative that this bill passes both Chambers and become law before the expiration date. Again, I ask that you co-sponsor S. 1279 and help me continue to provide the much-needed services to the students on my campus.

Sincerely,

HAKIM J. LUCAS, PH.D.,
President & CEO.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, recently our colleagues in the House passed this important legislation on a bipartisan basis. Now it is time for the Senate to do the same. Let's pass the FUTURE Act without further delay and then work together on a comprehensive reauthorization of the Higher Education Act.

As Dr. Harry Williams, president of the Thurgood Marshall College Fund, said, America's HBCUs ''simply do not have the time to wait for Congress to work out a deal.'' So let's put our broader policy differences aside for now and honor the commitments we made to HBCUs and other minority-serving institutions before Congress's inaction harms students in Virginia and around the country.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

BUDGET SCOREKEEPING REPORT

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I rise to announce a new use of an old requirement. I rise to speak about the latest Senate scorekeeping report which I filed this week in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is available to anyone online. This report could show overspending by committees and a number of other things. This is the first such report since I filed a current law budget for the fiscal year 2020 as authorized by the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2019.

This week's filing tracks the Senate's adherence to that current law budget and provides up-to-date budgetary information about the Federal Government for Congress and for the public. For the first time, a copy of the scorekeeping report can be found on the Senate Budget Committee's website to allow the American people to better track Congress's fiscal decision making. That is new.

Let me repeat that. For the first time, a copy of the scorekeeping report can be found on the Senate Budget Committee's website to allow the American people to better track Congress's decision making.

Since this is the first time the committee is posting the scorekeeping report on its website, I want to take this opportunity to explain the report for those taxpayers who are concerned, as I am, about our country's fiscal health and want to learn more.

I hope the people will look at the future months and each monthly report. A current-law budget allows the Senate to enforce the budget spending levels projected under current law. While it will not put us on a path to stabilizing our debt and deficits, like the levels approved by the Senate Budget Committee earlier this year would do, it tells the Congress to stop making our fiscal situation worse—to stop making our debt and deficits worse.

The scorekeeping report covers six primary areas. First, it shows whether authorizing committees are sticking to their allocation, which is just a fancy term for each committee's spending allowance. We track that for the 1-year, 5-year, and 10-year periods for this report. For the October 2019 report, all committees are in compliance and no breaches have been recorded since I filed the current-law budget on September 9. That is good news, though with our debt approaching $23 trillion, going a month on the budget is not something to pat ourselves on the back over, but it is a good start.

Second, the report tracks whether the Appropriations Committee is adhering to the discretionary spending limits imposed by the most recent Bipartisan Budget Act. For fiscal year 2020, the limit on regular discretionary spending for accounts in the defense category is $666.5 billion, and for the accounts in nondefense category, it is $621.5 billion. Since full-year appropriations measures for this fiscal year have not yet been enacted, the only budgetary effects recorded are for advanced or permanent appropriations made through our prior law.

Third, the scorekeeping report tracks changes in mandatory programs. We call that CHIMPS, which is used by the Appropriations Committee. That is so we are not using the very important wording of ''changes in mandatory programs,'' actually making changes in mandatory programs without people knowing. The Appropriations Committee uses those changes in mandatory programs to offset new discretionary spending each year. In recent years, the Budget Committee has ratcheted down the total amount of changes in mandatory programs that can be used in a given year in an effort to hold the line on spending.

This year's total limit is $15 billion—that is extra spending—and the report tracks the Appropriations Committee's adherence to that limit thus far. I know that many of my colleagues share my desire to finally end the practice of using changes in mandatory programs to inflate spending.

Fourth, the report tracks the amount of emergency and overseas contingency operations spending in appropriations bills. Emergency spending is not constrained by discretionary spending limits that I talked about, but it has the potential to cost hundreds of billions of dollars each year. To date, for fiscal year 2020, there has been $8 million worth of emergency budget authority adjustments. These adjustments are the result of agriculture provisions and the additional supplemental appropriations for the Disaster Relief Act of 2019. Emergencies don't count against the budget, but they do go to increased debt. There is no requirement to adjust the budget to pay for emergencies.

Fifth, included in the report is information provided to me by the Congressional Budget Office that compares topline spending and revenue amounts, known as aggregates, to the current-law budget levels. The report shows there is currently enough room on the spending aggregate to accommodate all outstanding regular appropriations and no additional room for revenue loss.

Finally, the report includes the current balances of the Senate's pay-go scorecard. Pay-go stands for ''pay as you go,'' a unique concept around here. In other words, was it paid for? If not, the report shows it on the scorecard. The Senate's pay-go scorecard, which is enforced with a 60-vote point of order, tracks the budgetary effects of legislation moving through Congress affecting mandatory spending and revenues. This report shows a zero balance on the Senate's pay-go scorecard due to the filing of new budgetary levels just last month.

As chairman of the Senate Budget Committee, I try to come to the floor regularly to sound the alarm about our country's unsustainable fiscal course. We are on a perilous path with the Congressional Budget Office projecting our debt and deficits to skyrocket in the coming years. Debt is the cumulative amount. Deficits are the annual amount.

The deficit for the fiscal year that ended September 30 reached $984 billion. While revenues were up $133 billion over the previous year, or 4 percent, compared to fiscal year 2018, spending was up $338 billion, or 7 percent, over the prior year. I can say that again. We overspent $984 billion. Revenues were up $133 billion, but spending was up $338 billion. The Congressional Budget Office projects the budget deficit for the current fiscal year to top $1 trillion. That is another trillion dollars added to our already high debt. That is overspending in spite of increased revenues.

We are long overdue for an honest conversation about the country's finances. I hope the Senate scorekeeping report can contribute in a small way to that conversation. I believe the more we allow the public to follow the dollars, the more pressure there will be on all of us to finally address our overspending problem. I truly hope all Members view this report and come to see it as a valuable tool for getting our books in order.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, our Democratic colleagues insist that despite their political differences with President Trump, they are still prepared to tackle important legislation and do our work for the American people.

Well, next week they will have an opportunity to prove it. Congress has fallen badly behind schedule on appropriations. It has been a month since my Democratic colleagues filibustered government funding on the floor, blocking defense funding and a pay raise for our servicemembers. We need to get moving. The country is watching. It is time to make progress.

So in just a moment, I will file cloture on motions to proceed to two government funding bills, setting up votes for next week.

In order to meet Democrats halfway, the first House shell we will vote on will be a package of domestic funding bills. If we can get bipartisan support to take up that domestic funding bill, we will stay on it until we complete it. I hope Chairman SHELBY and Senator LEAHY can work together to craft a bipartisan substitute amendment.

Afterward, we will turn to a second package, including the defense funding that our Armed Forces and commanders need, especially in this dangerous time and considering current events, plus resources for other priorities such as the opioid epidemic. So we will be voting next week, and I urge all of our colleagues to move in that direction. Let's make good on all the talk about bipartisanship and finally make progress toward funding the government.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

PROTOCOL TO THE NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY OF 1949 ON THE ACCESSION OF THE REPUBLIC OF NORTH MACEDONIA

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 5, Treaty Doc. No. 116–1.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The treaty will be stated.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Treaty document No. 116–1, Protocol to the North Atlantic Treaty of 1949 on the Accession of the Republic of North Macedonia.

AMENDMENT NO. 946

Mr. MCCONNELL. I have an amendment at the desk and ask the clerk to report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MCCONNELL] proposes an amendment numbered 946 to Treaty Doc. No. 116–1.

The amendment (No. 946) is as follows:

At the end add the following.

''This Treaty shall be effective 1 day after the date of ratification.''

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays have been ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 947 TO AMENDMENT NO. 946

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I have a second-degree amendment at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MCCONNELL] proposes an amendment numbered 947 to amendment No. 946.

The amendment (No. 947) is as follows:

Strike ''1 day'' and insert ''2 days''

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on treaties Calendar No. 5, Treaty Document No. 116–1, Protocol to the North Atlantic Treaty of 1949 on the Accession of the Republic of North Macedonia.

Mitch McConnell, David Perdue, John Cornyn, John Thune, John Hoeven, John Boozman, Thom Tillis, Steve Daines, Roger F. Wicker, Pat Roberts, John Barrasso, Richard Burr, Shelley Moore Capito, Roy Blunt, Mike Rounds, Mike Crapo, James E. Risch.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MCCONNELL. I move to proceed to legislative session.

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

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 441.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Andrew P. Bremberg, of Virginia, to be Representative of the United States of America to the Office of the United Nations and Other International Organizations in Geneva, with the rank of Ambassador.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Andrew P. Bremberg, of Virginia, to be Representative of the United States of America to the Office of the United Nations and Other International Organizations in Geneva, with the rank of Ambassador.

Mitch McConnell, Rick Scott, Roger F. Wicker, Tim Scott, John Hoeven, Deb Fischer, Thom Tillis, Cindy Hyde-Smith, Steve Daines, James M. Inhofe, Lindsey Graham, John Boozman, Mike Crapo, James E. Risch, Richard Burr, Shelley Moore Capito, Jerry Moran.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MCCONNELL. I move to proceed to legislative session.

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

The motion was agreed to.

MAKING APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE AND JUSTICE, SCIENCE, AND RELATED AGENCIES FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDING SEPTEMBER 30, 2020—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to Calendar No. 141, H.R. 3055.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BRAUN). The clerk will report the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 141, H.R. 3055, a bill 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.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk for the motion to proceed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 141, H.R. 3055, a bill 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.

Mitch McConnell, David Perdue, John Cornyn, John Thune, John Hoeven, John Boozman, Thom Tillis, Steve Daines, Roger F. Wicker, Pat Roberts, John Barrasso, Richard Burr, Shelley Moore Capito, Roy Blunt, Mike Rounds, Mike Crapo, James E. Risch.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I withdraw the motion to proceed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has that right.

MAKING APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDING SEPTEMBER 30, 2020—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to Calendar No. 140, H.R. 2740.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 140, H.R. 2740, a bill making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk for the motion to proceed.

The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 140, H.R. 2740, a bill making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes.

Mitch McConnell, David Perdue, John Cornyn, John Thune, John Hoeven, John Boozman, Thom Tillis, Steve Daines, Roger F. Wicker, Pat Roberts, John Barrasso, Richard Burr, Shelley Moore Capito, Roy Blunt, Mike Rounds, Mike Crapo, James E. Risch.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum call be waived.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

TURKEY AND SYRIA

Mr. ROMNEY. Mr. President, I rise today to address the current situation in Syria.

First, I welcome the Vice President's announcement of a cease-fire, which will prevent further loss of life. I hope the agreement is honored. But at the heart of this matter is a central question of why these terms and assurances were not negotiated before the President consented to withdraw our troops.

Let me briefly recount what has happened in the past 7 days since the United States announced our withdrawal. The Kurds, suffering loss of life and property, have allied with Assad, Russia has assumed control of our previous military positions, and the United States has been forced in many cases to bomb our own facilities to prevent their appropriation by Russia and Turkey.

The announcement today is being portrayed as a victory. It is far from a victory. Serious questions remain about how the decision was reached precipitously to withdraw from Syria and why that decision was reached.

Given the initial details of the cease-fire agreement, the administration must also explain what America's future role will be in the region, what happens now to the Kurds, and why Turkey will face no apparent consequences. Further, the cease-fire does not change the fact that America has abandoned an ally. Adding insult to dishonor, the administration speaks cavalierly, even flippantly, as our ally has suffered death and casualty. Their homes have been burned, and their families have been torn apart.

We know the truth about our Kurd allies. They lost 11,000 combatants in our joint effort to defeat ISIS. We dropped bombs from the air and provided intelligence and logistics behind the lines. The Kurds lost thousands of lives, and 86 brave Americans also lost their lives so tragically.

It is argued that the Kurds were fighting for themselves. Of course they were. That is the nature of an alliance. We fight together, each pursuing our own vital interests. America leaves no soldier behind, often at great cost in blood and treasure. We recover our dead and our wounded, and we free our men and women who are held captive. This is a matter of American honor and promise. So, too, is the principle that we stand by our allies, that we do not abandon our friends.

The decision to abandon the Kurds violates one of our most sacred duties. It strikes at American honor. What we have done to the Kurds will stand as a blood stain in the annals of American history.

There are broad strategic implications of our decision, as well. Iranian and Russian interests in the Middle East have been advanced by our decision at a time when we were applying maximum pressure on Iran. By giving them a stronger hand in Syria, we have actually weakened that pressure. Russia's objective to play a greater role in the Middle East has also been greatly enhanced. The Kurds, out of desperation, have now aligned with Assad. So America is diminished, and Russia, Iran, and Assad are strengthened.

So I ask how and why this decision was reached. I serve on the Foreign Relations Committee, and given the Syria decision taken by the administration, I might be forgiven for wondering why our committee even exists. I say this because apparently the decision to leave Syria was made without consultation with the committee or even with the committee chairman and ranking member.

Just 3 weeks ago, our subcommittee held hearings to receive an extensive analysis of the conditions and the way forward in Syria. It was presented to us by the Syria Study Group, a bipartisan, congressionally mandated commission tasked with providing an in-depth assessment of the conditions in Syria and to provide recommendations for American strategy going forward. So far as I am aware, the administration made no effort to contact those who attended that hearing or to speak with the Syria Study Group to be able to understand the content in their extensive published report.

I ask whether it is the position of the administration that the Senate—a body of 100 people representing both political parties—is to be entirely absent from decisions of the magnitude just taken in Syria.

Some argue that we should not have been in Syria in the first place because there was not a vote taken by the Senate to engage in war there. I disagree. Congress has given the President legal authority and funding to fight against terrorists in Syria.

However, for purposes of argument, even if one believed that no authorization had been given, that is really irrelevant to the decision as to the withdrawal once we have allied with a people—the Kurds—committed to defend them, and together defeated ISIS. Once you jump in the ocean to save a drowning soul, you don't turn around with the excuse that you didn't have to jump in in the first place. It is a matter of commitment.

Others argue that we should just get out of a messy situation like this. Middle East, they say, has had wars going on forever; just let them have at it. There is, of course, a certain logic to that position, as well, but again, it applies only to the original decision as to whether we should have gone into Syria. Once we have engaged and made the commitments we made, honor, as well as self-interest, demands that we not abandon our allies.

It has been suggested that Turkey may have called America's bluff—telling the President they were coming no matter what we did. If that is so, we should know it, for it would tell us a great deal about how we should deal with Turkey now and in the future.

Some have argued that Syria is simply a mess, with warring groups, subgroups, friends and allies shifting from one side to the other, and thus we had to exit because there was no reasonable path for us to go forward. Are we incapable of understanding and shaping complex situations? Russia seems to have figured it out. Are we less adept than they, and are our principles to be jettisoned when we find things get messy?

The administration claims that none of these reasons are accurate. Instead, the President has said that we left to fulfill a commitment to stop endless wars, to bring troops home, to get them out of harm's way, and perhaps to save money. I find these reasons hard to square. Why? Well, we withdraw 1,500 troops in Syria, but we are adding 2,000 troops in Saudi Arabia. All totaled, we have some 60,000 troops in the Middle East.

Assuming for the sake of understanding that getting out of endless wars was the logic for the decision, why would we take action so precipitously? Why would we not warn our ally, the Kurds, of what we were about to do? Why would we not give them time to also withdraw or perhaps to dig in to defend themselves? Clearly, the Turks had a heads-up because they were able to start bombing within mere hours. I simply don't understand why the administration did not explain in advance to Erdogan that it is unacceptable for Turkey to attack an American ally. Could we not insist that together we develop a transition plan that protects the Kurds, secures the ISIS prisoners, and meets the legitimate concerns of Turkey, as well? Was there no chance for diplomacy? Are we so weak and so inept diplomatically that Turkey forced the hand of the United States of America—Turkey? I believe it is imperative that public hearings be held to answer these questions, and I hope the Senate will be able to conduct those hearings next week.

I note in closing that I also hope the cease-fire agreement is honored and that Turkey ends its brutal killing, but I note that lives are already lost and American honor has already been tarnished. We once abandoned a redline; now we abandon an ally. We need answers. What has happened in Syria should not happen again. And we, the Senate, must take action to make sure that it does not.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I rise this afternoon to discuss the situation in Syria. Let me commend my colleague Senator ROMNEY for his very thoughtful and very timely and very important comments.

We all recognize that the situation in Syria is highly fluid. I think it is important to state the case with respect to the President's decision to acquiesce to President Erdogan's offensive against the Kurds. The President's decision is a disaster for our partners in the fight against ISIS and United States foreign policy more broadly.

While I welcome the temporary cease-fire announced a short time ago and hope that a permanent cease-fire can be achieved, it does not absolve President Trump of his responsibility for his betrayal of our Kurdish partners and his role in unleashing violence and instability in northern Syria. It is not clear whether Turkey made any concessions as part of the deal struck with the U.S. delegation or whether Kurdish forces will comply. If not, I am concerned that additional violence is likely to follow and we will have little leverage to prevent it. In fact, there is a quote attributed to the Turkish Foreign Minister, Mevlut Cavusoglu, by the White House reporter for CNN. She quotes the Turkish Foreign Minister as saying:

> This is not a cease-fire. We will pause the operation for 120 hours in order for the terrorists to leave. We will only stop the operation if our conditions are met.

So, indeed, even this supposed cease-fire may not materialize as a cease-fire.

But the reality is that the blood of many Kurds is on President Trump's hands, and thousands of hardened ISIS prisoners could be let loose as a result of his hasty and uninformed decision.

President Trump's decision to abandon our close partners also strengthens the hand of Erdogan, Putin, Assad, and Khamenei. Those are not friends; they are, in many cases, adversaries and antagonists.

Members of the administration claim that the U.S. Government opposed the Turkish incursion, but the President's own actions and statements make clear that he gave Erdogan a green light. The President ordered our military to begin a phased withdrawal from Syria last December—a decision that prompted the resignation of former Secretary of Defense Mattis and that surely gave the Turks the impression that he would fold when pressed by Erdogan. Not surprisingly, he did. In that phone call, Erdogan was pushing against an open door. He knew it. The President knew it. That is why the Turks went across the border.

Stating that we should let the Kurds and Turks fight it out because of their longstanding grievances, as the President has said repeatedly, betrays both our national security interests in the Middle East and our own American ideals.

It is shameful that the White House's statement that was released after the President's call with Erdogan did not even criticize the planned Turkish incursion or warn of potential consequences if it went forward. It wasn't until the following day, after a bipartisan and international outcry, that the President began to express any concerns about Turkish plans while at the same time reiterating his invitation for Erdogan to visit the White House next month. It is impossible to read the President's initial statements as anything but acquiescence.

Furthermore, the President's statements over the following days have sought to distance the United States from the Kurds and the foreseeable consequences of his decision with regard to ISIS and the humanitarian challenges in northern Syria.

The violence we have witnessed over the last few days in northern Syria has been the direct result of an impulsive President who has made decisions that are counter to the advice of our national security experts. President Trump has often expressed disdain for the career military, diplomatic, and intelligence professionals our Nation relies on to develop and implement sound national security policy. We are once again seeing the ramifications of his incompetence.

The President's stunning ignorance of the complexities in the Middle East was on full display over the weekend in a tweet in which he seemed not to have an understanding of the location or identity of the separate Kurdish groups with whom we have partnered in Syria and Iraq.

The Secretaries of Defense and State both insist they were consulted by the President on this decision. Maybe so, but it is clear that he didn't heed their advice or that of our national security experts. I am not aware of any security experts who advocated for standing by while the Turkish military carried out an offensive against our Kurdish partners.

In fact, on October 2—just 4 days before the phone call between Presidents Trump and Erdogan—the State Department's Special Envoy for Syria, Joel Rayburn, publicly warned: We certainly think that a conflict along the Turkey-Syria border would serve the interests of all the bad actors in the conflict and in the surrounding region—whether that is ISIS or al-Qaida or the Iranian regime or what have you.

That was President Trump's Special Envoy.

The President's capitulation to Erdogan runs directly counter to all of the administration's stated objectives in Syria. The administration's stated strategy is to, No. 1, defeat ISIS; No. 2, force the removal of Iranian-aligned

foreign forces from Syria; and No. 3, achieve a negotiated political settlement to the Syrian civil war in line with the United Nations' resolutions.

The security and humanitarian catastrophe that President Erdogan has unleashed with Trump's approval will make achieving any of these goals nearly impossible. The violence in northern Syria over the last few days has led to the displacement of at least 160,000 people, the suspension of humanitarian assistance into affected areas, the escape of an unidentified number of ISIS detainees, and the horrific killings of unarmed civilians, including incidents that Secretary of Defense Esper has described as potential war crimes.

Just weeks ago, at our urging, the SDF removed personnel from border areas, relocated heavy weapons, and destroyed defensive fortifications in northern Syria. They did so even in the face of a continued Turkish military buildup along the Syrian border because they believed the United States and Turkey had agreed to a security mechanism in good faith that could avoid bloodshed. It seems that they were wrong to put their faith in this administration.

The Turkish incursion into Syria has undermined years of effort against ISIS by the United States and the international community. Despite the elimination of the so-called physical caliphate, ISIS is not defeated. Former Secretary of Defense Mattis correctly warned over the weekend that ISIS will resurge if pressure against the group isn't sustained.

Perhaps even more damaging than the current situation in Syria is the long-term impact of the President's decision on our standing in the world and our ability to achieve the goals outlined in the national defense strategy of his administration. The President's shortsighted abandonment of the Kurds is a strategic disaster that raises grave doubts among our allies and our friends about whether the United States under this President can be counted on to defend our shared interests.

Given the diverse national security challenges we face, we must attract and rely upon partners who share our interests. Our military leaders often promote the virtues of the ''by, with, and through'' approach, especially when it comes to counterterrorism.

Since 9/11, we have built partnerships with local forces throughout the world—from North and East Africa, to the Middle East, and across the Pacific—to enable efforts against violent extremist groups. We have sought to apply exquisite capabilities only possessed by the U.S. military to support local partners doing the preponderance of the fighting and dying in service to our shared objective of containing and defeating such violent groups.

Contrary to President Trump's assertions, we are not engaged in an endless war in Syria. In fact, the Kurd's partnership with the United States should be viewed as a model of how to leverage an ''economy of force'' commitment of U.S. military capabilities to achieve strategic effects, thereby obviating the need for large numbers of U.S. personnel to be put at risk. In Syria, relatively small numbers of U.S. forces on the ground enabled a Kurdish and Arab ground force of approximately 60,000 personnel known as the Syrian Democratic Forces, or SDF. With our help, the SDF liberated millions of innocent civilians from the violent oppression of ISIS and defeated the so-called physical caliphate. Some have estimated that the SDF lost more than 10,000 fighters taking on ISIS.

It is true that many who joined the SDF did so to liberate their homes from ISIS; however, it is also true that even after their homes were liberated, the SDF—Kurds and Arabs alike—continued to pursue ISIS all the way through the Euphrates River Valley, where the last remnants of the physical caliphate were ultimately defeated earlier this year.

Those in the SDF were not only fighting for themselves; they were also fighting for us. They were fighting to help ensure that there were no more ISIS-directed or -inspired attacks like those carried out in Paris, Brussels, Istanbul, Orlando, and San Bernardino.

After the SDF successfully liberated the territory that was formerly controlled by ISIS, it also maintained custody of more than 10,000 ISIS detainees—including more than 2,000 foreign fighters—even when many of their home countries refused to take them back. Given the sacrifices of the SDF in the fight against ISIS, it was particularly insulting for President Trump to imply that the SDF may now be releasing ISIS detainees to get us involved, in his words, in the ongoing violence in northern Syria.

As our military leaders will tell you, our partnership with the SDF was not only built on our shared opposition to ISIS but also on the trust established between our forces in their fighting shoulder to shoulder against a common enemy. They deserved more from the United States and President Trump in the face of demands by Turkey's autocratic leader. Given all the SDF has sacrificed in furtherance of the fight against ISIS and our partnership, our betrayal of their trust is nothing short of appalling.

Again, just days before President Trump's fateful call with Erdogan, the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for the Middle East publicly stated: ''We, quite frankly, could not carry out our national defense strategy if it weren't for partners like [the SDF].''

I fear that the President's impulsive abandonment of the Kurds has done significant and lasting damage to the standing of the United States in the world and has shaken the confidence of our allies and partners. We are losing valuable partners in a region where the United States has critical national security interests.

Congress and the international community must send a clear, bipartisan signal to the President that we do not condone the Turkish incursion into northern Syria or the President's decision to abandon the Kurds.

President Trump must rescind the invitation to President Erdogan to visit the United States in November. We should not welcome an autocrat who is responsible for endangering our troops on the ground in Syria, the release of dangerous ISIS fighters, the mass displacement of hundreds of thousands of civilians, and violence against noncombatants, which, if reports are true, may amount to war crimes.

The United States does not need to stand alone in condemning the violence in northeastern Syria. Our partners in the counter-ISIS coalition share our concerns about the damage the Turkish incursion has caused to our efforts to defeat ISIS and the potential humanitarian costs. The United States should take the lead within the United Nations and NATO to organize efforts to denounce Turkey's actions and restrain the strategic consequences. We must also redouble diplomatic efforts to seek a negotiated settlement to the Syrian civil war that is consistent with U.N. Security Council Resolution No. 2254 and that protects the equities of the SDF and civilians who are living under their protection.

Unfortunately, the greatest impediment to securing our national security interests in northern Syria and bringing about an end to the conflict there appears to be President Trump's inability to grasp the strategic significance of his actions.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Ms. ERNST. Mr. President, I rise to call attention to the dire situation that continues to unfold in northern Syria.

Turkey embarked on a reckless and brutal intervention on October 9, 2019, ostensibly to clear northern Syria of terrorist elements. It has ironically dubbed this operation ''Peace Spring.'' The departure of U.S. forces in the days just prior to this incursion left nothing between Turkish military forces and the predominantly Kurdish militia, known as the Syrian Democratic Forces, or SDF. Up until the cease-fire agreement that was announced today, the SDF bore the brunt of the Turkish assault.

The Kurds are deeply stung by what they see as America's abandoning them—this after a long, hard, and successful fight against ISIS.

At the height of its power, ISIS controlled territory larger than the United Kingdom. As many Americans know, ISIS directed and inspired terrorist attacks on our homeland, in communities across the United States, and staged numerous attacks against our troops overseas. ISIS's branches across the globe have conducted unimaginable atrocities, including targeting Christians, Yazidis, Kurds, and others who

opposed ISIS's corrupt interpretation of Islam. Examples of these atrocities are the heartbreaking stories of so-called Yazidi brides who were forced into marriages with ISIS fighters. They were raped and brutalized repeatedly and were forced to decide whether to abandon their children or to make an escape. There are multiple stories of ISIS's terror that has been inflicted on those with disabilities, such as babies being suffocated simply for being born with Down syndrome.

The United States, together with a coalition of over 30 countries, engaged in a campaign to rid the world of ISIS and to restore peace and stability to that region. Yet it was not a nation-state that bore the brunt of the fighting against ISIS. The Kurds and the Arabs who made up the Syrian Democratic Forces took the fight to the heart of the caliphate. With the help of U.S. Special Operations Forces and airstrikes, the SDF liberated lands held by the terror group, imprisoned thousands of terrorist fighters, and restored hope to hundreds of thousands who suffered under ISIS rule.

In our fast-moving and quickly changing world, it is easy for some to forget the terrible threat ISIS once posed while they were at their most powerful, but it would be wrong to think we can now allow ourselves to take our foot off of our enemy's throat.

Even now, ISIS cells are seeking to take advantage of the chaos in northern Syria to reconstitute and once again pose a direct threat to Americans right here in our homeland.

You cannot watch what is unfolding in Syria without being fundamentally concerned about the security of our friends and our neighbors. A recapitalization of ISIS is a threat to us all.

It is for this reason that I have introduced a resolution which calls on the Department of Defense and the Department of State to provide a plan within 30 days which will outline a strategy to ensure ISIS will never again threaten Americans or our allies now or in the future.

This strategy will address the ongoing threat that ISIS poses regionally and globally and will outline the plan to prevent an ISIS resurgence, contain ISIS expansion, mitigate the threat ISIS poses to the United States and our allies, and describe how our gains against ISIS since 2014 will be further protected.

We cannot afford to take our eyes off of this vital task of ensuring the lasting and irreversible defeat of ISIS. We must consolidate our gains to rid the world of this terrible organization and insist on a sound strategy to ensure our success to that end.

Too many of our partner forces and indeed American brothers and sisters in arms have fought and died in this fight, and we must ensure that those sacrifices were not made in vain.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

SAUDI FUGITIVE DECLASSIFICATION ACT OF 2019

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I have come to the floor to fight for answers—answers that are long overdue.

In 2018, my hometown newspaper, The Oregonian, identified a handful of cases where Saudi nationals accused of serious crimes in the United States, like manslaughter and sexual assault, fled the country and escaped American justice.

Since then, The Oregonian has identified numerous similar cases—in fact, almost two dozen such cases across the United States. That includes 19 in just the last 7 years.

Today I want to tell the Senate about just one of those cases.

Three years ago, not far from my home in Southeast Portland, a young woman had her life taken from her. Fallon Smart was then a rising sophomore at Franklin High School, and she was aspiring to be a teacher. By all accounts, she would have been a terrific teacher.

She was 15, and according to everybody who knew her, Fallon was warm and smart and friendly. She had her whole life ahead of her.

According to police, she lost her life when she was crossing the street in front of stopped traffic, and a vehicle illegally swerved into the left-hand lane and hit her at 55 or 60 miles per hour. Her mom was in a car half a block away and ran to her daughter. Fallon died in her mother's arms, and the car that hit her just sped away.

A Saudi Arabian college student named Abdulrahman Sameer Noorah later returned to the scene and was arrested. He was eventually charged with manslaughter in Fallon's death and then released on $1 million bail. The Saudi consulate posted his $100,000 bond, according to The Oregonian newspaper.

In the United States, in our country, there was every expectation that Mr. Noorah would get a fair shake from the justice system. Our justice system was working the right way here until 2 weeks before Mr. Noorah was scheduled to go to trial. His tracking bracelet was somehow cut, and he disappeared. Mr. Noorah has never stood trial for Fallon Smart's death.

Eventually, this spring, the State Department confirmed in a letter to me that Mr. Noorah had returned to Saudi Arabia.

I felt then, and I do today, this raises an important and a serious question: How does a foreign national charged with manslaughter, whose passport was seized, disappear from the United States without a trace? How does this person escape the country and make it thousands of miles back to Saudi Arabia with there being no record of his doing so?

News reports in 2018 suggest that the Saudi Arabian Government knew about Mr. Noorah and these other fugitives and potentially helped them flee justice.

I have five children. I cannot imagine the grief I would feel if one of them was taken from me, and the person responsible somehow managed to evade the justice system. It is almost impossible to comprehend the anger and the helplessness and the frustration any parent would feel in a situation like this.

I met with Fallon's mom Fawn, and while she and all of Fallon's loved ones have borne this miscarriage of justice with extraordinary grace, they are just heartbroken.

In addition to being heartbroken, they are angry. They are outraged by the notion that the person charged with killing their daughter may have just been able to escape scot-free and face no consequences for his action.

For some time, I have been demanding information from the Trump administration. In my view, the victims of these crimes, their families, and the American people are owed some essential answers. How did this happen? What is the U.S. Government doing about it?

I have written the Department of Justice. I have written the State Department. I have written the U.S. Marshals Service. I have written to the Department of Homeland Security. As far as I can tell, I would have gotten better answers from the Saudi royal family themselves.

In fact, when I asked Secretary of State Mike Pompeo what he was doing to try to return the Saudi fugitives to the United States, basically what his Department did is that we just got a collective shrug of the shoulders. I sent the Secretary of State a letter last December. He didn't respond.

So I sent another letter in February. I said: The State Department needs to use all its resources and all the tools at its disposal to hold the Saudi Government accountable. I asked whether our Ambassador pressed the Saudi Government about this disturbing, shocking pattern of Saudi nationals skipping bail.

The State Department finally did respond to my second letter. What I got was a whole bunch of nothing. One of Mr. Pompeo's aides said that without an extradition treaty, there wasn't anything they could do about it. This is from a Secretary who tried to rebrand State as the ''Department of Swagger.'' That swagger was nowhere to be found when it was time to protect innocent Americans.

Today, I am not writing any more letters. I am here on the Senate floor asking for action—action today. I am

seeking to pass the Saudi Fugitive Declassification Act of 2019. My bill requires the FBI Director, in coordination with the Director of National Intelligence, to quickly—quickly—declassify any and all information related to a key question: whether the Government of Saudi Arabia helped any Saudi nationals escape the country when those Saudi nationals were awaiting trial or sentencing for a criminal offense.

Let me just repeat that so there is no confusion. The bill requires that the FBI Director and what is called the DNI, or the Director of National Intelligence, would quickly—quickly—declassify any and all information on the issue of whether the Government of Saudi Arabia helped any Saudi nationals escape the country when those Saudi nationals were awaiting trial or sentencing for a criminal offense in the United States.

I believe what I am asking for today must happen in the name of justice immediately. The American people deserve answers. The people I represent at home in our neighborhoods in Southeast Portland want answers. These are not academic matters. This is not about a series of victimless crimes.

This is about manslaughter. It is about rape. It is about a whole array of ugly offenses. This is about real people, real families—families who have suffered immeasurable pain. They deserve to see justice served. When individuals who are charged with violent crimes—no victimless crimes here, violent crimes—manage to escape and when the United States fails to do much of anything about it, it undermines public safety and it harms the U.S. justice system.

If, as some of the press stories have suggested, the Saudi Government has helped these alleged criminals escape justice, the American people have the right to be doubly concerned. Is the public image of Saudi Arabia a higher priority than the safety of American citizens?

Any action by a foreign government to thwart our criminal justice system would be an attack on our national security and our sovereignty. If that is what has happened, then, all Americans deserve to know.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the U.S. Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. 2635, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2635) to require the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation to declassify any and all information relating to whether the government of Saudi Arabia assisted a citizen or national of Saudi Arabia in departing the United States while the citizen or national was awaiting trial or sentencing for a criminal offense committed in the United States, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. WYDEN. I further ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

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

The bill (S. 2635) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 2635

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 ''Saudi Fugitive Declassification Act of 2019''.

SEC. 2. DECLASSIFICATION OF ANY AND ALL INFORMATION RELATING TO ACTIONS BY GOVERNMENT OF SAUDI ARABIA TO ASSIST PERSONS IN DEPARTING UNITED STATES WHO WERE AWAITING TRIAL OR SENTENCING IN UNITED STATES.

Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, in coordination with the Director of National Intelligence, shall declassify any and all information related to whether the government of Saudi Arabia materially assisted or facilitated any citizen or national of Saudi Arabia in departing from the United States while the citizen or national was awaiting trial or sentencing for a criminal offense committed in the United States.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, parliamentary inquiry.

With that action, has this bill now been passed?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It has.

Mr. WYDEN. 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. RUBIO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

TURKEY AND SYRIA

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, it is interesting. When we come here, we seem to think that everybody in America is reading the blogs and all the major newspapers every morning. A lot of people do, but some people have lives. They get up early. They go to work. They listen to the news from time to time, but they don't follow it closely. That is what they hire us to do and they hire us to deal with as policymakers.

On this issue of Syria, it strikes me, and it really did earlier this week when I visited this gas station close to my home that I frequent. It also has a little convenience store with a coffee stand inside. A gentleman comes up to me and basically says: Why do we care about all the stuff that is happening there? You know, it is thousands of miles away. These people have been fighting forever. Let them figure it out. Why do we have to be involved in all of this?

I will tell you that there is appeal to that argument. There really is. I understand why Americans feel that way. Since September of 2001, we have lost countless young men and women abroad in combat. We have seen families who have been ripped apart. We have seen the injuries that people come home with, not to mention the amount of money that has been spent on all of this as well. At a time when we face so many challenges, a lot of people are saying to themselves: Well, why do we have to be everywhere? Why do we have to care? These people have been fighting for a billion years. It is not our problem. We need to focus on issues here at home.

I do understand the appeal of that argument. I want to tell you that despite how much I focus on these issues and spend time on them, from time to time, those arguments appeal to me. But then you have to analyze why we are there to begin with and what it would mean in the short to long term to our country to just walk away from these obligations. That is what I hope to do here today in a way that answers the question the gentleman asked me last Monday. I didn't have time to get into all of this because I had an airplane to catch, and these airlines don't wait for anybody.

So here is the way I would explain it. The first is that you have to tell people why we are there to begin with. Let me tell you what this is not. This is not about an endless war or being somewhere for the rest of our lives. Frankly, it is not even about committing thousands of troops. The U.S. force presence in Syria was quite small. It actually achieved an extraordinary amount with such a few number of people.

There were 2,000 special operators imbedded alongside thousands of Kurds and our international partners. Basically, it is an area that ISIS once dominated. They literally controlled the cities. The capital of the caliphate was once there at one point. They were driven out. There was tremendous success, a real example of the sort of counterterror that these missions have successfully pursued.

The stated goal was, first and foremost, to stamp out and eliminate ISIS. The second was that our presence would provide leverage when the time came for a Syrian peace settlement—a settlement that would reflect our national interests, which are primarily three things.

The first is limiting Assad's power. The guy is a stone-cold criminal. This guy has gassed and murdered his own people. There has to be some limits and constraints to his power.

The second is to safeguard the Kurds. As you have heard others come to the floor and talk about, these people fought with us. We told them: If you will do the ground-fighting and we help you from the air and with logistics, we are going to be here with you. They did, and they lost over 10,000 people in that fight. They have been great partners in that endeavor. We had a moral obligation, not to mention a promise that we made.

The third is to limit Iran's influence. Iran would love nothing more than to completely dominate Syria because it links them directly into Lebanon to supply and support Hezbollah. It allows them to pivot over into Iraq to become the dominant power there.

Just imagine a Middle East in which Iran is the dominant power in Lebanon, in Syria, and, of course, in Iran, and, eventually, in Iraq, and, God forbid, in Bahrain, and with a growing influence in Yemen through the Houthis. They not only encircle Israel. They encircle Saudi Arabia. It would be a nightmare.

We are engaged in a campaign of maximum pressure against Iran, and the last thing you want to do in a maximum-pressure campaign is to alleviate pressure, and having a greater influence in Syria would alleviate a lot of pressure for Iran. That is the purpose of our presence there.

The administration's and the President's decision has undermined every single one of them. That is the only way to talk about it. I think it has done so in ways we are going to regret for a long time.

The first is the ISIS mission. There are 10,000 ISIS killers being held in jails and camps in northern Syria. The guards at those camps are not Americans. They are Kurdish guards. What happens when someone invades the cities that your family lives in? You send people to go meet that enemy. That means that they have been removing guards from the prisons to the frontlines.

There are less and less guards in these camps. Estimates are already that a large number of ISIS killers have already gotten out, and they anticipate more to get out soon. Just imagine 10,000 killers running loose, not to mention efforts by ISIS to break them out with less security.

By the way, this is a problem not just in Syria. It is a real problem in Iraq. About 200,000 refugees have already amassed at the border. There is no way Iraq can go through every single one of them and determine who is an ISIS killer and who is a refugee who is coming back. So you can suddenly see this resurgence of ISIS spread and destabilize Iraq. So, suddenly, this evil movement that we had on the ropes and had become an insurgency—and, frankly, was already reemerging as an insurgency—has just been given fuel to operate in one, and now in two, countries.

How about the goal of providing leverage for a future settlement to reflect our interests? First of all, in restraints on Assad's power, think about it this way. Literally, overnight, when the Turks came in and the Kurds didn't have us anymore, they were forced to cut a deal with Assad. So, suddenly, the Kurds are basically telling Assad's troops: Come up to the cities that we once had, and you now be the troops here to back us up. You take control of them. That is what they had to do to avoid being slaughtered.

In practical terms, what it means is that Assad, literally, overnight, has captured a third of the land of Syria at no price and no concession. He had to make no concessions, pay no price, do nothing other than just send people up to take it.

To me, this doesn't sound like we have imposed restraints on Assad. It sounds like he has just literally been gifted control over a third of the national territory at no concession and no price. He had to do nothing.

How about safeguarding the Kurdish interests? I think that is self-explanatory. The Kurds have now been forced to align themselves with Assad, who, in the short term, may be fine, but once this is all over, I doubt very seriously whether the Kurds will be treated well, not to mention the Yazidi and the Christian communities that the Kurds were protecting, who now are also under Assad's rule. Suffice it to say that nothing here has safeguarded their interests.

There is news today that the Vice President and the Secretary of State were able to go to Turkey and work out what is being called a ceasefire. I think they deserve praise, along with the President, for pursuing that mission because anytime that human lives are spared from death in a war, that is cause for celebration.

With all due respect, it does not appear to me, however, that this is really a ceasefire. It is more an ultimatum because what Erdogan is basically saying is this: Here is land that I intend to take. I intend to drive every Kurd out of this area, and I intend for Turkey to control this area in northern Syria as a security zone, as he calls it. The only thing he has agreed to as an ultimatum is that the Kurds can leave this area voluntarily in the next 5 days, or he will move in and take it and kill them. You can call it a ceasefire, but, frankly, it doesn't appear to have changed the strategic objective that Erdogan has for that region.

I certainly think that while it is good news that it made some lemonade out of this lemon, nonetheless, these are cities in which not just Kurdish troops but people and families are going to have to leave now, and we are going to have to be involved in helping to coordinate and guarantee that, which runs its own risks.

Ultimately, it is an ultimatum by him saying: You have 5 days to leave before I move in and kill you.

How about limiting Iran's influence? First of all, clearly, Iran will now have more operating space in Syria. The lack of a U.S. presence there means that Iran and its affiliated groups, particularly these Hezbollah shoots that are now in Syria, will have much more operating space. The stronger Assad is, the stronger Iran will be. Assad is a very close ally of the Iranians, and the more space he controls, the more space they have to operate.

Embedded in this, as you have noticed, is that Iran has developed this ability to conduct attacks against the United States, sometimes using third groups that they control, to either blame the attacks on, to claim credit for the attacks, or, in some cases, to conduct them, because what this does is it gives Iran the capability of attacking the United States without facing international condemnation for the attack—enough deniability—especially from countries that are looking to not blame Iran anyway because it would force them to get out of the Iran deal. And they have gotten away with it.

But one of the things that Iran has calculated in these attacks—one of the things they have taken into the calculation—is this: We believe the United States is trying to get out of the region; meaning, if we attack them, we can hit them much harder than we ever had before because they don't want another war. They are not going to hit us back as hard. We can get away with more.

I submit to you that I am pretty confident that this decision has strengthened that perception, not weakened it. I fear what that can mean next.

This also increases Iran's influence in Iraq. If you are an Iraqi politician right now, whether you are a Shia or a Sunni, and you have just seen this decision, you are thinking to yourself: We are next. And when the Americans leave here at some point—at some point we will have to—the Iranians are going to become the most important group on the ground.

In fact, there were reports yesterday that there were these protests on the street and there were Iranian-linked militias with snipers on the rooftops operating in Iraq. These were not elements of the army or the police force. These were Iranian elements operating in Iraq. This has increased their influence in Iraq and their ability to determine the future of Iraq in a way that is terrible for us, terrible for our allies, like Israel, and a great benefit to the Iranians, not to mention that Syria creates an extraordinary land bridge that the Iranians can now use to increasingly continue to supply Hezbollah in Lebanon and to increasingly supply their own militias just across the Golan Heights.

The irony in all of this, ironically, is that I fear this decision actually makes it likely that there is going to be a war. I will tell you why. As I pointed out first, there is the Iranian attack calculation. This further strengthens their belief that they can get away with even more brazen attacks because the threshold for a U.S. military response is higher than it has ever been because we are looking to get out, and this proves it.

What that can mean is they can miscalculate it, and we are going to have to respond. Then, all of a sudden, you are in a real shooting war—not a ''2,000 person on the ground, working with the Kurds'' war, a real regional conflict.

The other point is that all of our alliances around the world are built on security guarantees. In Eastern Europe,

the NATO security guarantee in many of these countries is a 300-, 400-, 500-man force—a tripwire. It is not enough to stop a Russian incursion, but they are there because if they were confronted by Russians, that would trigger a broader conflict.

You could say the same about South Korea, our presence in Japan, the commitments we have made to Israel, and the troop presence we have now in Saudi Arabia. It goes on and on and on.

Ask yourself: After this, would any ally relying on the U.S. security assurances be more or less confident of our assurances? I will tell you this. Less than 48 hours before this withdrawal decision was made, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff gave unequivocal assurances that we were not going anywhere. The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, a general, General Milley, said: We are there. We are not going anywhere. These are all rumors. Forty-eight hours later, this withdrawal announcement was made.

With all due respect, this is not his fault. I don't blame him, if he believes that. What is his credibility now when he says anything like that to anybody else or when he warns someone not to do something against us because we will act in return? Maybe his credibility isn't shot—and I would warn our enemies not to view it that way—but I can tell you it certainly hasn't been strengthened by this. One last point on this. You know, Russia and China are going all over the world trying to come up with an ad hoc, anti-U.S. coalition—a coalition of countries that are sanctioned—to try to get around the dollarization of the global economy, a coalition to fight against the impediments against Chinese spyware and technology, and a coalition to limit our presence in one part of the world or another. The argument they make to these countries is, Why are you aligned with America? They are unreliable. They are unreliable partners. They will cut on you as soon as it makes sense domestically for them to do so or somebody else gets elected and has a different opinion.

Well, ask yourselves, has that argument been strengthened or weakened? Have we made it easier or harder for Russia and China to make that argument, including the countries that we have basing agreements with now and including the countries that we are meeting with every single day and asking them: Don't buy Russian weapons. Don't install Chinese technology and spyware in your Safer City Initiatives so they can spy on you and ultimately on us. Don't allow them to take over your port facilities or operate rotationally based military forces in your national territory. We will help you with those things instead.

Well, I can tell you that when China and Russia go to them the next time and say that America is unreliable, they will have one more exhibit to show them as evidence to prove it. That is why I say this decision has an impact that goes well beyond Syria.

I will tell you that, again, I think what the Vice President and the Secretary of State did today is noble. There are lives that are going to be saved because now they have 5 days to leave those areas. But that doesn't address any of these other repercussions. In a blink of an eye, we completely undermined and unraveled the very justification for this operation and all of the stated reasons we said we were there. We had these 2,000 troops working with the Kurds to keep ISIS from reemerging and to provide leverage in the future Syrian settlement, to restrain Assad's power, to safeguard Kurdish interests, our partner's interest, and to limit Iranian influence. Every single one of those stated interests—that was our policy less than 2 weeks ago—has been wiped out.

One of my favorite questions in the hallway from the reporters is, What should Congress do now? What can we do? Well, I think we are all searching to see what we can do to mitigate some of this damage. But I want to be honest with you—there are some mistakes and some decisions that cannot be reversed. There is some damage that cannot be mitigated, and I fear that some of these things are a part of it. We will spend time thinking about it. I think there might be some opportunities for the administration in the weeks and months to come to do something about it, but right now, I think we need to prepare ourselves for the consequences, for what this is going to mean in the long term.

So it was kind of a long answer to give someone at a gas station when I had a flight to catch in 45 minutes and they were in a hurry as well, but I hope that for the people back home and potentially around the country who have an interest in this topic, I was at least able to shine some light on why some of us do not support this decision.

It isn't because we favor endless wars or want invasions. It is because while this may be popular when first presented to people, when you view it in its totality and entirety, sometimes what is popular in the short term is not good for America's national security in the long term, and it is my fear that this is one such example.

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. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. GRASSLEY. I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

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

HEALTHCARE

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, the purpose of my speaking today is to remind my colleagues about some history as it relates to the adoption of Part D of Medicare back in 2003 and the importance of considering that history in regard to the importance of passing legislation this year in regard to high drug costs. The reminder goes to my colleagues who are up for election, based on the fact that the history of the elections of 2000 and 2002 had consequences for people who weren't aware of the grassroots support for doing something for prescription drugs and Medicare, as Part D turned out to be.

In this environment today, I don't think there is proper concern that people—the grassroots of America—are expressing the need to do something about prescription drug prices, so I am going to spend my time doing what I just summarized for you going through the history of 20 years ago versus now.

I want to lower the cost of prescription drugs for American seniors. I have spoken on this topic many times before, and in my previous speeches years and years ago, I said that we were delivering on the promises of the last three elections in a bipartisan manner to help seniors who had waited far too long for relief, and that relief came out as Medicare Part D.

That speech was more than 15 years ago. We have been here before. In 2003, I was leading the last piece of bipartisan entitlement reform, the creation of the Medicare Part D Program that was entitled the ''Medicare Modernization Act of 2003.''

Now here we are again on the cusp of meaningful, bipartisan action in regard to prescription drugs. This action would fulfill the promises that I and many of my colleagues and the administration, meaning the Trump administration, made to the American people that we are going to do something about prescription drug pricing. We should be reminded that promises made ought to be promises kept.

I want to remind my colleagues that history does not have to repeat itself. Hopefully, this will help rid the gridlock that delayed us from delivering Medicare Part D nearly two decades ago.

As we all know, the Medicare Modernization Act was signed into law in November of 2003, but the process of creating Part D began long before the President actually signed the bill. We could go back more than a decade—but that is not the most important part of it—but Congress was voting on what would become prescription drug coverage as early as 1988. Obviously, it didn't become law.

Suggestions for how to help seniors with prescription drugs came from every corner throughout the next decade after those 1988 votes. Yet the proposals weren't enacted, so we failed to bring any kind of comprehensive change to Medicare.

Under President Clinton, prescription drug pricing reform gained national attention, just like it has national attention today because President Trump has made it one of his premier goals of reducing drug prices.

So going back to the Clinton administration as part of the Balanced Budget Act of 1997, Congress created a forum to bring more attention to the prescription drug program under Medicare. That was called the National Bipartisan Commission on the Future of Medicare.

After a year's worth of work and research, the Commission voted on three recommendations in 1999, including a prescription drug benefit. However, the recommendations failed to receive the mandated supermajority of members' votes, so no formal recommendations were ever submitted to Congress because that was the rule of the Commission at the time. It had to be a supermajority of the members of the Commission.

Facing mounting pressure from the public in anticipation of the 2000 election, all of the major Presidential candidates presented plans. President Bush had suggested a new Federal subsidy to help low-income beneficiaries purchase drug coverage through private insurers.

Vice President Al Gore, the Democratic candidate, proposed a new voluntary benefit within Medicare to protect chronically ill and low-income beneficiaries against catastrophic expenses. Yet the Congress still couldn't reach a compromise, even though it was very much discussed during that Presidential election, and it was in a lot of discussions in Senate races as well.

At that time, the country was united behind Medicare reform, but Congress was divided on how or even if it should act, and it did not act.

In the Finance Committee, the person that preceded me when I took over the chairmanship of the Finance Committee, a person by the name of Bill Roth of Delaware, proposed two plans to committee members in hopes that a consensus could be reached. The first plan worked to fundamentally change the Medicare Program. The proposal included a universal drug benefit for the Medicare Program with several major contracting reforms. The reforms would have permitted pharmacy benefit managers, insurers, and other qualified firms to compete to manage the government drug benefit in a cost-effective way.

Then-Chairman Roth also proposed a scaled-back plan which would extend prescription drug coverage to low-income seniors and on the State level to those seniors facing catastrophic levels of spending. This second piece of the Roth proposal was meant to be a backstop—just a short-term, bipartisan bandaid on a gaping wound while negotiations continued to find a longer term solution.

Despite the support from then-President Bill Clinton and the Republican majority leader, Trent Lott, compromise was elusive, and the Finance Committee did not act before the November election. So then we had the 2000 election. Prescription drug coverage was a big issue, and it was a big issue probably more for Republicans because we controlled the U.S. Senate. We lost five incumbent Republican Senators because people didn't pay attention to this being a major issue. Hence, to remind you what I opened with, I don't want Senators making that same mistake this year.

The American people were obviously disappointed in the lack of action back in 2000, and it showed, but as we have to do when there is grassroots support like there was then, we marched on to find a path forward, but building consensus was not easy.

I was chairman during part of that time between the years 2000 and 2003. I wasn't chairman all that time because the Senate flipped to a Democratic majority when Senator Jeffords of Vermont changed from Republican to Democrat. Between the years 2000 and 2003, we held countless meetings and hearings on the status of Medicare and how we could come to an agreement to add Part D and bring Medicare into the 21st century. The gridlock seemed inescapable.

In 2002, the budget allowed for $350 billion to reform the Medicare Program, most of that going toward the prescription drug reform that we were proposing. Partisan discord led to three separate proposals being sent to the Senate from House Republicans that were subsequently voted down.

As a result of the 2002 elections, Republicans were back in the majority, and I retook the gavel as chair of the Finance Committee. I promised at that time legislation that would address seniors' concerns and be bipartisan so it would pass an almost evenly split Senate. That was my goal. In the Finance Committee, we went through the important and wide-ranging process of creating what eventually became the Medicare Modernization Act of 2003.

I worked across the aisle, across the Capitol, and down Pennsylvania Avenue to make sure the prescription drugs and Medicare improvement bill struck the right balance, spending the money allocated to us by President Bush to be done in a fair and equitable way. A lot had changed in the practice of medicine since Medicare had been signed into law 40 years before, in 1965, and we needed to recognize that the practice of medicine had changed. My friend Senator Baucus, who was at that time the Democratic ranking member of my committee, and I were able to thoughtfully pull together a Medicare package by closing a big coverage gap and doing that in the right way. The Part D marketplace offered consumers better choice, better coverage, and better value. Of course, it was about time that Congress had taken this action demanded by the grassroots of America in a serious way. I said in 2003, ''We all know seniors don't want politics, they want prescription drugs,'' and that holds true today as we consider this issue.

It is important to note that just like in the 2000 election, the country took notice, but this time it was for our accomplishments, and Republicans gained four Senate seats in that 2004 election.

I am now standing here again, more than 15 years later, to make the very same point. It seems like deja vu. American seniors don't care about party politics any more now than they did in 2003. When it comes to almost any issue, but particularly healthcare issues, what they care about is having access to affordable medication.

Once again, I am leading a bipartisan effort to enact much needed entitlement reform, and once again some of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle are resisting compromise. Once again, medicine has changed since the last entitlement reform I led. Let me remind you, prescription medication was not much of a part of the cost of medicine in 1965 when Medicare was passed. By 2003, it had become a significant portion of the cost of medicine. That is why people needed Medicare Part D. Pharmaceuticals are even more a part of the practice of medicine today. Scientific advances have led to many new and more effective treatments. However, they are often accompanied by very high costs. That means prescription drug prices have skyrocketed, and Americans want Congress to act now so they can afford their lifesaving medications.

Our seniors deserve better than the over 5-year delay in action we put them through last time—in other words, 5 years before we finally passed something in 2003 called Part D of Medicare. They shouldn't have to wait 5 years this time. Congress has been here before. We want to make sure history doesn't repeat itself. I want to make sure it doesn't repeat itself. I personally have been here before. I have watched the opportunity to help patients slip away. Now, just like in 2003, Americans want action on entitlement reforms. Now, just like in 2003, the President supports action. Now, just like back then in 2003, numerous proposals were floated and ultimately fell short of the finish line.

We have another opportunity to deliver meaningful reforms to help the Part D program adapt to new innovations in the healthcare world. The bill that came out of my committee 19 to 9, titled the ''Prescription Drug Cost Reduction Act of 2019,'' builds on the successful programs we created in 2003. It will lower beneficiary premiums by $6 billion and lower out-of-pocket costs by $25 billion. The bill will implement an out-of-pocket cap, eliminate excess payments, cap taxpayer subsidies, and permanently repeal the doughnut hole in Medicare Part D. It uses market forces. Those market forces will incentivize manufacturers to lower list prices and report more accurate calculations of their rebate obligations.

In short, this is the right bill at the right time. We should seize this opportunity to support actions that Americans need now, not 5 or 10 years from now.

I want to give credit to Senator WYDEN of Oregon, the ranking Democrat on my committee and my partner on this issue.

Thank you for working with us in the tradition of the Finance Committee in the same way that Senator Baucus and I worked together 15 years ago on Part D legislation.

I ask all of my colleagues to join Senator WYDEN and me in our bipartisan effort to lower the cost of prescription drugs.

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. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

MORNING BUSINESS

(At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the following statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.)

S.J. RES. 53

• Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss S.J. Res. 53, the resolution of disapproval under the Congressional Review Act on the Environmental Protection Agency's Affordable Clean Energy, ACE rule. I fully support passage of the resolution.

Every week seems to bring fresh evidence of the damage climate change is causing to our environment and economy. Increasing floods, heatwaves, droughts, hurricanes, and snowstorms have wreaked havoc on communities across the country. We cannot continue to ignore that climate change is already happening all around us. We must take immediate action.

The Obama administration's Clean Power Plan established Federal standards for emissions of carbon dioxide from fossil fuel-fired power plants. The plan set achievable carbon emissions reduction targets of 32 percent from 2005 levels by 2030 to be reached by reducing emissions from coal-fired power plants, shifting energy generation from fossil fuels to renewable sources, and promoting energy conservation. The Clean Power Plan not only helped drive the transition of our energy generation to cleaner sources, it also served as the centerpiece of U.S. efforts to lead the world in addressing climate change through the Paris Climate Agreement.

The administration's rule would take us backward by repealing the emissions reduction targets in the Clean Power Plan and replacing them with less ambitious targets based on narrow energy efficiency improvements that also wholly exempt natural gas-fired power plants. It is clear that the new rules will likely result in more carbon pollution, halt the accelerated trends toward low- and zero-carbon energy, and have dire implications for our air quality and public health.

For these reasons, I oppose the administration's rule and support passage of Senator CARDIN's resolution—S.J. Res. 53—to disapprove of it.

Thank you.•

(At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the following statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.)

VOTE EXPLANATION

• Ms. HARRIS. Mr. President, I was absent for vote No. 324 on S.J. Res. 53, providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Environmental Protection Agency relating to ''Repeal of the Clean Power Plan; Emission Guidelines for Greenhouse Gas Emissions From Existing Utility Generating Units; Revisions to Emissions Guidelines Implementing Regulations.''

Had I been present, I would have voted yea on the resolution.•

ARMS SALES NOTIFICATION

Mr. RISCH. Mr. President, section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act requires that Congress receive prior notification of certain proposed arms sales as defined by that statute. Upon such notification, the Congress has 30 calendar days during which the sale may be reviewed. The provision stipulates that, in the Senate, the notification of proposed sales shall be sent to the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

In keeping with the committee's intention to see that relevant information is available to the full Senate, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the notifications which have been received. If the cover letter references a classified annex, then such annex is available to all Senators in the office of the Foreign Relations Committee, room SD–423.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEFENSE SECURITY COOPERATION AGENCY,
Arlington, VA.

Hon. JAMES E. RISCH,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, we are forwarding herewith Transmittal No. 19–51 concerning the Air Force's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance to the Republic of Korea for defense articles and services estimated to cost $253 million. After this letter is delivered to your office, we plan to issue a news release to notify the public of this proposed sale.

Sincerely,

CHARLES W. HOOPER,
Lieutenant General, USA, Director.

Enclosures.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 19–51

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended

(i) Prospective Purchaser: Republic of Korea.

(ii) Total Estimated Value:
Major Defense Equipment* $250 million.
Other $3 million.
Total $253 million.

(iii) Description and Quantity or Quantities of Articles or Services under Consideration for Purchase:

Major Defense Equipment (MDE): One hundred twenty (120) AIM–120C–7/C–8 Advanced Medium Range Air-to-Air Missile (AMRAAM).

Non-MDE: Also included are containers; weapon support and support equipment; spare and repair parts; U.S. Government and contractor engineering, technical, and logistics support services; and other related elements of logistical and program support.

(iv) Military Department: Air Force (KS–D–YDB).

(v) Prior Related Cases, if any: None.

(vi) Sales Commission, Fee, etc., Paid, Offered, or Agreed to be Paid: None.

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology Contained in the Defense Article or Defense Services Proposed to be Sold: See Annex Attached.

(viii) Date Report Delivered to Congress: October 17, 2019.

*As defined in Section 47(6) of the Arms Export Control Act.

POLICY JUSTIFICATION

Republic of Korea—AIM–120C Advanced Medium Range Air-to-Air Missile (AMRAAM)

The Republic of Korea (ROK) has requested to buy one hundred twenty (120) AIM–120C–7/C–8 Advanced Medium Range Air-to-Air Missiles (AMRAAM). Also included are containers; weapon support and support equipment; spare and repair parts; U.S. Government and contractor engineering, technical, and logistics support services; and other related elements of logistical and program support. The total estimated program cost is $253 million.

This proposed sale will support the foreign policy and national security objectives of the United States by meeting the legitimate security and defense needs of one of the closest allies in the INDOPACOM Theater. The Republic of Korea is one of the major political and economic powers in East Asia and the Western Pacific and a key partner of the United States in ensuring peace and stability in that region. It is vital to U.S. national interests to assist the Republic of Korea in developing and maintaining a strong and ready self-defense capability.

This proposed sale will improve the ROK capability to meet current and future threats by increasing its stocks of medium range missiles for its F–15K, KF–16, and F–35 fleets for its national defense. The potential sale will further strengthen the interoperability between the United States and the ROK. The ROK will have no difficulty absorbing these additional missiles into its armed forces.

The proposed sale of this equipment and support will not alter the basic military balance in the region.

The principal contractor will be Raytheon of Waltham, MA. There are no known offset agreements proposed in connection with this potential sale. Any offset agreement will be defined in negotiations between the Purchaser and the prime contractor.

Implementation of the proposed sale will not require the assignment of any additional U.S. Government or contractor representatives to the ROK.

There will be no adverse impact on U.S. defense readiness as a result of this proposed sale.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 19–51

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act

Annex Item No. vii

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology:

1. The proposed sale will involve the release of sensitive technology to the Republic of Korea related to the AIM–120C–7/C–8 Advanced Medium Range Air-to-Air Missile (AMRAAM). The AIM–120C–7/C–8 AMRAAM is a supersonic, air launched, aerial intercept, guided missile featuring digital technology and micro-miniature solid-state electronics. Purchase will include AMRAAM Guidance Sections. AMRAAM capabilities include look-down/shoot- down, multiple launches against multiple targets, resistance to electronic countermeasures, and interception of high- and low-flying maneuvering targets. The AIM–120C–8 is a form, fit, function refresh of the AIM–120C–7 and is the next generation to be produced. The capabilities of the AIM–120C–7 and C–8 are identical. The AMRAAM All Up Round is classified CONFIDENTIAL, major components and subsystems range from UNCLASSIFIED to CONFIDENTIAL, and technical data and other documentation are classified up to SECRET.

2. If a technologically advanced adversary were to obtain knowledge of the specific hardware and software elements, the information could be used to develop countermeasures that might reduce weapon system effectiveness or be used in the development of a system with similar or advanced capabilities.

3. A determination has been made that the Republic of Korea can provide substantially the same degree of protection for the sensitive technology being released as the U.S. Government. This sale is necessary in furtherance of the U.S. foreign policy and national security objectives outlined in the Policy Justification.

4. All defense articles and services listed on this transmittal have been authorized for release and export to the Republic of Korea.

RECOGNIZING CAPE ELIZABETH HIGH SCHOOL

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I am delighted to commend Cape Elizabeth High School of Cape Elizabeth ME, on being named a 2019 National Blue Ribbon Exemplary High Performing School. This outstanding high school is one of only 362 schools across the country to receive Blue Ribbon recognition this year from the U.S. Department of Education.

Created in 1982, the Blue Ribbon Schools Program honors schools that are either academically superior in their States or that demonstrate significant gains in student achievement. The schools singled out for this national recognition are models of high educational standards and accountability.

This award recognizes the hard work and determination of Cape Elizabeth High School's students, faculty, and staff. This top-performing school has a strong commitment to professional development that ensures that teachers and staff, as well as students, are lifelong learners. This recognition continues a tradition of excellence that builds upon Cape Elizabeth High School's previous Blue Ribbon Award in 2004.

Cape Elizabeth High School's mission is to ''open minds, open doors.'' The school provides its 540 students with a rigorous academic experience that prepares students for college and career, in a supportive environment that offers students many opportunities to explore their interests. Approximately 90 percent of students participate in at least one extracurricular activity, from the arts and athletics to robotics club and model united nations.

Cape Elizabeth students support each other. Every incoming ninth-grade student is assigned an upper class mentor to ease the transition to high school. Freshman Academy helps ninth graders explore their own values and strengths. Across the grade levels, students often say ''thank you'' to their teachers at the end of class, a powerful sign of a respectful school climate.

An active high school parents association strengthens the connections between school and home. The Cape Elizabeth Education Foundation, the first education foundation in Maine, fosters innovation and excellence. Over the years, the foundation has funded the creation of the Achievement Center to offer individualized tutoring, commissioned compositions for performance by school music ensembles, sponsored sexual assault awareness programs planned by students and staff together, and supported teacher professional development.

This Blue Ribbon Award is a tribute not only to the students but also to the administrators, teachers, staff, and parents of Cape Elizabeth High School. Together, they are accomplishing their mission to help students succeed in the classroom and as engaged citizens. They are making a difference in the lives of their students, helping them reach their full potential. I congratulate the entire community for this well-deserved recognition.

RECOGNIZING FRUIT STREET ELEMENTARY

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I am delighted to commend Fruit Street Elementary School in Bangor, ME, on being named a 2019 National Blue Ribbon Exemplary High Performing School. Serving 325 students from pre-K through third grade, this outstanding school is one of only 362 schools across the country this year to receive Blue Ribbon recognition from the U.S. Department of Education.

Created in 1982, the Blue Ribbon Schools Program honors schools that are either academically superior in their States or that demonstrate significant gains in student achievement. The schools singled out for this national recognition are models of high educational standards and accountability.

The Blue Ribbon designation continues a tradition of quality education in Bangor. The graduation rates and assessment test scores for the town's K–12 school district consistently are among the highest in the State of Maine.

Fruit Street Elementary School's mission statement, ''A high quality education is attainable by all of our students who will receive the encouragement and opportunities to develop the knowledge, skills, and attitudes that prepare them for citizenship in a global society,'' is carried out daily. Students focus on the core values of fairness, citizenship, respect, and caring. The core curriculum has a strong focus on math, literacy, science, and social studies, with special programs that recognize each student's individual learning style.

At Fruit Street, rich and diverse learning opportunities are a part of every child's experience, from art and music, to library skills and physical education. The school involves all students in extracurricular activities, which helps forge a strong school community where students are connected and encouraged to pursue their interests. Throughout the curriculum, students are also taught to use technology both effectively and responsibly.

Faculty, parents, and community members are committed to both academic excellence and each child's social, emotional, and physical health. Faculty work to ensure an effective learning environment and to develop strong and collaborative relationships with parents and community members. An active parent-teacher organization supports enriching educational activities and promotes excellence and innovation by funding special projects and initiatives.

I applaud the administrators, teachers, staff, and parents of Fruit Street Elementary School. Together, they are succeeding in their mission to build students' confidence and generate momentum for learning. I congratulate the entire school community for this outstanding achievement.

RECOGNIZING YARMOUTH HIGH SCHOOL

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I am delighted to commend Yarmouth High School of Yarmouth, ME, on being named a 2019 National Blue Ribbon Exemplary High Performing School. This outstanding high school is one of only 362 schools across the country to receive Blue Ribbon recognition this year from the U.S. Department of Education.

Created in 1982, the Blue Ribbon Schools Program honors schools that are either academically superior in their States or that demonstrate significant gains in student achievement. The schools singled out for this national recognition are models of high educational standards and accountability.

This award recognizes the hard work and determination of Yarmouth High School's students, faculty, and staff. This is a top-performing school on State-required assessments, and its strong commitment to professional development ensures that teachers, staff, and students are life-long learners. This recognition adds to the town's record of achievement in education—

Yarmouth Elementary School was awarded a Blue Ribbon last year.

The mission of Yarmouth High School is to ''empower all students to create fulfilling lives in a changing world.'' Yarmouth High School is known for its extensive extra-curricular activities, which help forge a strong school community where students are connected and encouraged to pursue their interests. In addition to the arts and athletics, the school provides strong STEM education and world language courses. A comprehensive social studies curriculum includes a Public Policy Project in which students conduct individual research on a contemporary policy issue and present their recommendations to policy makers.

Yarmouth High School students are active in their community. The student senate allows them to be involved in decisions regarding school policies and programs. Students and parents join staff and administrators to interview candidates for positions at the school. Economics classes visit local businesses, environmental science classes work on community recycling and environmental stewardship projects, and world history coursework includes visiting local religious centers to increase understanding of various cultures.

The school strives to address the varying needs of individual students by bringing together students, teachers, administrators, counselors, and parents to provide a support network to help ensure that all students have the opportunity to succeed academically and socially.

This Blue Ribbon Award is a tribute not only to the students but also to the administrators, teachers, staff, and parents of Yarmouth High School. Together, they are accomplishing their mission to help students succeed in the classroom and as engaged citizens in their community and the world. They are making a difference in the lives of their students, helping them reach their full potential. I congratulate the entire community for this well-deserved recognition.

INDUCTION OF BROOKS & DUNN, RAY STEVENS, AND JERRY BRADLEY INTO THE COUNTRY MUSIC HALL OF FAME

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. President, in Nashville, we have a saying: it all starts with a song; but a song is just the beginning of the story.

This Sunday, Nashville's unbroken circle of elite artists, producers, entertainers, and musical masterminds will welcome four new members into the Country Music Hall of Fame.

Kix Brooks, Ronnie Dunn, Ray Stevens, and Jerry Bradley represent different sectors within the music industry, but they have all contributed to country music's evolution.

Kix Brooks and Ronnie Dunn—we know them as Brooks & Dunn—began their careers as solo singer-songwriters but rocketed to stardom as a duo. Their fusion of classic rock composition and heartfelt songwriting spoke to country music fans craving an edge to the genre's traditional ''Nashville Sound.'' Nearly three decades after their first album dropped, their music still inspires emerging generations of fans.

From the beginning of his career, audiences and fellow artists alike were drawn to Ray Stevens' wonderful sense of humor, open heart, and commitment to entertainment as an art form. Known for his work in musical comedy, Ray stretched his legs and also made a name for himself as a studio musician, producer, songwriter, publisher, label owner, gospel singer, and country star.

Jerry Bradley, this year's final inductee, may not have invented country music, but no one on Music Row would deny the impact his work has had on generations of country stars. Jerry began his career in Nashville when the industry was on the brink of a major transformation. He drove the format into a new era defined by rebels, outlaws, and crossover superstars.

Today, I encourage my colleagues to take a moment to think of their favorite song and to remember how it made them feel the first time they heard it.

Kix, Ronnie, Ray, and Jerry are responsible for making millions of people feel that exact same way about their favorite song.

Their body of work represents more than just a series of accomplishments. It represents the best of Music City.

It is a gift.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO JOHN ROBERTSON

• Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize my friend John Robertson, a dedicated servant to the great people of West Virginia and native of our State capital, Charleston. After a 41-year career, John is retiring as the general manager of the Charleston Coliseum and Convention Center. Throughout these past four decades, John's leadership has transformed the facility, turning it into one of the cultural epicenters of our State.

In August of 1978, with a bachelor's degree from the University of Charleston under his belt, John began his career as an assistant manager for the Charleston Civic Center. At the time, the building was in its fledgling stages, having just broken ground the month before. For John, it was all hands on deck, and he hit the ground running, assisting in structural related duties, as well as the concession stand operations. Two years later, in August of 1980, the Charleston Civic Center was host to its first big concert—the band Queen.

With John's vision and leadership at the helm, this was just the beginning for the Charleston Civic Center. Soon after the center was completed, the necessary renovations to turn the civic center into exhibit and meeting facilities were well under way. Through additional construction, two parking structures were placed contiguous to the Civic Center, creating an entirely different complex by 1983.

John's greatest of many accomplishments has come within the past few years, when approval of a city sales tax appropriated the proper funding to build the state-of-the-art facility that he had always dreamed of creating for his home town. John worked tirelessly with the mayor and Charleston city council, civic center board members, his staff, city planners, and consulting firms to complete the new Charleston Coliseum and Convention Center in the fall of 2018. This achievement is underscored by the fact that the center was continually operated during the entire construction period.

The Charleston Civic Center is held so fondly in the memories of so many West Virginians. For some, it is where they saw their favorite band perform live for the first time. For others, it was where they were able to bring home a State basketball title. From Garth Brooks concerts, to oldtime car shows, West Virginia versus Marshall basketball games or the West Virginia Book Festival, one thing has remained the same; that is, John's dedication to the citizens of Charleston through his tireless work to make sure that every detail of every event, no matter how big or small, held at the Charleston Civic Center was in place.

In retirement, John will now have more time to spend with his loving wife Kimberly, his daughters Bethany and Allyson, and his grandchildren Lucy and Henry, but the lasting effects of what he did for our State and the city of Charleston will continue on for generations to come. I wish John all the best as he continues to make a difference in his community with his unwavering diligence and kind soul. It is truly an honor to call you friend and fellow West Virginian.•

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Ms. Roberts, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 10:02 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by

Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, without amendment:

S. 1196. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1715 Linnerud Drive in Sun Prairie, Wisconsin, as the ''Fire Captain Cory Barr Post Office Building''.

The message further announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 887. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 877 East 1200 South in Orem, Utah, as the ''Jerry C. Washburn Post Office Building''.

H.R. 1252. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 6531 Van Nuys Boulevard in Van Nuys, California, as the ''Marilyn Monroe Post Office''.

H.R. 1253. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 13507 Van Nuys Boulevard in Pacoima, California, as the ''Ritchie Valens Post Office Building''.

H.R. 1496. An act to amend the Act of August 25, 1958, commonly known as the ''Former Presidents Act of 1958'', with respect to the monetary allowance payable to a former President, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1833. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 35 Tulip Avenue in Floral Park, New York, as the ''Lieutenant Michael R. Davidson Post Office Building''.

H.R. 1972. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1100 West Kent Avenue in Missoula, Montana, as ''Jeannette Rankin Post Office Building''.

H.R. 2151. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 7722 South Main Street in Pine Plains, New York, as the ''Senior Chief Petty Officer Shannon M. Kent Post Office''.

H.R. 2451. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 575 Dexter Street in Central Falls, Rhode Island, as the ''Elizabeth Buffum Chace Post Office''.

H.R. 3144. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 8520 Michigan Avenue in Whittier, California, as ''Jose Ramos Post Office Building''.

H.R. 3152. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 456 North Meridian Street in Indianapolis, Indiana, as the ''Richard G. Lugar Post Office''.

H.R. 3207. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 114 Mill Street in Hookstown, Pennsylvania, as the ''Staff Sergeant Dylan Echlin Post Office Building''.

H.R. 3314. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1750 McCulloch Boulevard North in Lake Havasu City, Arizona, as the ''Lake Havasu City Combat Veterans Memorial Post Office Building''.

H.R. 3329. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 5186 Benito Street in Montclair, California, as the ''Paul Eaton Post Office Building''.

H.R. 3889. An act to amend the Office of National Drug Control Policy Reauthorization Act of 1998 to make technical corrections.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 887. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 877 East 1200 South in Orem, Utah, as the ''Jerry C. Washburn Post Office Building''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 1252. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 6531 Van Nuys Boulevard in Van Nuys, California, as the ''Marilyn Monroe Post Office''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 1253. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 13507 Van Nuys Boulevard in Pacoima, California, as the ''Ritchie Valens Post Office Building''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 1833. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 35 Tulip Avenue in Floral Park, New York, as the ''Lieutenant Michael R. Davidson Post Office Building''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 1972. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1100 West Kent Avenue in Missoula, Montana, as the ''Jeannette Rankin Post Office Building''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 2151. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 7722 South Main Street in Pine Plains, New York, as the ''Senior Chief Petty Officer Shannon M. Kent Post Office''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 3144. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 8520 Michigan Avenue in Whittier, California, as the ''Jose Ramos Post Office Building''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 3207. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 114 Mill Street in Hookstown, Pennslyvania, as the ''Staff Sergeant Dylan Elchin Post Office Building''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 3314. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1750 McCulloch Boulevard North in Lake Havasu City, Arizona, as the ''Lake Havasu City Combat Veterans Memorial Post Office Building''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 3329. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 5186 Benito Street in Montclair, California, as the ''Paul Eaton Post Office Building''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 3889. An act to amend the Office of National Drug Control Policy Reauthorization Act of 1998 to make technical corrections; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following joint resolutions were read the second time, and placed on the calendar:

S.J. Res. 58. Joint resolution expressing support for freedom of conscience.

H.J. Res. 77. Joint resolution opposing the decision to end certain United States efforts to prevent Turkish military operations against Syrian Kurdish forces in Northeast Syria.

The following bills were read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and placed on the calendar:

H.R. 2451. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 575 Dexter Street in Central Falls, Rhode Island, as the ''Elizabeth Buffum Chace Post Office''.

H.R. 3152. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 456 North Meridian Street in Indianapolis, Indiana, as the ''Richard G. Lugar Post Office''.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bill was read the first time:

S. 2644. A bill to impose sanctions with respect to Turkey, 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–2767. A communication from the Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Administration's 2018 compensation program adjustments; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–2768. A communication from the Director of the Regulations Management Division, Rural Development, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Community Facilities Guaranteed Loan Program Guarantee Fee Rate, Annual Renewal Fee, Rural Area Definition, and Funding Priority for Fiscal Year 2020; and Water and Waste Disposal Programs Guaranteed Rural Area Definition and Funding Reservation for Fiscal Year 2020'' received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 7, 2019; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–2769. A communication from the Director of the Regulations Management Division, Rural Development, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Section 538 Guaranteed Rural Rental Housing Program Notice of Funding Availability Elimination'' (RIN0575–AD12) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 11, 2019; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–2770. A communication from the Director of the Transparency and Accountability Reporting Division, Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Nonprocurement Debarment and Suspension'' (RIN0505–AA17) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 8, 2019; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–2771. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel, Office of the General Counsel, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Rules of Practice and Procedure Governing Formal Rulemaking Proceedings Instituted by the Secretary'' (7 CFR Part 1) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 11, 2019; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–2772. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Acquisition and Sustainment), transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual Selected Acquisition Reports (SARs) as of June 30, 2019 (OSS–2019–1092); to the Committees on Appropriations; and Armed Services.

EC–2773. A communication from the General Counsel, Government Accountability Office, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Fiscal Year 2018 Antideficiency Act Reports Compilation''; to the Committee on Appropriations.

EC–2774. A communication from the General Counsel, Government Accountability Office, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of violations of the Antideficiency Act by the Environmental Protection Agency; to the Committee on Appropriations.

EC–2775. A communication from the General Counsel, Government Accountability Office, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of violations of the Antideficiency Act by the Commodity Futures Trading Commission; to the Committee on Appropriations.

EC–2776. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to violations of the Antideficiency Act that involved fiscal years 2013–2016 Operations and Maintenance, Defense-Wide (O&M), and Research, Development, Testing and Evaluation, Defense-Wide (RDT&E) funds and was assigned case number 18–01; to the Committee on Appropriations.

EC–2777. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Acquisition and Sustainment), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Report on Defense Electronics Industrial Base''; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–2778. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to South Sudan that was declared in Executive Order 13664 of April 3, 2014; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–2779. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Sudan that was declared in Executive Order 13067 of November 3, 1997; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–2780. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to significant malicious cyber-enabled activities that was declared in Executive Order 13694 of April 1, 2015; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–2781. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Somalia that was declared in Executive Order 13536 on April 12, 2010; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–2782. A communication from the General Counsel of the National Credit Union Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Real Estate Appraisals'' (RIN3133–AE79) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 10, 2019; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–2783. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to discretionary appropriations legislation; to the Committee on the Budget.

EC–2784. A communication from the Senior Attorney-Advisor, Federal Highway Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Construction and Maintenance - Promoting Innovation in Use of Patented and Proprietary Products'' (RIN2125–AF84) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 9, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–2785. A communication from the Senior Attorney-Advisor, Federal Highway Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Pedestrian and Bicycle Accommodations and Projects; Removal of Obsolete Regulation'' (RIN2125–AF90) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 9, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–2786. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''North Carolina: Final Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Management Program Revisions'' (FRL No. 10001–05–Region 4) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 10, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–2787. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Significant New Use Rules on Certain Chemical Substances (17–5)'' (RIN2070–AB27) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 10, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–2788. A communication from the Director of the Human Resources Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, two (2) reports relative to vacancies in the Environmental Protection Agency, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 11, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–2789. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Medicaid Emergency Psychiatric Demonstration: Response to 21st Century Cures Act Requirements Report to Congress''; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–2790. A communication from the Senior Advisor, Office of the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Commissioner, Administration for Children, Youth & Families, Department of Health and Human Services, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 9, 2019; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–2791. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel, General Law, Ethics, and Regulation, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Deputy Under Secretary (Legislative Affairs), Department of Treasury received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 11, 2019; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–2792. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Removal of Temporary Regulations on Partner's Share of a Partnership Liability for Disguised Sale Purposes'' (RIN1545–BO05) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 10, 2019; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–2793. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Liabilities Recognized as Recourse Partnership Liabilities under Section 752'' (RIN1545–BM83) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 10, 2019; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–2794. A communication from the Associate Commissioner for Legislative Affairs, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Recommendations for Sponsors of Medically Important Antimicrobial Drugs Approved for Use in Animals to Voluntarily Bring Under Veterinary Oversight All Products That Continue to be Available Over-the-counter''; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–2795. A communication from the Administrator, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the cost of response and recovery efforts for FEMA–3419-EM in the State of Florida having exceeded the $5,000,000 limit for a single emergency declaration; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–2796. A communication from the Administrator, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the cost of response and recovery efforts for FEMA–3416-EM in the State of Louisiana having exceeded the $5,000,000 limit for a single emergency declaration; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–2797. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 23–119, ''Criminal Justice Coordinating Council Information Sharing Temporary Amendment Act of 2019''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–2798. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 23–120, ''Access to Public Benefits Amendment Act of 2019''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–2799. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 23–121, ''Close Relative Caregiver Subsidy Pilot Program Establishment Amendment Act of 2019''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–2800. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 23–122, ''Wells School Designation and Master Facilities Plan Disapproval Amendment Act of 2019''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–2801. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 23–115, ''Urban Farming Land Lease Temporary Amendment Act of 2019''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–2802. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 23–116, ''MLK Gateway Real Property Tax Abatement Temporary Amendment Act of 2019''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–2803. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 23–117, ''Appraisal Management Company Regulation Temporary Act of 2019''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–2804. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 23–118, ''Standby Guardian Temporary Amendment Act of 2019''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–2805. A communication from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Bureau of Prisons' compliance with the privatization requirements of the National Capital Revitalization and Self-Government Improvement Act of 1997; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–2806. A communication from the Senior Trial Attorney, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''The Safer Affordable Fuel-Efficient (SAFE) Vehicles Rule Part One: One National program'' (RIN2127–AL76; RIN2060–AU09) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 20, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2807. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Affairs, Consumer Product Safety Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Revisions to Safety Standard for Full-Size Baby Cribs'' (16 CFR Part 1219) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 26, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2808. A communication from the Attorney, Regulatory Affairs Division, Consumer Product Safety Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Revisions to Safety Standard for Carriages and Strollers'' (16 CFR Part 1227) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 26, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2809. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Affairs, Consumer Product Safety Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Revisions to Safety Standard for Infant Bath Seats'' (16 CFR Part 1215) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 30, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2810. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Affairs, Consumer Product Safety Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment to Requirements for Consumer Registration of Durable Infant or Toddler Products'' (16 CFR Part 1130) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 10, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2811. A communication from the Chief of Regulatory Development, Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''General Technical, Organizational, Conforming, and Correcting Amendments to the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Regulations'' (RIN2126–AC27) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 30, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2812. A communication from the Program Analyst, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Odometer Disclosure Requirements'' (RIN2127–AL39) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 2, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2813. A communication from the Chief of Regulatory Development, Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Limitations on the Issuance of Commercial Driver's Licenses with a Hazardous Materials Endorsement; Interim Final Rule Made Final'' (RIN2126–AA70) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 1, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2814. A communication from the Deputy Division Chief, Wireline Competition Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Auction of Toll Free Numbers in the 833 Code, Notice and Filing Requirements, Upfront Payments, and Other Procedures for the 833 Auction, Bidding Scheduled to occur on December 17, 2019'' ((FCC 19–75) (AU Docket No. 19–101, WC Docket No. 17–192, CC Docket No. 95–155)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 1, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2815. A communication from the Deputy Chief, Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Telecommunications Relay Services and Speech-to-Speech Services for Individuals with Hearing and Speech Disabilities, Report and Order, Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking'' (CG Docket No. 03–123) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 4, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2816. A communication from the Deputy Bureau Chief, Wireline Competition Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''The Uniendo a Puerto Rico Fund and the Connect USVI Fund, Connect America Fund, ETC Annual Reports and Certifications'' ((RIN3060–AK57) (FCC 19–95)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 8, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2817. A communication from the Division Chief, Wireline Competition Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Report and Order and Modification of Section 214 Authorizations'' ((FCC 19–94) (WC Docket No. 18–155)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 9, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2818. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Fokker Services B.V. Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2019–0324)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 19, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2819. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2019–0696)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 4, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2820. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2018–0113)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 4, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2821. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2019–0193)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 4, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2822. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2019–0498)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 4, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2823. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2019–0482)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 4, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2824. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2019–0318)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 4, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2825. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2019–0486)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 4, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2826. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2019–0250)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 4, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2827. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2019–0402)) received during adjournment of the Senate

in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 4, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2828. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2019–0771)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 4, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2829. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Emraer S.A. Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2019–0325)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 4, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2830. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Saab AB, Saab Aeronautics (Formerly Known as Saab AB, Saab Aerosystems)'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2019–0521)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 4, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2831. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Engine Alliance Turbofan Engines'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2019–0692)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 4, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2832. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Lockheed Martin Corporation/Lockheed Martin Aeronautics Company Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2019–0699)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 4, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2833. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2019–0711)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 4, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2834. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; De Havilland Aircraft of Canada Limited (Type Certificate Previously Held by Bombardier, Inc.) Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2019–0453)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 4, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2835. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2019–0495)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 15, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2836. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2019–0401)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 15, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2837. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Sikorsky Aircraft Corporation Helicopters'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2019–0389)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 15, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. GRAHAM for the Committee on the Judiciary.

Justin Reed Walker, of Kentucky, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Kentucky.

Lee Philip Rudofsky, of Arkansas, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Arkansas.

R. Austin Huffaker, Jr., of Alabama, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Alabama.

David B. Barlow, of Utah, to be United States District Judge for the District of Utah.

John Fitzgerald Kness, of Illinois, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Illinois.

Eleni Maria Roumel, of Maryland, to be a Judge of the United States Court of Federal Claims for a term of fifteen years.

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself, Mr. CORNYN, and Mr. SCOTT of Florida):

S. 2617. A bill to allow the procurement of supplies and services for commercial activities at National Aeronautics and Space Administration centers; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. PAUL (for himself, Mr. BENNET, Mr. CORNYN, Ms. ERNST, Mr. LEE, and Mr. PORTMAN):

S. 2618. A bill to strengthen employee cost savings suggestions programs within the Federal Government; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. BROWN (for himself, Mr. BURR, Ms. STABENOW, and Ms. ERNST):

S. 2619. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize the Healthy Start program; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. INHOFE (for himself and Mr. HEINRICH):

S. 2620. A bill to bolster the domestic workforce by encouraging communication between career and technical education institutions and emphasizing potential employment opportunities, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to treat certain costs relating to career and technical education as qualified higher education expenses for purposes of section 529 programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself, Ms. ROSEN, and Mr. SCOTT of Florida):

S. 2621. A bill to provide for the restoration of legal rights for claimants under holocaust-era insurance policies; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENNET (for himself, Mr. GARDNER, and Mr. TESTER):

S. 2622. A bill to provide greater controls and restrictions on revolving door lobbying; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Ms. BALDWIN (for herself and Mr. HOEVEN):

S. 2623. A bill to require the Administrator of Federal Aviation Administration to establish a pilot program to provide flight training services to veterans; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. PAUL (for himself and Mr. BRAUN):

S. 2624. A bill to prohibit arms sales to Turkey; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. WARNER:

S. 2625. A bill to authorize the admission of a limited number of Kurdish Syrians and other Syrian partners as special immigrants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MERKLEY:

S. 2626. A bill to remove limitations on inmate eligibility for Medicare, the Children's Health Insurance Program, and veteran's health benefits; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. CORTEZ MASTO (for herself, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. MERKLEY):

S. 2627. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow an above-the-line deduction for attorney fees and costs in connection with civil claim awards; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. BROWN, and Mr. DURBIN):

S. 2628. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to remove a limitation on an individual's eligibility for medical assistance under the State Medicaid plan while the individual is in custody pending disposition of charges; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. ROUNDS (for himself and Mr. JONES):

S. 2629. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act with respect to the Public Health Service Corps; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. LEE (for himself, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, and Mrs. BLACKBURN):

S. 2630. A bill to repeal the wage requirements of the Davis-Bacon Act; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. SCOTT of Florida (for himself, Mrs. CAPITO, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. COTTON, and Mrs. BLACKBURN):

S. 2631. A bill to amend the Fair Credit Reporting Act to accurately report identity

theft transactions in the credit histories of criminal defendants; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. BROWN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. BOOKER):

S. 2632. A bill to amend the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 to require more detailed travel disclosure filings from judicial officers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL:

S. 2633. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide coverage for wigs as durable medical equipment under the Medicare program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself and Mr. PORTMAN):

S. 2634. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to simplify reporting requirements, promote tax compliance, and reduce tip reporting compliance burdens in the beauty service industry; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WYDEN:

S. 2635. A bill to require the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation to declassify any and all information relating to whether the government of Saudi Arabia assisted a citizen or national of Saudi Arabia in departing the United States while the citizen or national was awaiting trial or sentencing for a criminal offense committed in the United States, and for other purposes; considered and passed.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself and Mrs. CAPITO):

S. 2636. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to establish a program to make grants to eligible entities to increase the resilience of publicly owned treatment works to natural hazards, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. WYDEN:

S. 2637. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act to establish requirements and responsibilities for entities that use, store, or share personal information, to protect personal information, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. DUCKWORTH (for herself and Mrs. FISCHER):

S. 2638. A bill to amend title 49, United State Code, to require small hub airports to construct areas for nursing mothers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. UDALL (for himself, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mr. SANDERS):

S. 2639. A bill to restore integrity to America's Election; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. BROWN (for himself and Ms. WARREN):

S. 2640. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to make for-profit institutions ineligible for Federal student aid and to protect the integrity of nonprofit institutions of higher education; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. RISCH (for himself, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. JONES, Mr. GARDNER, and Mr. BARRASSO):

S. 2641. A bill to promote United States national security and prevent the resurgence of ISIS, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself and Ms. WARREN):

S. 2642. A bill to prohibit the construction of natural gas compressor stations as part of a project that would lead to or facilitate natural gas exports; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. PETERS:

S. 2643. A bill to posthumously award a Congressional Gold Medal to Judge Damon Jerome Keith; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. GRAHAM (for himself, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. ERNST, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. COONS, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. ALEXANDER, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. PORTMAN, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. ROMNEY, Mr. CARPER, Ms. COLLINS, and Ms. SINEMA):

S. 2644. A bill to impose sanctions with respect to Turkey, and for other purposes; read the first time.

By Mrs. BLACKBURN (for herself, Mr. TILLIS, and Mr. PERDUE):

S. 2645. A bill to prove that the Federal Communications Commission and communications service providers regulated by the Commission under the Communications Act of 1934 shall not be subject to certain provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 and the National Historic Preservation Act with respect to the construction, rebuilding, or hardening of communications facilities following a major disaster or an emergency declared by the President, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. CORNYN:

S. 2646. A bill to amend the National Trails System Act to provide for the study of the Emancipation National Historic Trail, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. ERNST (for herself and Mr. CRAMER):

S. 2647. A bill to address Federal employees and contractors who commit sexual assault; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. MURPHY:

S. Res. 360. A resolution affirming the importance of access to safe, quality education, including protection from attacks on education, for children in conflict settings; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Ms. ERNST (for herself and Mr. RUBIO):

S. Res. 361. A resolution acknowledging the Kurds' vital role in stopping the spread of ISIS militants in the Middle East, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. COONS (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY):

S. Res. 362. A resolution designating the week beginning on October 13, 2019, as ''National Wildlife Refuge Week''; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHUMER (for Ms. HARRIS):

S. Res. 363. A resolution designating October 2019 as ''National Youth Justice Action Month''; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VAN HOLLEN (for himself, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. KAINE, Mr. WARNER, and Ms. CANTWELL):

S. Res. 364. A resolution congratulating the Washington Mystics on winning the 2019 Women's National Basketball Association championship; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. COONS (for himself, Mr. MORAN, Mr. BOOZMAN, and Mr. LEAHY):

S. Res. 365. A resolution designating October 16, 2019, and October 16, 2020, as ''World Food Day''; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 106

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the names of the Senator from Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 106, a bill to reauthorize and extend funding for community health centers and the National Health Service Corps.

S. 230

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 230, a bill to require a report on foreign nationals who flee from the United States while awaiting trial or sentencing for a criminal offense committed in the United States, to establish a list of countries who have assisted or facilitated with such departures, to penalize parties connected to such departures, and to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to prohibit the exclusion from gross income from certain investments made by foreign governments who are identified on such list.

S. 286

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 286, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the coverage of marriage and family therapist services and mental health counselor services under part B of the Medicare program, and for other purposes.

S. 299

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 299, a bill to amend title VII of the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize programs that support interprofessional geriatric education and training to develop a geriatric-capable workforce, improving health outcomes for a growing and diverse aging American population and their families, and for other purposes.

S. 457

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the names of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER) and the Senator from Missouri (Mr. HAWLEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 457, a bill to require that $1 coins issued during 2019 honor President George H.W. Bush and to direct the Secretary of the Treasury to issue bullion coins during 2019 in honor of Barbara Bush.

S. 495

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 495, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to reauthorize and expand the National Threat Assessment Center of the Department of Homeland Security.

S. 621

At the request of Ms. DUCKWORTH, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 621, a bill to amend the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 to require each State to implement a process under which individuals who are 16 years of age may apply to register to vote in elections for Federal office in the State, to direct the Election Assistance Commission to make grants to States to increase the involvement of minors in public election activities, and for other purposes.

S. 785

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 785, a bill to improve mental health care provided by the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

S. 787

At the request of Ms. WARREN, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 787, a bill to make housing more affordable, and for other purposes.

S. 827

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 827, a bill to designate certain National Forest System land and certain public land under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior in the States of Idaho, Montana, Oregon, Washington, and Wyoming as wilderness, wild and scenic rivers, wildland recovery areas, and biological connecting corridors, and for other purposes.

S. 846

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 846, a bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to limit certain rolling stock procurements, and for other purposes.

S. 888

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 888, a bill to require a standard financial aid offer form, and for other purposes.

S. 933

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 933, a bill to improve data collection and monitoring of the Great Lakes, oceans, bays, estuaries, and coasts, and for other purposes.

S. 990

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. SASSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 990, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to participate in the implementation of the Platte River Recovery Implementation Program First Increment Extension for threatened and endangered species in the Central and Lower Platte River Basin, and for other purposes.

S. 997

At the request of Ms. WARREN, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 997, a bill to recognize and honor the service of individuals who served in the United States Cadet Nurse Corps during World War II, and for other purposes.

S. 1004

At the request of Mr. PETERS, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1004, a bill to increase the number of U.S. Customs and Border Protection Office of Field Operations officers and support staff and to require reports that identify staffing, infrastructure, and equipment needed to enhance security at ports of entry.

S. 1032

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1032, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the definition of income for purposes of determining the tax-exempt status of certain corporations.

S. 1037

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1037, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to modernize provisions relating to rural health clinics under Medicare.

S. 1088

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor 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. 1255

At the request of Mr. SASSE, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1255, a bill to require the Secretary of Transportation to modify provisions relating to hours of service requirements with respect to transportation of livestock and insects, and for other purposes.

S. 1263

At the request of Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, the names of the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) and the Senator from Alabama (Mr. JONES) were added as cosponsors 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. 1264

At the request of Mr. DAINES, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1264, a bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to deny Federal retirement benefits to individuals convicted of child sex abuse.

S. 1280

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the names of the Senator from Florida (Mr. SCOTT) and the Senator from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA) were added as cosponsors of S. 1280, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to establish a system to notify individuals approaching Medicare eligibility, to simplify and modernize the eligibility enrollment process, and for other purposes.

S. 1381

At the request of Mr. BOOZMAN, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1381, a bill to modify the presumption of service connection for veterans who were exposed to herbicide agents while serving in the Armed Forces in Thailand during the Vietnam era, and for other purposes.

S. 1421

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the names of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1421, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the 23d Headquarters Special Troops and the 3133d Signal Service Company in recognition of their unique and distinguished service as a ''Ghost Army'' that conducted deception operations in Europe during World War II.

S. 1590

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the names of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) and the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1590, a bill to amend the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 to authorize rewards for thwarting wildlife trafficking linked to transnational organized crime, and for other purposes.

S. 1627

At the request of Mrs. CAPITO, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1627, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend and modify the section 45 credit for refined coal from steel industry fuel, and for other purposes.

S. 1723

At the request of Mr. BENNET, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1723, a bill to amend the Omnibus Parks and Public Lands Management Act of 1996 to provide for the establishment of a Ski Area Fee Retention Account.

S. 1725

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1725, a bill to permit occupational therapists to conduct the initial assessment visit and complete the comprehensive assessment under a Medicare home health plan of care for certain rehabilitation cases.

S. 1731

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr.

SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1731, a bill to amend the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002 to require the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board to maintain a list of certain foreign issuers, and for other purposes.

S. 1757

At the request of Ms. ERNST, the names of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1757, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the United States Army Rangers Veterans of World War II in recognition of their extraordinary service during World War II.

S. 1802

At the request of Mr. KAINE, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. JONES) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1802, a bill to provide a work opportunity tax credit for military spouses and to provide for flexible spending arrangements for childcare services for military families.

S. 1846

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1846, a bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to provide for engagements with State, local, Tribal, and territorial governments, and for other purposes.

S. 1891

At the request of Mr. PETERS, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1891, a bill to provide for the inclusion on the Vietnam Veterans Memorial Wall of the names of the soldiers who died on Flying Tiger Flight 739 on March 16, 1962.

S. 1906

At the request of Mr. BOOZMAN, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. JONES) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1906, a bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide financial assistance to eligible entities to provide and coordinate the provision of suicide prevention services for veterans at risk of suicide and veteran families through the award of grants to such entities, and for other purposes.

S. 1964

At the request of Ms. HIRONO, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1964, a bill to support educational entities in fully implementing title IX and reducing and preventing sex discrimination in all areas of education, and for other purposes.

S. 1989

At the request of Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1989, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for transparency of Medicare secondary payer reporting information, and for other purposes.

S. 2054

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2054, a bill to posthumously award the Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to Glen Doherty, Tyrone Woods, J. Christopher Stevens, and Sean Smith, in recognition of their contributions to the Nation.

S. 2132

At the request of Mr. LANKFORD, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2132, a bill to promote security and provide justice for United States victims of international terrorism.

S. 2158

At the request of Ms. HASSAN, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2158, a bill to improve certain programs of the Department of Health and Human Services with respect to heritable disorders.

S. 2179

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2179, a bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to provide social service agencies with the resources to provide services to meet the urgent needs of Holocaust survivors to age in place with dignity, comfort, security, and quality of life.

S. 2203

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the names of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) were added as cosponsors of S. 2203, a bill to extend the transfer of Electronic Travel Authorization System fees from the Travel Promotion Fund to the Corporation for Travel Promotion (Brand USA) through fiscal year 2027, and for other purposes.

S. 2330

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the names of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) and the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 2330, a bill to amend the Ted Stevens Olympic and Amateur Sports Act to provide for congressional oversight of the board of directors of the United States Olympic and Paralympic Committee and to protect amateur athletes from emotional, physical, and sexual abuse, and for other purposes.

S. 2417

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2417, a bill to provide for payment of proceeds from savings bonds to a State with title to such bonds pursuant to the judgment of a court.

S. 2439

At the request of Mr. KING, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2439, a bill to amend the Trademark Act of 1946 to provide that the licensing of a mark for use by a related company may not be construed as establishing an employment relationship between the owner of the mark, or an authorizing person, and either that related company or the employees of that related company, and for other purposes.

S. 2507

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2507, a bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to authorize admission of Canadian retirees as long-term visitors for pleasure described in section 101(a)(15)(B) of such Act, and for other purposes.

S. 2521

At the request of Mr. KAINE, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2521, a bill to award grants for the recruitment, retention, and advancement of direct care workers.

S. 2530

At the request of Mr. PERDUE, the names of the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 2530, a bill to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to establish a School Safety Clearinghouse, and for other purposes.

S. 2535

At the request of Ms. SINEMA, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. 2535, a bill to require the Secretary of Commerce to conduct an assessment and analysis relating to the decline in the business formation rate in the United States.

S. 2570

At the request of Ms. SINEMA, the names of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) and the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) were added as cosponsors of S. 2570, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to Greg LeMond in recognition of his service to the United States as an athlete, activist, role model, and community leader.

S. 2579

At the request of Ms. HIRONO, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2579, a bill to direct the Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy to carry out programs and activities to ensure that Federal science agencies and institutions of higher education receiving Federal research and development funding are fully engaging their entire talent pool, and for other purposes.

S. 2590

At the request of Mr. BRAUN, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2590, a bill to protect the dignity of fetal remains, and for other purposes.

S.J. RES. 53

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the names of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) and the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) were added as cosponsors of S.J. Res. 53, a joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Environmental Protection Agency relating to ''Repeal of the Clean Power Plan; Emission Guidelines for Greenhouse Gas Emissions From Existing Electric Utility Generating Units; Revisions to Emission Guidelines Implementing Regulations''.

S. RES. 150

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 150, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that it is the policy of the United States to commemorate the Armenian Genocide through official recognition and remembrance.

S. RES. 318

At the request of Mr. RISCH, the names of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 318, a resolution to support the Global Fund to fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria, and the Sixth Replenishment.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS ON JUNE 13, 2019

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself and Mr. MANCHIN):

S. 1868. A bill to provide support to States to establish invisible high-risk pool or reinsurance programs; to the Committee on Finance.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, rising health care costs are a major concern for millions of Americans—whether it's expensive health insurance premiums, high out-of-pocket expenses, or soaring prescription drug costs. In the individual market, where 11.5 million Americans who do not have employer-sponsored insurance have to go to buy their insurance—including the 78,000 individuals in Maine—premiums continue to rise exponentially.

With this in mind, I am introducing the Premium Reduction Act of 2019 with my good friend and colleague, Senator JOE MANCHIN. Leading health care experts at Oliver Wyman indicate that our legislation would lower average health insurance premiums for consumers in the individual market by as much as 30 percent. In addition, more than a million more individuals would have health insurance that they now lack.

Data from the Kaiser Family Foundation show premiums for the benchmark ''silver'' plans under the Affordable Care Act (ACA) are nearly 75 percent higher than they were when the ACA went ''live'' in 2014. While individuals who are eligible for the ACA's premium tax credits are shielded from these increases, the price of these silver plans is out of reach for many who are not eligible for these tax credits. Even ''bronze plans''—the lowest cost individual market policies available through the ACA exchanges—have become unaffordable for those without subsidies. Bronze plan premiums have gone up so much that they now exceed those charged for silver plans in 2014, despite the fact that these bronze policies have far higher deductibles and out-of-pocket expenses.

Individuals who make 400 percent or less of the federal poverty level get a federal tax credit to help defray the monthly premium cost. But individuals who make just one dollar over that level get no help at all, and must pay the full premium on their own. These premiums are simply unaffordable for middle-income families.

The difference in premiums is shocking for many families. For example, in Aroostook County, Maine, a 60 year-old couple enrolled in a silver plan will pay about $6,500 for coverage if they earn 400 percent or less of the federal poverty level: in other words, as long as they earn less than roughly $66,000. But if they earn just a dollar more, they will lose their eligibility for a premium tax credit, and will have to pay the entire premium themselves—an incredible $36,500!

One step Congress could take to help alleviate the rising cost of premiums in the individual health insurance markets is to provide States with additional flexibility and support to design State-based stabilization programs that would help offset the costs of covering consumers with high medical expenses. Once these costs are covered, the premiums needed to provide insurance to the rest of the population can be set at a much lower level. Thus far, seven states—Maine, Alaska, Maryland, Minnesota, New Jersey, Oregon, and Wisconsin—have established such programs. According to the health care experts at Avalere, the programs in these seven states have reduced premiums in the individual market by 20 percent compared to what they otherwise would have been, and saved the federal government nearly $1 billion in funding in the first year, which was returned to the states in the form of ''pass through'' funding.

Under the Premium Reduction Act, $5 billion would be available annually over three years to support states that operate stabilization programs under section 1332 of the Affordable Care Act. In addition, $500 million is provided to assist states with planning the design of their own stabilization program, and there is a ''federal fallback'' for 2021 to give states time to apply for waivers under section 1332. It is important to note that our proposal does not change in any way the ACA's essential benefits requirements or its protections for individuals with pre-existing conditions.

The bill provides three options for expedited review so that states could quickly stand-up their own programs using the existing waiver process under section 1332 of the Affordable Care Act:

First, a state can demonstrate that their program is an ''invisible high-risk pool'' in keeping with the design pioneered by Maine early in this decade and used as a template by Alaska more recently;

Second, a state can show that its program fits within the parameters of the ACA's transitional reinsurance program, which expired at the end of 2016; or

Third, a state can submit what can be described as a ''copycat'' application based on another state's program that has already received approval.

In lieu of these three expedited approval options, a state may seek approval of a program of their own design. Regardless of the option they select, all states operating qualifying stabilization programs would be eligible to receive an allocation from the funding provided by the bill. States may also add funds from other sources to the mix.

In addition, in 2021, states that do not wish to establish their own stabilization program may instead receive funding through the ''federal fallback'' that I described a few moments ago.

Finally, the bill would also extend the section 1332 ''feedback effect'' to states that receive funding through the federal fallback provision. This will ensure that the benefits of lower premiums are felt in all states as quickly as possible, giving states ample time to seek and obtain approval of their own programs under the waiver process.

In a recent letter to me endorsing our bill, the National Association of Insurance Commissioners stressed that ''[alction must be taken to make coverage more affordable or we will see even higher uninsured rates, more people move to less regulated plans, and sicker individual market pools.'' The NAIC's letter goes on to note the success of stabilization programs at the state level, stating that such programs are ''a cost-effective way to significantly reduce individual market premiums'' that can expand coverage and make it more affordable unsubsidized individuals and families. The NAIC closed its letter with a call to implement such programs nationwide.

Also, a consortium of health care providers, insurers, and stakeholders—joined by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce—circulated a letter recently to Senate and House leadership urging them to adopt a proposal like the one we are introducing as a ''commonsense solution to significantly lower premiums.'' In their letter, they stressed that premium reduction programs can ''help cover the costs of people with significant health care needs and improve the affordability of health care coverage,'' especially for those who are not eligible for subsidies.

Mr. President, I ask that these letters be entered into the RECORD immediately after my remarks.

Efforts at further reform of America's health care system have been the source of frustration and division in this chamber. At the same time, many members of both parties are committed to reducing health care costs and expanding access to quality, affordable coverage. The programs adopted by seven pioneering states have a proven track-record in reducing premiums for consumers and would make policies in the individual market more affordable. The bill Senator MANCHIN and I are introducing today would help extend and fund these successful models to every state that chooses to participate, helping to reduce premiums for the 11.5 million Americans who get their insurance in the individual market nationwide. I urge my colleagues to support our bill.

MAY 28, 2019.

DEAR LEADERS MCCONNELL AND SCHUMER, SPEAKER PELOSI AND LEADER MCCARTHY: As providers of health care and coverage to hundreds of millions of Americans, we write to you to urge prompt action to lower health insurance premiums. The individual market is a critical source of coverage for millions of Americans, helping them to access care. Unfortunately, however, individual market premiums are often unaffordable for many middle class families who do not receive any financial assistance. With health insurers finalizing their premium rates for 2020, the time is now for Congress to establish a premium reduction/reinsurance program to help cover the costs of people with significant health care needs and improve the affordability of health care coverage.

A reinsurance program is a commonsense solution to significantly lower premiums, which would greatly improve access to coverage and care. Independent analyses, including ones by Oliver Wyman and Avalere Health, show that a premium reduction/reinsurance program could reduce premiums by up to 20% while preserving the comprehensiveness of coverage, primarily helping those who are not subsidy eligible.

We understand that there are numerous efforts in Congress underway to establish a premium reduction/reinsurance program, and we are happy to work with all parties towards a final bill that will improve the individual market for 2020 and beyond.

We urge you to deliver on the promise to reduce premiums for millions of deserving Americans and their families so they can access the care they need. We look forward to working with you in support of this promise.

Sincerely,

AMERICA'S HEALTH INSURANCE PLANS.
AMERICAN ACADEMY OF FAMILY PHYSICIANS.
AMERICAN BENEFITS COUNCIL.
AMERICAN HOSPITAL ASSOCIATION.
AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION.
BLUE CROSS BLUE SHIELD ASSOCIATION.
FEDERATION OF AMERICAN HOSPITALS.
U.S. CHAMBER OF COMMERCE.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF INSURANCE COMMISSIONERS AND THE CENTER FOR INSURANCE POLICY AND RESEARCH,

June 12, 2019.

Hon. SUSAN COLLINS,
Senator, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR COLLINS: On behalf of the members of the National Association of Insurance Commissioners (NAIC) we write to express our support for your continued efforts to help improve the individual health insurance markets in our states through the funding of state stabilization programs.

While many states have seen more stable premium rates and carrier participation over the past two years, the fact remains that in all states premiums continue to be significant for those who do not receive federal subsidies. This has resulted in shrinking individual markets and less stable risk pools. Action must be taken to make coverage more affordable or we will see even higher uninsured rates, more people move to less-regulated plans, and sicker individual market pools.

This is why commissioners from across the political spectrum have contacted their congressional delegations, testified before House and Senate committees, and urged federal policymakers to take immediate action to stabilize the individual health insurance market. In particular, we support your proposal to provide federal funding for state stabilization programs, as well as for grants to help states develop innovative solutions through Section 1332 waivers. We also support the creation of a federal program to assist consumers in states unable to implement their own program quickly.

State reinsurance programs and invisible high-risk pools have already proven their effectiveness. According to a recent Avalere study, the seven states that have already implemented a program through a Section 1332 waiver using state funds have reduced premium by almost 20%. Additional federal funding, as outlined in your bill, would provide even more benefit to consumers, and extend the benefits to all states.

Creating a federal market stabilization program is a cost-effective way to significantly reduce individual market premiums, thus making coverage more affordable to unsubsidized individuals and families and growing the individual market pool. We have seen it work in the handful of states that have implemented such programs; it is time to implement it nationwide.

Sincerely,

ERIC A. CIOPPA,
NAIC President, Superintendent, Maine Bureau of Insurance.
RAYMOND G. FARMER,
NAIC President-Elect, Director, South Carolina Department of Insurance.
DAVID ALTMAIER,
NAIC Vice President, Commissioner, Florida Office of Insurance.
DEAN L. CAMERON,
NAIC Secretary-Treasurer, Director, Regulation Idaho Department of Insurance.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. WYDEN:

S. 2635. A bill to require the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation to declassify any and all information relating to whether the government of Saudi Arabia assisted a citizen or national of Saudi Arabia in departing the United States while the citizen or national was awaiting trial or sentencing for a criminal offense committed in the United States, and for other purposes; considered and passed.

S. 2635

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 ''Saudi Fugitive Declassification Act of 2019''.

SEC. 2. DECLASSIFICATION OF ANY AND ALL INFORMATION RELATING TO ACTIONS BY GOVERNMENT OF SAUDI ARABIA TO ASSIST PERSONS IN DEPARTING UNITED STATES WHO WERE AWAITING TRIAL OR SENTENCING IN UNITED STATES.

Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, in coordination with the Director of National Intelligence, shall declassify any and all information related to whether the government of Saudi Arabia materially assisted or facilitated any citizen or national of Saudi Arabia in departing from the United States while the citizen or national was awaiting trial or sentencing for a criminal offense committed in the United States.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 360—AFFIRMING THE IMPORTANCE OF ACCESS TO SAFE, QUALITY EDUCATION, INCLUDING PROTECTION FROM ATTACKS ON EDUCATION, FOR CHILDREN IN CONFLICT SETTINGS

Mr. MURPHY submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 360

Whereas providing children with education is critical to the international, humanitarian, and development efforts of the United States;

Whereas 142,000,000 children live in high-intensity conflict zones, according to a February 2019 report from Save the Children;

Whereas grave violations against children, which are defined by the United Nations Security Council as the killing and maiming of children, recruitment or use of children as soldiers, sexual violence against children, abduction of children, and attacks against schools or hospitals, have nearly tripled since 2010;

Whereas attacks on education settings, including targeted killings, sexual and gender-based violence, abduction, child recruitment, intimidation, threats, military occupation, and destruction of property, are common tactics in conflict;

Whereas there were 1,432 verified attacks on schools in conflict contexts in 2017, according to the United Nations Secretary General's annual report on children and armed conflict;

Whereas conflict limits educational opportunities for millions of students worldwide, and regions with low rates of education have a 50-percent chance of experiencing conflict;

Whereas 27,000,000 children of primary and lower secondary school age are out of school

in 24 conflict-affected countries, and refugee children are 5 times more likely to be out of school as compared to nonrefugee children;

Whereas only 61 percent of refugee children attend primary school compared to 92 percent of nonrefugee children, only 23 percent of refugee adolescents attend secondary school compared to 84 percent globally, and only 1 percent of refugee children make it to a university;

Whereas education in emergencies is lifesaving, providing access to critical services, including nutrition, health services, mental health and psychosocial support, water, sanitation, and hygiene;

Whereas education supports children's safety and well-being as part of child protection strategies;

Whereas education accounts for less than 2 percent of total global humanitarian funding and child-specific protection programs account for 0.53 percent;

Whereas girls and boys experience conflict differently, encounter distinct gender-related barriers to education, and require gender-responsive and context-specific approaches to education, child protection, and health services, including mental health and psychosocial support programming;

Whereas girls, children with disabilities, and those impacted by traumatic experiences living in conflict contexts face significant barriers to access, enrollment, and attendance in schools;

Whereas access to quality educational opportunities can contribute to peace and security as well as mitigate factors that lead to conflict and displacement; and

Whereas Congress passed the Reinforcing Education Accountability in Development Act (Public Law 115–56), and the Protecting Girls' Access to Education in Vulnerable Settings Act (Public Law 115–442), which recognize the importance of education in crisis and conflict situations, and require reporting on progress toward a comprehensive United States strategy to promote quality basic education in partner countries and address the needs of displaced girls: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) condemns attacks on education settings, including violence against schools, the military use of schools, acts of sexual violence against children in school settings, and the abduction and recruitment of children into armed forces from schools;

(2) affirms the commitment of the United States Government to support educational services for children affected by conflict, including the most vulnerable and marginalized, beginning in the earliest phases of humanitarian response efforts—

(A) to save lives and facilitate access to critical services, including nutrition, health, psychosocial support, water, sanitation, and hygiene;

(B) to support physical, psychosocial, and cognitive protection; and

(C) to support greater short- and long-term stability, promote peace, and support the vital contributions of women and girls to communities, nations, and regions around the world; and

(3) calls on the United States Government—

(A) to monitor attacks on education settings, including attacks on schools, teachers, and students, and attacks that are gender-related, and to use that information to support effective and coordinated diplomatic and programmatic responses;

(B) to hold accountable all parties, including government and non-state actors, responsible for attacks on schools and other grave violations against children in armed conflict;

(C) to support policies and programs to return refugee children to educational settings as soon as possible upon arrival in a host country;

(D) to provide support for the inclusion of refugee children in host country national education plans and systems whenever possible;

(E) to recognize that education in emergencies and child protection programs are lifesaving and complementary efforts that are strongest when equally supported;

(F) to ensure that marginalized children in conflict settings, especially girls, children with disabilities, those suffering from trauma, and those excluded from access to quality and inclusive education due to other causes, are able to access safe, quality education;

(G) to ensure appropriate training and support for teachers to best support students' distinct needs, including their psychosocial well-being, and to apply conflict-sensitive and gender-responsive approaches;

(H) to encourage the inclusion of child protection experts in peacekeeping missions, to push for reporting requirements on attacks on schools and children in peacekeeping mandates, and to support the inclusion of child rights experts in justice and accountability mechanisms;

(I) to support preventative measures, such as early warning systems and rapid response mechanisms, in places where attacks on education occur or are highly likely to occur; and

(J) to work in collaboration with civil society experts to better prevent and respond to attacks on education, and with relevant multilateral institutions and other nations to share responsibility for monitoring, preventing, and responding to attacks on education.

SENATE RESOLUTION 361—ACKNOWLEDGING THE KURDS' VITAL ROLE IN STOPPING THE SPREAD OF ISIS MILITANTS IN THE MIDDLE EAST, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Ms. ERNST (for herself and Mr. RUBIO) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.:

S. RES. 361

Whereas, in 2014, the United States led an international coalition against Islamic State (ISIS) militants, conducting airstrikes and later building military bases on Syrian territory to assist ground operations against ISIS;

Whereas a coalition of Arab and Kurdish militias, known as the Syrian Democratic Forces (SDF), with the help of United States airstrikes and military advisors, drove ISIS away from the Turkish border and out of northern Syria;

Whereas, since ISIS militants swept across Syria and military action against ISIS began, the SDF has done the critical work of clearing, holding, and governing the territory previously conquered by the ISIS militants;

Whereas the SDF became one of the United States' strongest partners in fighting ISIS as fearless and loyal fighters who fought fiercely alongside United States special operations forces and other coalition partners, losing over 10,000 SDF troops throughout the course of military operations;

Whereas the SDF with coalition support captured approximately 11,000 ISIS fighters and detained them in Kurdish-held territory;

Whereas the Kurds have assisted humanitarian efforts in the area, including caring for refugees and operating more than a dozen camps for displaced families, helping tens of thousands of people, many of them the wives and children of ISIS fighters;

Whereas the Government of Turkey is hostile toward Kurdish groups living along its border with Syria, claiming that the Kurdish fighters in Syria are linked to the Kurdistan Workers Party (PKK), which has been in conflict with Turkey for the past several decades;

Whereas the SDF has not engaged in offensive operations against Turkey and has served as a buffer preventing extremist fighters from launching attacks into Turkey and beyond;

Whereas the United States Armed Forces were ordered to withdraw from sites along the Turkish border in northern Syria, followed by a Turkish incursion that began on October 9, 2019;

Whereas the withdrawal of United States troops and the ongoing conflict between Turkey and Kurdish-led fighters will allow ISIS to profit from the instability in the region, as SDF counter-ISIS missions have been suspended, and Kurdish-held ISIS prisoners are in danger of being released from confinement, as the SDF no longer have the capacity to guard detention facilities while they are engaged in defensive operations against Turkish forces; and

Whereas the withdrawal of United States forces from northern Syria has severely damaged our relationship with our Kurdish partners, effectively forcing them to ally with the Assad regime, allowing the Governments of the Russian Federation and Iran to expand their influence in the region, while at the same time laying the groundwork for an ISIS resurgence, damaging the United States's standing in the international community and undermining both regional security as well as our own national security: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That is the sense of the Senate—

(1) to acknowledge the importance of the Kurds' vital role in stopping the spread of ISIS militants in the region;

(2) that ISIS still poses a danger in the Middle East and beyond and must not be allowed the opportunity to mount an effective resurgence campaign;

(3) that the United States Government must continue its leading role in promoting peace in the Middle East and fighting against terrorist groups such as ISIS, wherever they may be located; and

(4) that the Department of Defense, in conjunction with the Department of State, should provide a briefing to Congress within 30 days outlining plans and a strategy to continue the global fight against ISIS, specifically addressing the ongoing threat of ISIS in Syria and Iraq and how this strategy will—

(A) prevent an ISIS resurgence in Syria;

(B) prevent ISIS efforts to capitalize from recent developments;

(C) contain any ISIS expansion in Syria or in nations bordering Syria;

(D) mitigate the threat of ISIS attacks on the United States homeland or our partners and allies; and

(E) protect the gains made in the fight against ISIS since 2014.

SENATE RESOLUTION 362—DESIGNATING THE WEEK BEGINNING ON OCTOBER 13, 2019, AS ''NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE WEEK''

Mr. COONS (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 362

Whereas, in 1903, President Theodore Roosevelt established the first national wildlife refuge on Pelican Island in Florida;

Whereas, in 2019, the National Wildlife Refuge System, administered by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, is the premier system of land and water to conserve wildlife in the world and has grown to 567 national wildlife refuges and 38 wetland management districts located in every State and territory of the United States;

Whereas national wildlife refuges are important recreational and tourism destinations in communities across the United States and offer a variety of recreational opportunities, including 6 wildlife-dependent uses that the National Wildlife Refuge System manages, specifically hunting, fishing, wildlife observation, photography, environmental education, and interpretation;

Whereas the National Wildlife Refuge System receives more than 50,000,000 visitors annually, which generates more than $3,200,000,000 in sales and more than 41,000 jobs in local economies;

Whereas 382 units of the National Wildlife Refuge System have hunting programs that receive more than 2,000,000 hunting visits annually, and 316 units of the National Wildlife Refuge System have fishing programs that receive more than 7,000,000 fishing visits annually;

Whereas the National Wildlife Refuge System has hosted more than 30,000,000 wildlife observation visits in recent years;

Whereas national wildlife refuges are important to local businesses and gateway communities;

Whereas the National Wildlife Refuge System encompasses every kind of ecosystem in the United States, including temperate, tropical, and boreal forests, wetlands, deserts, grasslands, arctic tundras, and remote islands, and spans 12 time zones from the United States Virgin Islands to Guam;

Whereas national wildlife refuges are home to more than—

(1) 700 species of birds;

(2) 220 species of mammals;

(3) 250 species of reptiles and amphibians; and

(4) 1,000 species of fish;

Whereas national wildlife refuges are the primary Federal land on which the production, migration, and wintering habitats for waterfowl are fostered;

Whereas, since 1934, the Migratory Bird Conservation Fund, which has been largely funded from the sale of the Federal Duck Stamp to outdoor enthusiasts, has generated more than $1,500,000,000 and enabled the conservation of more than 5,900,000 acres of habitat for waterfowl and numerous other species in the National Wildlife Refuge System;

Whereas national wildlife refuges provide protection to more than 380 threatened and endangered species;

Whereas national wildlife refuges are cores of conservation for larger landscapes and resources for other agencies of the Federal Government, State governments, private landowners, and organizations in efforts to secure the wildlife heritage of the United States;

Whereas more than 38,000 volunteers and almost 200 national wildlife refuge ''Friends'' organizations contribute approximately 1,350,000 volunteer hours annually, the equivalent of 650 full-time employees, and provide an important link to local communities;

Whereas national wildlife refuges provide an important opportunity for children to discover and gain a greater appreciation for the natural world;

Whereas there are national wildlife refuges located in several urban and suburban areas and there is a national wildlife refuge located within a 1-hour drive of nearly every metropolitan area in the United States, which has enabled national wildlife refuges to employ, educate, and engage young people from all backgrounds in exploring, connecting with, and preserving the natural heritage of the United States;

Whereas, since 1995, national wildlife refuges across the United States have held festivals, educational programs, guided tours, and other events to celebrate National Wildlife Refuge Week during the second full week of October;

Whereas the United States Fish and Wildlife Service has designated the week beginning on October 13, 2019, as ''National Wildlife Refuge Week''; and

Whereas the designation of National Wildlife Refuge Week by the Senate would recognize more than a century of conservation in the United States, raise awareness about the importance of wildlife and the National Wildlife Refuge System, and celebrate the myriad recreational opportunities available for the enjoyment of the protected land and water within that system: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates the week beginning on October 13, 2019, as ''National Wildlife Refuge Week'';

(2) encourages the observance of National Wildlife Refuge Week with appropriate events and activities;

(3) acknowledges the importance of national wildlife refuges for their recreational opportunities and contribution to local economies across the United States;

(4) finds that national wildlife refuges play a vital role in securing the hunting and fishing heritage of the United States for future generations;

(5) identifies the significance of national wildlife refuges in advancing the traditions of wildlife observation, photography, environmental education, and interpretation;

(6) recognizes the importance of national wildlife refuges to wildlife conservation, the protection of imperiled species and ecosystems, and compatible uses;

(7) acknowledges the role of national wildlife refuges in conserving waterfowl and waterfowl habitat under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (16 U.S.C. 703 et seq.);

(8) reaffirms the support of the Senate for wildlife conservation and the National Wildlife Refuge System; and

(9) expresses the intent of the Senate—

(A) to continue working to conserve wildlife; and

(B) to manage the National Wildlife Refuge System for current and future generations.

SENATE RESOLUTION 363—DESIGNATING OCTOBER 2019 AS ''NATIONAL YOUTH JUSTICE ACTION MONTH''

Mr. SCHUMER (for Ms. HARRIS) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 363

Whereas the historical role of the juvenile court system is to rehabilitate and treat young offenders while holding them accountable and maintaining public safety, and the juvenile court system is therefore better equipped to work with youth than the adult criminal justice system, which is punitive in nature;

Whereas youth are developmentally different from adults, and those differences have been—

(1) documented by research on the adolescent brain; and

(2) acknowledged by the Supreme Court of the United States, State supreme courts, and many State and Federal laws that prohibit youth under the age of 18 from taking on major adult responsibilities such as voting, jury duty, and military service;

Whereas youth who are placed under the commitment of the juvenile court system are able to access age-appropriate services and education and remain closer to their families, which reduces the likelihood that those youth will commit offenses in the future;

Whereas, every year in the United States, an estimated 76,000 youth are tried, sentenced, or incarcerated as adults, and most of those youth are prosecuted for nonviolent offenses;

Whereas most laws allowing the prosecution of youth as adults were enacted before the publication of research-based evidence by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention of the Department of Justice demonstrating that prosecuting youth in adult court actually decreases public safety as, on average, youth prosecuted in adult court are 34 percent more likely to commit future crimes than youth retained in the juvenile court system;

Whereas youth of color, youth with disabilities, and youth with mental health issues are disproportionally represented at all stages of the criminal justice system;

Whereas it is harmful to public safety and to young offenders to confine youth in adult jails or prisons where they are significantly more likely to be physically and sexually assaulted and often placed in solitary confinement;

Whereas youth sentenced as adults receive an adult criminal record that hinders future education and employment opportunities;

Whereas youth who receive extremely long sentences deserve an opportunity to demonstrate their potential to grow and change; and

Whereas, in October, people around the United States participate in Youth Justice Action Month to increase public awareness of the issues facing youth transferred to the adult criminal justice system and to provide people across the United States with an opportunity to develop action-oriented events in their communities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) acknowledges that the collateral consequences normally applied in the adult criminal justice system should not automatically apply to youth arrested for crimes before the age of 18;

(2) designates October 2019 as ''National Youth Justice Action Month''; and

(3) recognizes and supports the goals and ideals of National Youth Justice Action Month.

SENATE RESOLUTION 364—CONGRATULATING THE WASHINGTON MYSTICS ON WINNING THE 2019 WOMEN'S NATIONAL BASKETBALL ASSOCIATION CHAMPIONSHIP

Mr. VAN HOLLEN (for himself, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. KAINE, Mr. WARNER, and Ms. CANTWELL) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 364

Whereas, on October 10, 2019, the Washington Mystics won the 2019 Women's National Basketball Association (referred to in this preamble as the ''WNBA'') championship;

Whereas that October 10, 2019, win is the first WNBA championship won by the Washington Mystics in the 22 years that the Washington Mystics have been in the WNBA;

Whereas the Washington Mystics beat the Connecticut Sun in the WNBA finals;

Whereas the Washington Mystics—

(1) dominated the competition in the regular season, with 26 wins and 8 losses, the best record of any team in the WNBA; and

(2) earned the top seed in the playoffs;

Whereas the Washington Mystics play home games at the Entertainment and Sports Arena in Southeast Washington, DC;

Whereas the 2019 roster of Washington Mystics players includes—

(1) Ariel Atkins;
(2) Natasha Cloud;
(3) Elena Delle Donne;
(4) Tianna Hawkins;
(5) Myisha Hines-Allen;
(6) Kiara Leslie;
(7) Emma Meesseman;
(8) Kim Mestdagh;
(9) Aerial Powers;
(10) LaToya Sanders;
(11) Kristi Toliver; and
(12) Shatori Walker-Kimbrough;

Whereas Emma Meesseman received the 2019 WNBA Finals Most Valuable Player award;

Whereas Elena Delle Donne received the 2019 WNBA League Most Valuable Player award;

Whereas Natasha Cloud received the 2019 WNBA Dawn Staley Community Leadership award;

Whereas the 2019 Washington Mystics coaching staff includes—

(1) Head Coach Mike Thibault;
(2) Assistant Coach Marianne Stanley; and
(3) Assistant Coach Eric Thibault;

Whereas Ted Leonsis, founder, chairman, principal partner, and chief executive officer of Monumental Sports & Entertainment, which owns the Washington Mystics, has built a culture of success and contributed greatly to Washington, DC, and the surrounding region through philanthropy;

Whereas the Washington Mystics have exhibited dedication to positive social impact by strengthening communities through the Mystics Care partnership with organizations in Washington, DC, and the surrounding region; and

Whereas the dedication and hard work of the Washington Mystics have inspired and empowered girls, boys, women, and men of all ages: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes the Washington Mystics for winning the 2019 Women's National Basketball Association championship;

(2) applauds the people of Washington, DC, and the surrounding region for their enthusiastic support of the Washington Mystics;

(3) supports equity in men's and women's professional sports; and

(4) respectfully requests the Secretary of the Senate to transmit an enrolled copy of this resolution to the founder, chairman, principal partner, and chief executive officer of Monumental Sports & Entertainment, Ted Leonsis.

SENATE RESOLUTION 365—DESIGNATING OCTOBER 16, 2019, AND OCTOBER 16, 2020, AS ''WORLD FOOD DAY''

Mr. COONS (for himself, Mr. MORAN, Mr. BOOZMAN, and Mr. LEAHY) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 365

Whereas hunger and malnutrition are daily facts of life for hundreds of millions of people around the world;

Whereas women and children suffer the most serious effects of hunger and malnutrition;

Whereas millions of children die each year from hunger-related illness and disease;

Whereas many people suffer permanent physical or mental impairment because of vitamin or protein deficiencies;

Whereas the United States has a long tradition of demonstrating humanitarian concern for the hungry and malnourished people of the world;

Whereas there is a growing concern in the United States and in other countries about threats to the future food supply, including—

(1) misuse and overuse of land and water;
(2) loss of biological diversity; and
(3) erosion of genetic resources on a global scale;

Whereas the world community increasingly calls upon the United States to resolve food problems stemming from natural- and human-made disasters by providing humanitarian assistance;

Whereas the United States—

(1) plays a major role in the development and implementation of international food and agricultural trade standards and practices; and

(2) recognizes the positive role that the global food trade can play in enhancing human nutrition and alleviating hunger;

Whereas, although progress has been made in reducing the incidence of hunger and malnutrition in the United States, certain groups remain vulnerable to malnutrition and related diseases;

Whereas the conservation of natural resources, the preservation of biological diversity, and strong public and private agricultural research programs are required for the United States—

(1) to remain food secure; and

(2) to continue to aid the hungry and malnourished people of the world;

Whereas the United States is a world leader in the development of agricultural innovation and technology aimed at enhancing the improved production, safety, and quality of the world food supply and must continue to retain that role;

Whereas participation by private voluntary organizations and businesses, working with national governments and the international community, is essential in the search for ways to increase food production in developing countries and improve food distribution to hungry and malnourished people;

Whereas the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (referred to in this preamble as the ''FAO'') is mandated to lead global efforts to address food and nutrition security issues;

Whereas the member nations of the FAO have unanimously designated October 16 of each year as ''World Food Day'';

Whereas the FAO has worked to organize activities and efforts on ''World Food Day'' in over 130 countries to promote awareness of and action for people suffering from hunger and malnutrition;

Whereas past observances of ''World Food Day'' have been supported—

(1) by proclamations by Congress, the President, the 50 States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the territories and possessions of the United States; and

(2) by programs of the Department of Agriculture and other Federal departments and agencies;

Whereas private voluntary organizations and community leaders are participating in planning ''World Food Day'' observances in 2019 and 2020, and a growing number of these organizations and leaders are using ''World Food Day'' as a focal point for year-round programs; and

Whereas the people of the United States can express their concern for the plight of hungry and malnourished people throughout the world by study, advocacy, and action: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates October 16, 2019, and October 16, 2020, as ''World Food Day''; and

(2) encourages the people of the United States to observe the days with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 946. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to Treaty Doc. 116–1, Protocol to the North Atlantic Treaty of 1949 on the Accession of the Republic of North Macedonia.

SA 947. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 946 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the resolution of ratification for Treaty Doc. 116–1, supra.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 946. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to Treaty Doc. 116–1, Protocol to the North Atlantic Treaty of 1949 on the Accession of the Republic of North Macedonia; as follows:

At the end add the following.

''This Treaty shall be effective 1 day after the date of ratification.''

SA 947. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 946 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the resolution of ratification for Treaty Doc. 116–1, Protocol to the North Atlantic Treaty of 1949 on the Accession of the Republic of North Macedonia; as follows:

Strike ''1 day'' and insert ''2 days''

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I have 7 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 AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY

The Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, October 17, 2019, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED'SERVICES

The Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, October 17, 2019, at 9 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Banking. Housing, and Urban Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, October 17, 2019, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

The Committee on Energy and Natural Resources is authorized to meet

during the session of the Senate on Thursday, October 17, 2019, at 10:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, October 16, 2019, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing on the following nominations: Halil Suleyman Ozerden, of Mississippi, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Fifth Circuit, David B. Barlow, to be United States District Judge for the District of Utah, John Fitzgerald Kness, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Illinois, R. Austin Huffaker, Jr., to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Alabama, Lee Philip Rudofsky, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Arkansas, Justin Reed Walker, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Kentucky, Eleni Maria Roumel, of Maryland, to be a Judge of the United States Court of Federal Claims, Danielle J. Hunsaker, of Oregon, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit, Steven J. Menashi, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Second Circuit, William Joseph Nardini, of Connecticut, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Second Circuit, Jodi W. Dishman, to be, United States District Judge for the Western District of Oklahoma, Karen Spencer Marston, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, Richard Earnest Myers II, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of North Carolina, Sarah E. Pitlyk, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Missouri, Anuraag Singhal, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Florida, Daniel Mack Traynor, to be United States District Judge for the District of North Dakota, and David M. DeVillers, to be United States Attorney for the Southern District of Ohio, Department of Justice.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON SECURITY

The Subcommittee on Security of the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, October 17, 2019, at 10:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CLEAN AIR AND NUCLEAR SAFETY

The Subcommittee on Clean Air and Nuclear Safety of the Committee on Environment and Public Works is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, October 17, 2019, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

MEASURE READ THE FIRST TIME—S. 2644

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I understand there is a bill at the desk, and I ask for its first reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bill by title for the first time.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2644) to impose sanctions with respect to Turkey, and for other purposes.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I now ask for a second reading, and in order to place the bill on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I object to my own request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection having been heard, the bill will receive its second reading on the next legislative day.

HIDDEN FIGURES CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL ACT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 214, H.R. 1396.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1396) to award Congressional Gold Medals to Katherine Johnson and Dr. Christine Darden, to posthumously award Congressional Gold Medals to Dorothy Vaughan and Mary Jackson, and to award a Congressional Gold Medal to honor all of the women who contributed to the success of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration during the Space Race.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The bill (H.R. 1396) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

CRIMINAL ANTITRUST ANTI-RETALIATION ACT OF 2019

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 163, S. 2258.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2258) to provide anti-retaliation protections for antitrust whistleblowers.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The bill (S. 2258) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 2258

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 ''Criminal Antitrust Anti-Retaliation Act of 2019''.

SEC. 2. AMENDMENT TO ACPERA.

The Antitrust Criminal Penalty Enhancement and Reform Act of 2004 (Public Law 108–237; 15 U.S.C. 1 note) is amended by inserting after section 215 the following:

''SEC. 216. ANTI-RETALIATION PROTECTION FOR WHISTLEBLOWERS.

''(a) WHISTLEBLOWER PROTECTIONS FOR EMPLOYEES, CONTRACTORS, SUBCONTRACTORS, AND AGENTS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—No employer may discharge, demote, suspend, threaten, harass, or in any other manner discriminate against a covered individual in the terms and conditions of employment of the covered individual because of any lawful act done by the covered individual—

''(A) to provide or cause to be provided to the Federal Government or a person with supervisory authority over the covered individual (or such other person working for the employer who has the authority to investigate, discover, or terminate misconduct) information relating to—

''(i) any violation of, or any act or omission the covered individual reasonably believes to be a violation of, the antitrust laws; or

''(ii) any violation of, or any act or omission the covered individual reasonably believes to be a violation of, another criminal law committed in conjunction with a potential violation of the antitrust laws or in conjunction with an investigation by the Department of Justice of a potential violation of the antitrust laws; or

''(B) to cause to be filed, testify in, participate in, or otherwise assist a Federal Government investigation or a Federal Government proceeding filed or about to be filed (with any knowledge of the employer) relating to—

''(i) any violation of, or any act or omission the covered individual reasonably believes to be a violation of, the antitrust laws; or

''(ii) any violation of, or any act or omission the covered individual reasonably believes to be a violation of, another criminal law committed in conjunction with a potential violation of the antitrust laws or in conjunction with an investigation by the Department of Justice of a potential violation of the antitrust laws.

''(2) LIMITATION ON PROTECTIONS.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply to any covered individual if—

''(A) the covered individual planned and initiated a violation or attempted violation of the antitrust laws;

''(B) the covered individual planned and initiated a violation or attempted violation of another criminal law in conjunction with a violation or attempted violation of the antitrust laws; or

''(C) the covered individual planned and initiated an obstruction or attempted obstruction of an investigation by the Department of Justice of a violation of the antitrust laws.

''(3) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(A) ANTITRUST LAWS.—The term 'antitrust laws' means section 1 or 3 of the Sherman Act (15 U.S.C. 1 and 3).

''(B) COVERED INDIVIDUAL.—The term 'covered individual' means an employee, contractor, subcontractor, or agent of an employer.

''(C) EMPLOYER.—The term 'employer' means a person, or any officer, employee, contractor, subcontractor, or agent of such person.

''(D) FEDERAL GOVERNMENT.—The term 'Federal Government' means—

''(i) a Federal regulatory or law enforcement agency; or

''(ii) any Member of Congress or committee of Congress.

''(E) PERSON.—The term 'person' has the same meaning as in subsection (a) of the first section of the Clayton Act (15 U.S.C. 12(a)).

''(4) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—The term 'violation', with respect to the antitrust laws, shall not be construed to include a civil violation of any law that is not also a criminal violation.

''(b) ENFORCEMENT ACTION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—A covered individual who alleges discharge or other discrimination by any employer in violation of subsection (a) may seek relief under subsection (c) by—

''(A) filing a complaint with the Secretary of Labor; or

''(B) if the Secretary of Labor has not issued a final decision within 180 days of the filing of the complaint and there is no showing that such delay is due to the bad faith of the claimant, bringing an action at law or equity for de novo review in the appropriate district court of the United States, which shall have jurisdiction over such an action without regard to the amount in controversy.

''(2) PROCEDURE.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—A complaint filed with the Secretary of Labor under paragraph (1)(A) shall be governed under the rules and procedures set forth in section 42121(b) of title 49, United States Code.

''(B) EXCEPTION.—Notification made under section 42121(b)(1) of title 49, United States Code, shall be made to any individual named in the complaint and to the employer.

''(C) BURDENS OF PROOF.—An action brought under paragraph (1)(B) shall be governed by the legal burdens of proof set forth in section 42121(b) of title 49, United States Code.

''(D) STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS.—A complaint under paragraph (1)(A) shall be filed with the Secretary of Labor not later than 180 days after the date on which the violation occurs.

''(E) CIVIL ACTIONS TO ENFORCE.—If a person fails to comply with an order or preliminary order issued by the Secretary of Labor pursuant to the procedures set forth in section 42121(b) of title 49, United States Code, the Secretary of Labor or the person on whose behalf the order was issued may bring a civil action to enforce the order in the district court of the United States for the judicial district in which the violation occurred.

''(c) REMEDIES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—A covered individual prevailing in any action under subsection (b)(1) shall be entitled to all relief necessary to make the covered individual whole.

''(2) COMPENSATORY DAMAGES.—Relief for any action under paragraph (1) shall include—

''(A) reinstatement with the same seniority status that the covered individual would have had, but for the discrimination;

''(B) the amount of back pay, with interest; and

''(C) compensation for any special damages sustained as a result of the discrimination including litigation costs, expert witness fees, and reasonable attorney's fees.

''(d) RIGHTS RETAINED BY WHISTLEBLOWERS.—Nothing in this section shall be deemed to diminish the rights, privileges, or remedies of any covered individual under any Federal or State law, or under any collective bargaining agreement.''.

CONGRATULATING THE WASHINGTON MYSTICS ON WINNING THE 2019 WOMEN'S NATIONAL BASKETBALL ASSOCIATION CHAMPIONSHIP

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 364, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 364) congratulating the Washington Mystics on winning the 2019 Women's National Basketball Association championship.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I further ask that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The resolution (S. Res 364) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

WORLD FOOD DAY

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 365, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 365) designating October 16, 2019, and October 16, 2020, as ''World Food Day.''

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I know of no further debate on the measure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no further debate, the question is on adoption of the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 365) was agreed to.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the preamble be agreed to and that the motions to reconsider be made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, OCTOBER 21, 2019

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 3 p.m., Monday, October 21; further, that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed; further, that following leader remarks, the Senate proceed to executive session and resume consideration of the Treaties Calendar No. 5, Treaty Document No. 116–1; finally, that the cloture motions filed during today's session ripen at 5:30 p.m. on Monday.

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

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY, OCTOBER 21, 2019, AT 3 P.M.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 5:10 p.m., adjourned until Monday, October 21, 2019, at 3 p.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD

THOMAS B. CHAPMAN, OF MARYLAND, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD FOR A TERM EXPIRING DECEMBER 31, 2023, VICE THO DINH-ZARR, TERM EXPIRED.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

JOSEPH MANSO, OF NEW YORK, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, FOR THE RANK OF AMBASSADOR DURING HIS TENURE OF SERVICE AS UNITED STATES REPRESENTATIVE TO THE ORGANIZATION FOR THE PROHIBITION OF CHEMICAL WEAPONS.

UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

JENNY A. MCGEE, OF TEXAS, TO BE AN ASSISTANT ADMINISTRATOR OF THE UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT, VICE R. DAVID HARDEN.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

DOROTHY SHEA, OF NORTH CAROLINA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE LEBANESE REPUBLIC.

JOHN JOSEPH SULLIVAN, OF MARYLAND, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.

OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH REVIEW COMMISSION

CYNTHIA ATTWOOD, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH REVIEW COMMISSION FOR A TERM EXPIRING APRIL 27, 2025. (REAPPOINTMENT)

AMANDA WOOD LAIHOW, OF MAINE, TO BE A MEMBER OF OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH REVIEW COMMISSION FOR THE REMAINDER OF A TERM EXPIRING APRIL 27, 2023, VICE HEATHER L. MACDOUGALL, RESIGNED.

THE JUDICIARY

FERNANDO L. AENLLE-ROCHA, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, VICE S. JAMES OTERO, RETIRED.

ADAM L. BRAVERMAN, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, VICE ROGER T. BENITEZ, RETIRED.

UNITED STATES PAROLE COMMISSION

ALMO J. CARTER, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE A COMMISSIONER OF THE UNITED STATES PAROLE COMMISSION FOR A TERM OF SIX YEARS, VICE CRANSTON J. MITCHELL, TERM EXPIRED.

THE JUDICIARY

BERNARD MAURICE JONES II, OF OKLAHOMA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA, VICE JOE L. HEATON, RETIRED.

SANDY NUNES LEAL, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, VICE CHRISTINA A. SNYDER, RETIRED.

R. SHIREEN MATTHEWS, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE A UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, VICE BARRY TED MOSKOWITZ, RETIRED.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

THOMAS MICHAEL O'CONNOR, OF TEXAS, TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE GARY BLANKINSHIP, TERM EXPIRED.

THE JUDICIARY

RICK LLOYD RICHMOND, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, VICE MANUEL L. REAL, RETIRED.

STEPHEN SIDNEY SCHWARTZ, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE A JUDGE OF THE UNITED STATES COURT OF FEDERAL CLAIMS FOR A TERM OF FIFTEEN YEARS, VICE MARIAN BLANK HORN, TERM EXPIRED.

STEPHEN A. VADEN, OF TENNESSEE, TO BE A JUDGE OF THE UNITED STATES COURT OF INTERNATIONAL TRADE, VICE DELISSA A. RIDGWAY, RETIRED.

GOVERNMENT PUBLISHING OFFICE

HUGH NATHANIAL HALPERN, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE DIRECTOR OF THE GOVERNMENT PUBLISHING OFFICE, VICE DAVITA VANCE-COOKS.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HONORING THE LIFE OF TRISHA MARTINEZ

HON. NORMA J. TORRES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 17, 2019

Mrs. TORRES of California. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Trisha Martinez of the City of Montclair, and her tireless dedication to serving the Inland Empire community.

A resident of Montclair since 1992, Trisha was elected to the Montclair City Council in 2014 and re-elected in 2018. Throughout her tenure, Trisha was a fierce advocate for the City she dearly loved. As a Council member, she fought for Montclair's award-winning Montclair to College Program which provides free tuition and books to graduating Montclair High School students who attend Chaffey College for up to two years.

Trisha also remained committed to Montclair's seniors, working to ensure the elderly community continues to receive free or reduced-cost services, including micro-transit and discounted refuse services. Trisha also continued to volunteer with the Senior Nutrition Program at the Montclair Senior Center for over 10 years.

In April 2019, Trisha was diagnosed with cervical cancer. Despite spending most of these past months in hospitals, Trisha still dedicated herself to attending City Council meetings and other local and regional board meetings. This rare kind of commitment and devotion to the people of Montclair is worthy of admiration.

For her exemplary life of service, Madam Speaker, it is my honor to recognize Montclair City Council Member Trisha Martinez on the House floor. Her decades of commitment and contributions to the city she loved are exemplary, and her memory will live on through the countless lives she impacted. May she rest in peace.

TRIBUTE HONORING LATHRAN J. WOODARD

HON. JAMES E. CLYBURN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 17, 2019

Mr. CLYBURN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to an outstanding South Carolinian and a proven health care champion for the people of South Carolina and the nation. Lathran Johnson Woodard has devoted her career to promoting the health and well-being of South Carolinians, especially those who struggle to access quality health care.

A Columbia, South Carolina native, Ms. Woodard received her primary and secondary education in Richland County public schools, graduating from C.A. Johnson High School in Columbia. She received her Bachelor of Science Degree in Business Administration from Southern Wesleyan University and began her career at the South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control (DHEC). Over the course of her fourteen-year tenure, she was promoted to various positions at the agency. Her hard work and dedication earned her the position of Deputy Director for the Division of Maternal Health. While at DHEC, Ms. Woodard helped write and initiate the state's Women, Infants, and Children (WIC) program and led initiatives to ensure access and improve the quality of services provided to mothers and children in South Carolina.

Ms. Woodard has achieved over 30 years of service in the health care field. In 1987, she became the Assistant Director for the South Carolina Primary Health Care Association (SCPHCA), where she now serves as the Chief Executive Officer. As CEO of SCPHCA, Ms. Woodard has worked relentlessly to ensure the strength and capacity of the state's primary care safety net, focusing primarily on assistance to those health care centers that provide vital services to medically underserved communities. Her primary interests are community systems design, the development of integrated systems of healthcare, and youth self-enhancement.

Beyond her work in South Carolina, Ms. Woodard has promoted health care on a national level as well. She is currently the Chair-Elect of the National Association of Community Health Centers. She holds membership in the National Association of Female Executives, the National Rural Health Association, the American Society of Association Executives, and the South Carolina Public Health Association. She has earned several awards and honors. Most recently, Ms. Woodard was a recipient of the Order of Palmetto, the highest honor a civilian can receive in the State of South Carolina.

Madam Speaker, I ask that you and my colleagues join me in offering congratulations and sincere gratitude to Ms. Lathran J. Woodard for her unwavering service to the people of South Carolina and the nation. Her many contributions have improved the quality of life for so many South Carolinians and helped advance healthy communities throughout the country. I am pleased to honor her for exemplifying what it means to be a true public servant.

CONGRATULATING SENATOR MAGGIE HASSAN ON RECEIVING THE 2019 NEW ENGLANDER OF THE YEAR AWARD

HON. CHRIS PAPPAS

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 17, 2019

Mr. PAPPAS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate my friend and colleague, Senator MAGGIE HASSAN, for receiving the 2019 New Englander of the Year award from the New England Council. This award recognizes New Englanders who make our region such a wonderful place to live, learn, and grow.

Senator HASSAN epitomizes all that we should strive for as public servants. Her call to public service is deeply rooted in her belief that everyone, no matter their ability or background, should be able to fully participate in their communities. Senator HASSAN knows that when we lift up and empower all members of our community, we can collectively rise higher.

First as a New Hampshire State Senator, then as Governor, and now as a United States Senator, Senator HASSAN has been a committed public servant and champion in making our communities stronger. During her tenure as governor, I was honored to work under her leadership to expand access to health care and deliver additional resources for treatment and recovery. Now in Washington, I am proud to work with her to address the opioid crisis, foster a more inclusive future, and build a New Hampshire economy that works for everyone.

Senator HASSAN's steadfast advocacy for our state and region may only be surpassed by one other thing—her passion for our great New England sports team.

I could not think of a better recipient of such an award than my colleague, Senator MAGGIE HASSAN. On behalf of our constituents in New Hampshire's First Congressional District, I want to congratulate Senator HASSAN on this well-deserved honor.

PHARMACEUTICAL INDEPENDENCE LONG-TERM READINESS REFORM ACT OF 2019

HON. JOHN GARAMENDI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 17, 2019

Mr. GARAMENDI. Madam Speaker, today I introduce the "Pharmaceutical Independence Long-Term Readiness Reform Act." I want to thank Congresswoman HARTZLER for her support as an original cosponsor.

Our legislation would require the Department of Defense to acquire and purchase only American-made raw materials, medicines, and vaccines for our military. It would also require the Department of Defense to identify the national security vulnerabilities caused by our country's current dependence on Chinese pharmaceuticals.

As a result of the Chinese government's chokehold on the generic pharmaceutical market, our military servicemembers have been left vulnerable. China is a principal creator of generic prescriptions, which account for approximately 90 percent of the global pharmaceutical market.

The reality is that if the Chinese wanted to cripple the United States they could sabotage or cut off our supply of generic medications and antibiotics used by our military. This simply is a vulnerability that we cannot let continue to exist. We need to reinvigorate the

United States' industrial base to produce generic medicines and antibiotics domestically, ensuring the readiness of our military forces.

Madam Speaker, I urge all Members to join us in cosponsoring the ''Pharmaceutical Independence Long-Term Readiness Reform Act.''

HONORING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE YEMENI AMERICAN BENEVOLENT ASSOCIATION

HON. RASHIDA TLAIB

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 17, 2019

Ms. TLAIB. Madam Speaker, I rise today in honor of the Yemeni American Benevolent Association, an outstanding service organization in Wayne County, Michigan, for its fifty years of service.

The Yemeni American Benevolent Association was founded in 1969 to promote empowerment of people, environmental protection, and respect for cultural diversity. They have worked to cultivate community leadership, as well as providing education and other services to the surrounding community. Aside from language classes, translation services, and tutoring, the Yemeni American Benevolent Association has grown its annual scholarship program to help young people achieve their dreams of pursuing higher education. The scholarship program is an amazing achievement that has provided a pathway to a better future and encourages young people to give back to their community.

I ask you to please join me in tribute to the Yemeni American Benevolent Association as they celebrate this milestone.

RECOGNIZING THIRTEEN PLANO ISD PARENT TEACHER ASSOCIATIONS

HON. VAN TAYLOR

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 17, 2019

Mr. TAYLOR. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate thirteen Plano ISD schools on receiving the National PTA School of Excellence designation.

This recognition program, created by the National Parent Teacher Association, works to support and celebrate partnerships between PTAs and schools across the nation.

Plano ISD is setting an incredible example, with a current Parent Teacher Association membership of more than 16,000 parents. With the help of their PTA's, Plano ISD is cultivating crucial relationships between teachers, parents, and the surrounding community.

Their dedication to improving the learning environment for students in and outside of the classroom serves as a crucial reminder of volunteerism and its role in shaping a community.

I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating these thirteen Plano PTAs on their success of putting students first and championing a quality education.

PLANO ISD NATIONAL PTA SCHOOLS OF EXCELLENCE AWARD RECIPIENTS

Barksdale Elementary PTA, Boggess Elementary School, Bettye Haun Elementary School, Gulledge Elementary School, Harrington Elementary PTA, Hickey Elementary School, Huffman Elementary School, Hughston Elementary School, Mathews Elementary, Mitchell Elementary School, Pearson Early Childhood School, Robinson Middle School, Wyatt Elementary School.

RECOGNIZING THE WASHINGTON BLADE

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 17, 2019

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, I rise today to ask the House of Representatives to join me in recognizing The Washington Blade on the occasion of its 50th anniversary.

On October 5, 1969, Richard M. Nixon was President, John W. McCormick was Speaker of the House, Richard Russell, Jr. was Senate President pro tempore, Americans were listening to ''Sugar Sugar'' by The Archies, and the 91st Congress was in weekend recess. However, a few LGBTQ Washingtonians read the first edition of The Gay Blade, created by Nancy Tucker and Lilli Vincenz.

The Gay Blade survived controversy, epidemic and bankruptcy to thrive as America's LGBTQ newspaper of record, The Washington Blade. On October 18, 2019, The Blade celebrates its 50th anniversary with a gala at the Wharf.

Since its inception, The Blade continued as a monthly one-sheet newsletter until it expanded to four pages in June 1972. By April 1974, it grew to eight legal-sized sheets, and in July of the following year, The Gay Blade moved to newsprint.

During the 1970s, The Gay Blade changed its name to The Blade. Don Michaels became the editor. Michaels took The Blade out of the closet by prohibiting pen names, and he increased its frequency to biweekly. By the decade's end, the newspaper added ''Washington'' to its masthead.

The Washington Blade entered the 1980s with headline, ''Rare, Fatal Pneumonia Hits Gay Men,'' one of the earliest newspaper articles on the disease that became AIDS. The Blade promoted Don Michaels to publisher, a position he held for two decades. By the decade's end, the newspaper adopted computer layout that led to its online edition in 1995.

Window Media, LLC purchased The Blade in 2001. The paper's staff unionized, and in 2008, The Blade published the first interview ever given by a Republican presidential candidate to an LGBTQ newspaper. The Blade grew steadily until November 16, 2009.

That Monday, Window Media filed Chapter 7 bankruptcy. The Blade's staff found its offices locked. Former staff volunteered to produce a new publication, DC Agenda, by the following Friday.

Publisher Lynne Brown, editor Kevin Naff, sales executive Brian Pitts and other former Blade staff members pooled their resources to form Brown Naff Pitts Omnimedia. This company published DC Agenda weekly until April 2010, when it acquired The Blade's assets from the bankruptcy court. Like a phoenix, The Washington Blade rose from the ashes on April 30, 2010.

The Blade remains, for many in our nation's capital, including me, a weekly must-read. It continues, according to The New York Times, to be ''one of the most influential publications written for a gay audience.''

In closing, I remind the House of Representatives that the 700,000 residents of the District of Columbia have yet to read, and The Blade, despite its many scoops and breaking news stories, has yet to publish the banner ''Washington, D.C. the 51st State.''

Madam Speaker, I ask the House of Representatives to join me in celebrating The Washington Blade on the occasion of its 50th anniversary.

HONOR THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF MR. DON WAFUL

HON. JOHN KATKO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 17, 2019

Mr. KATKO. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and legacy of Mr. Don Waful, who passed away at the age of 103 on September 12, 2019. Mr. Waful was known in Central New York as a decorated World War II veteran, prominent Syracuse University sports fan, and for his tenure as the President of the Syracuse Sky Chiefs baseball team.

After graduating from Syracuse University with a bachelor's degree in 1937 and master's degree in 1939, Mr. Waful went on to enlist in the U.S. Army at the onset of World War II. In the war, Mr. Waful served with the 1st Armored Division, receiving several commendations for his service including, the POW Medal, American Defense Service Medal, European-African-Middle Eastern Campaign Medal, World War II Victory Medal, and the Honorable Service Lapel Button. Notably, while in Tunisia, Mr. Waful and his unit encountered a German tank company, which subsequently took him and his unit prisoner. Mr. Waful survived as a POW in camps in Italy, Poland, and Germany before finally returning home.

Following World War II, Mr. Waful returned home to Central New York to pursue a career in insurance and to serve as the President of the Syracuse Sky Chiefs baseball team. In his role with the Sky Chiefs, Mr. Waful contributed to the design and construction of NBT Bank stadium, which opened in 1997. Along with his contributions to the Sky Chiefs, Mr. Waful was known for his unwavering support of Syracuse University sports. As a lifelong Syracuse University Football fan, Mr. Waful was a mainstay at home games, missing only three contests since 1945.

Madam Speaker, I ask that my colleagues in the House join me in honoring the life and legacy of Mr. Don Waful. As a celebrated member of our Central New York community and prominent Syracuse sports supporter, Mr. Waful will be dearly missed. I ask my colleagues to keep him and his family in mind as we remember his life.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. CLAY HIGGINS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 17, 2019

Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana. Madam Speaker, I missed votes on October 16 due to illness. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on Roll Call No. 556, and "yea" on Roll Call No. 557.

HONORING THE 64TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE CLARKSVILLE NAACP

HON. MARK E. GREEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 17, 2019

Mr. GREEN of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 64th Anniversary of the Clarksville, Tennessee chapter of the NAACP.

This local chapter was chartered 64 years ago in 1955, just as the Civil Rights Movement was starting to gain momentum throughout the nation, culminating in 1963 with the March on Washington and Martin Luther King, Jr.'s "I Have A Dream" speech. The leadership of Dr. King and the NAACP challenged the nation to live up to its own founding ideals of liberty and justice for all.

The Clarksville NAACP has continued to serve the community since its founding, particularly in its engagement with the young people of Clarksville and its support for education.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives to join me in congratulating the Clarksville branch of the NAACP for its service to the community over the past 64 years.

RECOGNIZING THE 90TH ANNIVERSARY OF QUEENS PUBLIC LIBRARY, RIDGEWOOD BRANCH

HON. NYDIA M. VELÁZQUEZ

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 17, 2019

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 90th Anniversary of Queens Public Library, Ridgewood Branch. I also rise to thank Friends of the Ridgewood Library and Principal Librarian Thomas Maxheimer for their contributions to this celebrated anniversary.

Queens Public Library, Ridgewood Branch opened on October 15, 1929. Not only was Queens Public Library, Ridgewood Branch the first library to open in Queens, but also the first library to be publicly-funded by the City of New York.

Over the last 90 years, Queens Public Library, Ridgewood Branch has served as a cornerstone of the Queens community. In one of the most diverse counties in New York State, the Library continues to invite individuals of all ages and ethnicities to learn, research and discover. In addition, Queens Public Library, Ridgewood Branch serves the community through unparalleled accessibility, providing resources for individuals with physical and/or visual impairments. From children's story time to genealogical research tools, the library offers a wide range of programming and learning opportunities.

I ask my colleagues of the 116th Congress to join me in celebrating the 90th Anniversary of the Queens Public Library, Ridgewood Branch by recognizing its crucial contributions to the Queens community.

CALLING ATTENTION TO AN IMPRESSIVE PROGRAM THAT ORIGINATED IN POCATELLO, IDAHO

HON. MICHAEL K. SIMPSON

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 17, 2019

Mr. SIMPSON. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 2019 Idaho Career & Technical Education (ICTE) Special Program Award recipient, the Construction Combine.

At the Construction Combine, program participants learn to demonstrate their construction skills to builders who are potential employers. The program recruits local contractors to teach construction skills to interested high school students and others, and construction materials suppliers such as Home Depot generously provide the necessary supplies and tools to facilitate building sheds for this two-day event. The completed sheds are donated to deserving veterans at no cost.

The Construction Combine is the brain-child of Mr. Scott Stevens. As a staff member in Idaho State University's (ISU) Continuing Education and Workforce Training Program (CEWT), Mr. Stevens recognized the need to attract more skilled workers to the construction industry and to increase the housing stock in order to promote economic growth. He teamed up with Brad Landon, the Pocatello/Chubbuck Home Depot Store manager, to execute his vision—one that helps home builders, veterans and students. There was extensive additional support from the surrounding high schools; local contractors; Gary Salazar, the Director of ISU's CEWT; and others in ISU's CEWT Program.

The first Construction Combine event took place at the Pocatello/Chubbuck Home Depot in the Spring of 2018 with 54 participants, producing eight sheds. The following year, in 2019, the Construction Combine hosted six events in Idaho and Oregon with 228 participants, producing 41 sheds. I am eager to see the continued growth of this program in years to come.

Madam Speaker, I would like to join the ICTE Awards Selection Committee in recognizing the Construction Combine as an innovative solution to the construction and low housing stock issues associated with Idaho's very low unemployment rate and our booming economy. I would like to recognize ISU's CEWT, the Home Depot, and the local contractors for their efforts to make the Construction Combine a success and to give back to their communities. Congratulations.

RECOGNITION OF WOOD COUNTY, OHIO'S 200TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. ROBERT E. LATTA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 17, 2019

Mr. LATTA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the Bicentennial of Wood County, Ohio. This Crossroad of America was established by the Ohio State Legislature on February 12, 1820. Wood County has historical ties to the earliest days of Ohio history, gaining its name from Colonel Eleazer D. Wood, the planning engineer of Fort Meigs in 1813.

Wood County was once home to the Great Black Swamp. This made settlement of the area extremely difficult, but the pioneering spirit of early residents produced an extensive system of ditches which drained the swamp and revealed the rich farmland beneath. There are still more than 3,000 miles of drainage ditches keeping the county dry to this day.

The oil and natural gas industries were the first to enter Wood County in the late 1800s. This caused a large spike in population as people migrated to the county in hopes of obtaining riches. Wood County currently covers nearly 620 square miles of land and water which provides evidence of the rural traditions and history of the area, while fostering agricultural ingenuity, manufacturing developments, and educational success.

The celebration of the 200th Anniversary of Wood County is a meaningful reminder of the hard work, grit, and pioneering attitude upon which Wood County, Ohio and the United States of America were founded. Congratulations to Wood County in celebration of its Bicentennial Year.

300TH ANNIVERSARY OF GARRETSON FORGE AND FARM

HON. JOSH GOTTHEIMER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 17, 2019

Mr. GOTTHEIMER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Garretson Forge and Farm, a national historical landmark in Fair Lawn, New Jersey. This year marks the 300th anniversary of the settlement of Garretson in 1719. Thanks to the extraordinary efforts of the volunteers of Garretson Forge and Farm Restoration, Inc., this special property has been preserved and kept open to the community. In recognition of Garretson's anniversary, I would like to include in the RECORD the poem 'A Heritage to Keep,' by William F. Haywood which captures the long history of Garretson Forge and Farm, a Bergen County treasure:

The traffic moves in swifter pace
Around the bend that holds this place
In gentle curves where time has flown
And countless passers it has known.

The silent step of moccasin,
The echoing of forge's din;
A gangling pine saw all of these,
New homes replacing other trees.

The continental soldier came,
Lone hunter seeking wary game,
A farmer tilling fertile soil
Where the river turns its coil.

So generations came and went
Through seasons ill and fairly spent.

The Garretsons had built to last,
While time has added to the past
A heritage for here and now—
To keep it whole should be our vow.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Garretson Forge and Farm's 300th anniversary. I know that we will continue to enjoy Garretson for many generations to come.

HONORING LYLE ENDICOTT

HON. MIKE BOST

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 17, 2019

Mr. BOST. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Lyle Endicott of Mt. Vernon, Illinois, for his selfless service to our country during World War II and for his upcoming 98th birthday. Mr. Endicott served his country with honor, started multiple successful businesses, and is a staple in his community.

Mr. Endicott was born in Mt. Vernon on December 7, 1921. Twenty years later, when the Japanese attacked Pearl Harbor, he enlisted in the United States Navy and became a fighter pilot. As a naval aviator, Mr. Endicott deployed to the Pacific on the Steamer Bay Aircraft Carrier, where he supported the invasions of Iwo Jima and the Okinawa Islands. After his honorable discharge, he married Elizabeth ''Annie'' Piercy and started a family. Upon settling in Woodlawn, Illinois, the two opened a grocery store and Endicott Interiors, a furniture business that still operates today. Mr. Endicott later became the head pilot for Self Oil Company in Mt. Vernon and was renowned as one of Southern Illinois' finest aviators. Those who know Mr. Endicott say that he is fun-loving and fearless in his approach to life. As a father, grandfather, and now great-grandfather, he is a true family man who has touched countless lives.

Madam Speaker, please join me in honoring Lyle Endicott for his unwavering patriotism and celebrate his birthday. On behalf of Southern Illinois, happy 98th.

IN HONOR OF KRISTI FEHR

HON. ANDY BARR

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 17, 2019

Mr. BARR. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor a special teacher, Mrs. Kristi Fehr. Mrs. Fehr is an educator at Cassidy Elementary School in Lexington, Kentucky.

Mrs. Fehr has been selected to receive a Presidential Award for Excellence in Mathematics and Science Teaching by the National Science Foundation. This award, administered on behalf of the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy, recognizes outstanding K–12 teachers for their contributions to the teaching and learning of science, technology, engineering, mathematics, and/or computer science.

Mrs. Fehr, a graduate of Xavier University, has been an elementary teacher for 24 years and has taught at Cassidy Elementary School since 2014. She is a science lab teacher for grades K–5. Among many of her accomplishments, she partnered with a bio-systems engineer at the University of Kentucky to implement a science garden at Cassidy. She led a Scientists and Engineers Empowering Kids (SEEK) Science Club for 3rd through 5th graders. She annually recruits engineers from the community to lead sessions with students during National Engineers Week. Mrs. Fehr has been awarded numerous environmental and sustainability awards. She is a recognized leader in her school and among science educators.

I thank Mrs. Fehr for educating and inspiring her students in the field of science. This prestigious award is well-deserved by Mrs. Fehr due to her innovation, dedication, and passion that she brings to science education. I congratulate her on being awarded the Presidential Award for Excellence in Mathematics and Science Teaching.

MISSING AND MURDERED INDIGENOUS WOMEN

SPEECH OF

HON. DAN NEWHOUSE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 16, 2019

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the following letter regarding the Special Order on Missing and Murdered Indigenous Women on October 17, 2019.

NEZ PERCE,
TRIBAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE,
Lapwai, ID, September 18, 2019.

Hon. JERROLD NADLER,
Chairman, House Committee on the Judiciary, Washington, DC.

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

Hon. DOUG COLLINS,
Ranking Member, House Committee on the Judiciary, Washington, DC.

Hon. ROB BISHOP,
Ranking Member, House Committee on Natural Resources, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMEN NADLER AND GRIJALVA AND RANKING MEMBERS COLLINS AND BISHOP: As Congressman Newhouse stated in his June 6 letter, Native American and Alaska Native women face a murder rate ten times higher than the national average, with 84% experiencing some form of violence in their lifetime. Still, the tools and resources to document and address this issue are severely lacking in Indian Country due to outdated databases and a lack of coordination between law enforcement agencies. In addition to the Violence Against women Reauthorization Act of 2019 (H.R. 1585), legislation such as Savanna's Act (H.R. 2733), the Native Youth and Tribal Officer Protection Act (H.R. 958), and the Bridging Agency Data Gaps and Ensuring Safety for Native Communities Act (H.R. 4289) are each distinctly designed to provide an array of solutions to some of these unique problems.

To fully understand the need for this type of legislation and the federal resources and programs necessary to combat violence against women and the resulting issues, it is important to hear directly from communities to learn how reservations, families, and law enforcement are impacted by this crisis. The Nez Perce Tribe has suffered the loss of a number of our tribal citizens as a result of violence. It is for this reason, and because Washington State encompasses some of the Tribe's treaty-reserved homelands, that the Nez Perce Tribe supports Congressman Newhouse's request that either one or both of your committees host field hearings in the state of Washington to examine issues relating to missing and murdered Indian women.

Thank you for your consideration of this request.

Sincerely,

SHANNON F. WHEELER,
Chairman.

CELEBRATING THE LIFE OF LOUIS M. CHIBBARO, JR.

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 17, 2019

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, during the 50th anniversary of the Stonewall Riot, it is my honor and pleasure to rise today to ask the House of Representatives to join me in recognizing my friend, Ward 6 neighbor and Washington institution Louis M. Chibbaro, Jr. Chibbaro is the Senior News Reporter for our nation's LGBTQ newspaper of record, The Washington Blade.

Washington, D.C. contains one of the largest LGBTQ communities in the United States. Among the thousands of LGBTQ Washingtonians, two names stand out: the late Dr. Franklin Kameny, who made the headlines, and Lou Chibbaro, Jr., who wrote the bylines.

Chibbaro is a native New Yorker who came to D.C. in 1971 as a college student with the State University of New York at Brockport Washington Semester Program. Upon graduation, he returned to work for the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. He continued his studies at American University before beginning his career as a reporter for several Washington-based independent newsletters, Environment Report, Energy Today and Science Trends.

Chibbaro became a public information representative for the American Public Power Association in 1975. Chibbaro volunteered as a freelance news writer and co-host for the then D.C. gay radio program ''Friends.'' He soon began freelancing for The Washington Blade. The Blade hired him in 1982 part-time and later promoted him to full-time staff in 1984.

Chibbaro pounds the LGBTQ beat. He has covered the panoply of national and local LGBTQ interests of social, religious, and governmental institutions: the White House, Congress, the U.S. Supreme Court, the military, law enforcement agencies and the Catholic Church. Chibbaro began reporting on D.C. local politics with the 1978 mayoral and council elections. He commenced his chronicles of the Democratic and Republican conventions as a credentialed reporter in 1984.

Chibbaro has covered HIV and AIDS since the 1980s. He reported on the Matthew Shepherd trial from Laramie, Wyoming. Chibbaro filed radio news repo1ts on LGBTQ developments for the Sirius XM Radio Network's ''OutQ News'' program from 2013 to 2019.

Chibbaro has received accolades for his contributions to journalism. The Office of the United States Attorney for the District of Columbia presented him with the 1998 Justice for Victims of Crime Award. The Office cited his ''outstanding service to crime victims and their families'' through his news reporting. His colleagues at Society of Professional Journalists

D.C. Professional Chapter (SJP D.C. Pro) have awarded Chibbaro several Dateline Awards for Excellence in Local Journalism, most recently in 2016. Chibbaro became the first out-LGBTQ inductee to SJP D.C. Pro's Hall of Fame, where he joined such journalistic greats as Nina Totenberg and Bob Woodward.

This Friday, October 18th, The Washington Blade celebrates its 50th anniversary with a gala at Washington's Wharf. Madam Speaker, I ask the House of Representatives to join me in recognizing Lou Chibbarro's accomplishments and his contributions to journalism, The Blade and our Nation's Capital.

MISSING AND MURDERED INDIGENOUS WOMEN

SPEECH OF

HON. DON YOUNG

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 16, 2019

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about the ongoing epidemic of Missing and Murdered Indigenous Women and Girls. Alaska Native and American Indian women and girls face disproportionately high rates of violent crimes including murder, rape, kidnapping, and trafficking. Alaska Native and American Indian women are 10 times more likely to be murdered than other Americans. The National Crime Information Center reported that, in 2016, there were close to 6000 reports of missing American Indian and Alaska Native women and girls. According to the Urban Indian Health Institute, Alaska is the fourth highest state in terms of the number of these cases.

In Alaska, extreme isolation and lack of law enforcement in remote Native communities make it difficult to prevent and respond to these crimes. In fact, only one out of every three Alaska Native villages have any law enforcement at all. These villages are not connected to the road system, and it can take days for state troopers to respond to incidents, particularly when weather prevents flights from landing. Women and girls in urban areas also face risk factors, particularly when they are away from the support of family and culture.

Given the scale of the crisis, it is troubling that tribes and Native communities do not have adequate resources to respond. Native communities around the country are governed by a varying patchwork of criminal jurisdictions that complicate law enforcement and leave Native women and girls unprotected. Native communities and tribes also lack full access to crime databases, which undermines the efforts of tribal law enforcement and tribal courts. In addition, the Justice Department, which is responsible for pursuing the most serious crimes in Native communities, declines to prosecute the majority of these cases.

Instead of simply acknowledging these issues, Congress must act. We must reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act. VAWA funds vital programs, like domestic violence shelters. The House's reauthorization bill expands legal authority for tribes to prosecute violent crimes against women. It also includes a new demonstration program, enhanced by an amendment I offered, that would expand Alaska Native villages' jurisdictional authority.

We must pass the BADGES Act, which Rep. HAALAND sponsored and I cosponsored. The BADGES Act improves BIA law enforcement recruitment and retention. The bill also improves federal law enforcement reporting mechanisms for missing and murdered Indigenous women. In addition, it expands tribal access to federal criminal databases. Congress must honor the trust relationship and pass this crucial legislation.

HONORING THE NEW MEMORIAL PARK IN THE TOWN OF SARATOGA DEDICATED TO THE HISTORIC SURRENDER OF BRITISH GENERAL BURGOYNE TO AMERICAN GENERAL GATES ON OCTOBER 17, 1777

HON. ELISE M. STEFANIK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 17, 2019

Ms. STEFANIK. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the new memorial park in the town of Saratoga dedicated to the historic surrender of British General Burgoyne to American General Gates on October 17, 1777.

242 Years ago, the first and second battles of Saratoga marked a crucial turning point in the American Revolutionary War. The courage and effectiveness of American troops during the battles broke the British Army's air of invincibility and led to the Franco-American alliance that proved crucial to winning the war. Today, that famous battle is memorialized in the rotunda of the Capitol with the famous painting by John Trumbull depicting General Burgoyne surrendering his sword to General Gates. That image was used to create a bronze relief that is displayed at the new memorial park. Many historians rank The Battle of Saratoga as one of the most consequential battles in history and I am glad to see this recognition for the heroism and sacrifices made that day.

On behalf of New York's 21st Congressional District, I want to thank The Friends of Saratoga Battlefield, Open Space Institute, the Hudson-Hoosic Partnership and Saratoga National Historical Park for their hard work making this memorial a reality. It is crucial that we honor the achievements and sacrifices of those Americans who came before us as we chart our path forward. I look forward to this memorial serving as a space for all Americans to come and reflect on our history while we contemplate the future.

COMMEMORATING THE 50 YEAR ANNIVERSARY OF COMMUNITY HUMAN SERVICES

HON. JIMMY PANETTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 17, 2019

Mr. PANETTA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to ask my colleagues in the House join me in congratulating Community Human Services on the occasion of their 50th Anniversary. Throughout the last half-century, Community Human Services has not only brought attention to, but also alleviated the hardships that middle and low income individuals and families in Monterey County face on a daily basis. Under the leadership of Chief Executive Officer Robin McCrae, the agency has grown from three programs, 55 employees, and a $1 million budget to a multi-million dollar organization with a workforce that has doubled and operates twelve programs throughout Monterey County.

Community Human Services' mission is to address the tribulations that can be associated with addiction, mental illness, emotional health, domestic violence, child abuse, homelessness, and any other issue individuals may have trouble solving on their own. The institution allows people of all ages access to the tools necessary to overcome these challenges, creating lasting and sustainable changes on the central coast of California.

A key aspect of Community Human Service's mission involves connecting with individuals in our community and ensuring them that help is available to them without insurance or monetary compensation. Information regarding programs and corresponding issues are widely distributed to schools, businesses, civic groups, churches, and service organizations.

Madam Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me in recognizing and congratulating the commitment that Community Human Services has provided the Central Coast. As the organization celebrates its 50th Anniversary, I am proud to recognize Community Human Services for its continued work to address the challenges of individuals and families on the Central Coast. We are fortunate to have an institution like Community Human Services call the 20th Congressional District of California home.

SALUTING THE CHINESE AMERICAN PLANNING COUNCIL BROOKLYN COMMUNITY SERVICES ON THEIR 40TH ANNIVERSARY CELEBRATION

HON. NYDIA M. VELÁZQUEZ

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 17, 2019

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Madam Speaker, I rise today to salute the Chinese American Planning Council Brooklyn Community Services on its milestone 40th Anniversary Celebration. I thank them for their commitment to bettering Chinese-American Communities in Brooklyn and greater New York City.

Since 1979, CPC Brooklyn Community Services has provided Chinese-American residents in Brooklyn with vital social services, such as child care, youth organizing, workforce development, adult literacy opportunities, senior services and housing support. Since inception, it has delivered culturally competent social services and has been instrumental in enriching and enhancing the quality of life of Chinese-American families in Brooklyn and beyond. The families it serves are grateful for their dedication and commitment to the community.

Madam Speaker, please join me in congratulating the Chinese American Planning Council Brooklyn Community Services on this special anniversary. These dedicated individuals exemplify outstanding leadership through their public service to the community. I am confident the Chinese American Planning

Council Brooklyn Community Services will continue to build on its history of service. I wish them continued success and many years of service.

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S5855–S5906

Measures Introduced: Thirty-one bills and six resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 2617–2647, and S. Res. 360–365. **Pages S5895–96**

Measures Passed:

Government of Saudi Arabia: Senate passed S. 2635, to require the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation to declassify any and all information relating to whether the government of Saudi Arabia assisted a citizen or national of Saudi Arabia in departing the United States while the citizen or national was awaiting trial or sentencing for a criminal offense committed in the United States. **Pages S5884–85**

Hidden Figures Congressional Gold Medal Act: Senate passed H.R. 1396, to award Congressional Gold Medals to Katherine Johnson and Dr. Christine Darden, to posthumously award Congressional Gold Medals to Dorothy Vaughan and Mary Jackson, and to award a Congressional Gold Medal to honor all of the women who contributed to the success of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration during the Space Race. **Page S5904**

Criminal Antitrust Anti-Retaliation Act: Senate passed S. 2258, to provide anti-retaliation protections for antitrust whistleblowers. **Pages S5904–05**

Congratulating the Washington Mystics: Senate agreed to S. Res. 364, congratulating the Washington Mystics on winning the 2019 Women's National Basketball Association championship. **Page S5905**

World Food Day: Senate agreed to S. Res. 365, designating October 16, 2019, and October 16, 2020, as "World Food Day". **Page S5905**

Measures Failed:

Clean Power Congressional Review Act: Committee on Environment and Public Works was discharged from further consideration of S.J. Res. 53, providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Environmental Protection Agency relating to "Repeal of the Clean Power Plan; Emission Guidelines for Greenhouse Gas Emissions From Existing Electric Utility Generating Units; Revisions to Emission Guidelines Implementing Regulations", and the joint resolution failed to pass, 41 yeas to 53 nays (Vote No. 324), after agreeing to the motion to proceed to consideration of the joint resolution. **Pages S5858–69**

Measures Considered:

Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act—Cloture: Senate began consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of H.R. 3055, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020. **Pages S5880–81**

A motion was entered to close further debate on the motion to proceed to consideration of the bill, and, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, a vote on cloture will occur upon disposition of the nomination of Andrew P. Bremberg, of Virginia, to be Representative of the United States of America to the Office of the United Nations and Other International Organizations in Geneva, with the rank of Ambassador. **Page S5881**

Subsequently, the motion to proceed was withdrawn. **Page S5881**

Prior to the consideration of this measure, Senate took the following action:

Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Legislative Session. **Page S5880**

Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act—Cloture: Senate began consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of 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. **Page S5881**

A motion was entered to close further debate on the motion to proceed to consideration of the bill, and, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII

of the Standing Rules of the Senate, a vote on cloture will occur upon disposition of H.R. 3055, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020. **Page S5881**

Veto Messages:

National Emergency Declaration—Veto Message: By 53 yeas to 36 nays (Vote No. 325), two-thirds of the Senators voting not having voted in the affirmative, S.J. Res. 54 relating to a national emergency declared by the President on February 15, 2019, upon reconsideration, was rejected, and the veto of the President was sustained. **Pages S5869–75**

Treaty on the Republic of North Macedonia—Cloture: Senate began consideration of the protocol to the North Atlantic Treaty of 1949 on the Accession of the Republic of North Macedonia (Treaty Doc. 116–1), taking action on the following motion and amendments proposed thereto: **Page S5880**

Pending:

McConnell Amendment No. 946, to change the enactment date. **Page S5880**

McConnell Amendment No. 947 (to Amendment No. 946), of a perfecting nature. **Page S5880**

A motion was entered to close further debate on the treaty, and, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, and pursuant to the unanimous-consent agreement of Thursday, October 17, 2019, a vote on cloture will occur at 5:30 p.m., on Monday, October 21, 2019. **Page S5880**

Prior to the consideration of this treaty, Senate took the following action:

Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Executive Session to consider the treaty. **Page S5880**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that at approximately 3 p.m., on Monday, October 21, 2019, Senate resume consideration of the treaty; and that the motions to invoke cloture filed on Thursday, October 17, 2019, ripen at 5:30 p.m., on Monday, October, 21, 2019. **Page S5905**

Bremberg Nomination—Cloture: Senate began consideration of the nomination of Andrew P. Bremberg, of Virginia, to be Representative of the United States of America to the Office of the United Nations and Other International Organizations in Geneva, with the rank of Ambassador. **Page S5880**

A motion was entered to close further debate on the nomination, and, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, a vote on cloture will occur upon disposition of the protocol to the North Atlantic Treaty of 1949 on the Accession of the Republic of North Macedonia (Treaty Doc. 116–1). **Page S5880**

Prior to the consideration of this nomination, Senate took the following action:

Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Legislative Session. **Page S5880**

Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Executive Session to consider the nomination. **Page S5880**

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:

Thomas B. Chapman, of Maryland, to be a Member of the National Transportation Safety Board for a term expiring December 31, 2023.

Joseph Manso, of New York, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, for the rank of Ambassador during his tenure of service as United States Representative to the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons.

Jenny A. McGee, of Texas, to be an Assistant Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development.

Dorothy Shea, of North Carolina, to be Ambassador to the Lebanese Republic.

John Joseph Sullivan, of Maryland, to be Ambassador to the Russian Federation.

Cynthia Attwood, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission for a term expiring April 27, 2025.

Amanda Wood Laihow, of Maine, to be a Member of Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission for the remainder of a term expiring April 27, 2023.

Fernando L. Aenlle-Rocha, of California, to be United States District Judge for the Central District of California.

Adam L. Braverman, of California, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of California.

Almo J. Carter, of the District of Columbia, to be a Commissioner of the United States Parole Commission for a term of six years.

Bernard Maurice Jones II, of Oklahoma, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Oklahoma.

Sandy Nunes Leal, of California, to be United States District Judge for the Central District of California.

R. Shireen Matthews, of California, to be a United States District Judge for the Southern District of California.

Thomas Michael O'Connor, of Texas, to be United States Marshal for the Southern District of Texas for the term of four years.

Rick Lloyd Richmond, of California, to be United States District Judge for the Central District of California.

Stephen Sidney Schwartz, of Virginia, to be a Judge of the United States Court of Federal Claims for a term of fifteen years.

Stephen A. Vaden, of Tennessee, to be a Judge of the United States Court of International Trade.

Hugh Nathanial Halpern, of Virginia, to be Director of the Government Publishing Office.

Pages S5905–06

Messages from the House: **Pages S5891–92**

Measures Referred: **Page S5892**

Measures Placed on the Calendar: **Pages S5856–57, S5892**

Measures Read the First Time: **Pages S5892, S5904**

Executive Communications: **Pages S5892–95**

Executive Reports of Committees: **Page S5895**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S5896–99**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Pages S5899–S5900, S5900**

Additional Statements: **Page S5891**

Amendments Submitted: **Page S5903**

Authorities for Committees to Meet: **Pages S5903–04**

Record Votes: Two record votes were taken today. (Total—325) **Pages S5869, S5875**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 5:10 p.m., until 3 p.m. on Monday, October 21, 2019. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today's Record on page S5905.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

FARM BILL

Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry: Committee concluded a hearing to examine implementing the 2018 Farm Bill, after receiving testimony from Stephen Censky, Deputy Secretary of Agriculture.

FCC OVERSIGHT

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Financial Services and General Government concluded an oversight hearing to examine the Federal Communications Commission, focusing on the spectrum auctions program, after receiving testimony from Ajit Pai, Chairman, Federal Communications Commission; and Tom Schatz, Citizens Against Government Waste, and David Williams, Taxpayers Protection Alliance, both of Washington, D.C.

SYRIA

Committee on Armed Services: Committee concluded a closed hearing to examine the situation in Syria and the wider region, after receiving testimony from Mark T. Esper, Secretary, and General Mark A. Milley, USA, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, both of the Department of Defense.

CFPB SEMI-ANNUAL REPORT

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau's semi-annual report to Congress, after receiving testimony from Kathleen L. Kraninger, Director, Consumer Financial Protection Bureau.

IMPROVING SECURITY AT AMERICA'S AIRPORTS

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Subcommittee on Security concluded a hearing to examine improving security at America's airports, focusing on stakeholder perspectives, after receiving testimony from Tori Emerson Barnes, U.S. Travel Association, Lauren Beyer, Airlines for America, and Sara Nelson, Association of Flight Attendants–CWA, AFL–CIO, all of Washington, D.C.; Chris McLaughlin, Denver International Airport, Denver, Colorado; and Ken Cornick, CLEAR, New York, New York.

STRATEGIC PETROLEUM RESERVE STATUS

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the status of the Strategic Petroleum Reserve and related energy security issues, after receiving testimony from Linda Capuano, Administrator, Energy Information Administration, Department of Energy; Steven E. Winberg, Assistant Secretary of Energy for Fossil Energy; Phillip Brown, Specialist in Energy Policy, Congressional Research Service, Library of Congress; Jason E. Bordoff, Columbia University School of International and Public Affairs Center on Global Energy Policy, New York, New York; and Keisuke Sadamori, International Energy Agency, Paris, France.

REDUCING EMISSIONS AND ECONOMIC GROWTH

Committee on Environment and Public Works: Subcommittee on Clean Air and Nuclear Safety concluded a hearing to examine reducing emissions while driving economic growth, focusing on industry-led initiatives, after receiving testimony from Todd Wilkinson, Redstone Feeders, LLC, on behalf of the National Cattlemen's Beef Association, Frank Macchiarola, American Petroleum Institute, Marty Durbin, U.S. Chamber of Commerce Global Energy

Institute, and John K. S. Wilson, Calvert Research and Management, all of Washington, D.C.; and Andrea Dutton, University of Wisconsin-Madison, Gainesville, Florida.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:

S. 2132, to promote security and provide justice for United States victims of international terrorism, with an amendment; and

The nominations of David B. Barlow, to be United States District Judge for the District of Utah, John Fitzgerald Kness, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Illinois, R. Austin Huffaker, Jr., to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Alabama, Lee Philip Rudofsky, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Arkansas, Justin Reed Walker, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Kentucky, and Eleni Maria Roumel, of Maryland, to be a Judge of the United States Court of Federal Claims.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 23 public bills, H.R. 4710–4732; and 4 resolutions, H. Res. 635–638 were introduced. **Pages H8226–27**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H8228–29**

Reports Filed: Reports were filed today as follows:

H.R. 4387, to establish Growth Accelerator Fund Competition within the Small Business Administration, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 116–238);

H.R. 4405, to amend the Small Business Act to improve the women's business center program, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 116–239);

H.R. 4406, to amend the Small Business Act to improve the small business development centers program, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 116–240);

H.R. 4407, to amend the Small Business Act to reauthorize the SCORE program, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 116–241); and

H. Res. 326, expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding United States efforts to resolve the Israeli-Palestinian conflict through a negotiated two-state solution, with amendments (H. Rept. 116–242). **Page H8226**

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein she appointed Representative Cuellar to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H8203**

Recess: The House recessed at 10:35 a.m. and reconvened at 12 noon. **Pages H8206–07**

Securities and Exchange Commission Disclosure Effectiveness Testing Act: The House passed H.R. 1815, to require the Securities and Exchange Commission, when developing rules and regulations about disclosures to retail investors, to conduct investor testing, including a survey and interviews of retail investors, by a yea-and-nay vote of 229 yeas to 186 nays, Roll No. 564. **Pages H8209–24**

Pursuant to the Rule, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 116–34, modified by the amendment printed in part A of H. Rept. 116–237, shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole, in lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Financial Services now printed in the bill. **Pages H8215–16**

Agreed to:

Casten (IL) amendment (No. 4 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–237) that clarifies that the term ''retail investor'' does not mean an institutional investor; and **Pages H8219–20**

Gottheimer amendment (No. 2 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–237) that requires the SEC to include a specific consideration of the unique challenges senior investors face as part of their overall investor testing (by a recorded vote of 240 ayes to 178 noes, Roll No. 562). **Pages H8217–18, H8220–21**

Rejected:

Huizenga amendment (No. 1 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–237) that sought to exempt Form CRS, a recently developed disclosure document that went through SEC investor testing, from the bill's investor testing requirements (by a recorded vote of 188 ayes to 229 noes, Roll No. 561); and **Pages H8216–17, H8220**

Wagner amendment (No. 3 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–237) that sought to apply the bill's investor testing requirements only to applicable disclosure documents developed after January 21, 2021 (by a recorded vote of 188 ayes to 230 noes, Roll No. 563). **Pages H8218–19, H8221–22**

Agreed that the Clerk be authorized in the engrossment to correct section numbers, punctuation, spelling, and cross-references and to make such other technical and conforming changes as may be necessary to reflect the actions of the House, including the change at the desk. **Pages H8224–25**

H. Res. 629, the rule providing for consideration of the bills (H.R. 1815) and (H.R. 3624) was agreed to yesterday, October 16th.

Expressing the profound sorrow of the House of Representatives on the death of the Honorable Elijah E. Cummings: The House agreed to H. Res. 635, expressing the profound sorrow of the House of Representatives on the death of the Honorable Elijah E. Cummings. **Page H8225**

Quorum Calls—Votes: One yea-and-nay vote and three recorded votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H8220, H8220–21, H8221–22, and H8224. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and at 3:08 p.m., pursuant to House Resolution 635, the House stands adjourned until 9 a.m. on Friday, October 18, 2019, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the late Honorable Elijah E. Cummings.

Committee Meetings

TO REVIEW IMPLEMENTATION OF USDA FARM BILL RESEARCH PROGRAMS

Committee on Agriculture: Subcommittee on Biotechnology, Horticulture, and Research held a hearing entitled ''To Review Implementation of USDA Farm Bill Research Programs''. Testimony was heard from Scott Hutchins, Deputy Under Secretary, Research, Education, and Economics, Department of Agriculture.

OVERSIGHT HEARING: CHRONIC WASTING DISEASE

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies held a hearing entitled ''Oversight Hearing: Chronic Wasting Disease''. Testimony was heard from William Werkheiser, Science Advisor to the Secretary and Chair, Chronic Wasting Disease Task Force, Department of the Interior; and public witnesses.

OVERSIGHT HEARING: THE DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT'S COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT-DISASTER RECOVERY PROGRAM

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies held a hearing entitled ''Oversight Hearing: The Department of Housing and Urban Development's Community Development Block Grant-Disaster Recovery Program''. Testimony was heard from the following Department of Housing and Urban Development officials: Irv Dennis, Chief Financial Officer; Jeremy Kirkland, Counsel to the Inspector General, Office of Inspector General; and David Woll, Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for Community Planning and Development.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURE

Committee on Education and Labor: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 3, the ''Lower Drug Costs Now Act of 2019''. H.R. 3 was ordered reported, as amended.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 3, the ''Lower Drug Costs Now Act of 2019''; H.R. 4665, the ''Medicare Vision Act of 2019''; H.R. 4671, the ''Help Seniors Afford Health Care Act''; H.R. 4618, the ''Medicare Hearing Act of 2019''; and H.R. 4650, the ''Medicare Dental Act of 2019''. H.R. 4665, H.R. 4671, H.R. 4618, and H.R. 4650 were ordered reported, without amendment. H.R. 3 was ordered reported, as amended.

EXAMINING CORPORATE PRIORITIES: THE IMPACT OF STOCK BUYBACKS ON WORKERS, COMMUNITIES, AND INVESTORS

Committee on Financial Services: Subcommittee on Investor Protection, Entrepreneurship, and Capital Markets held a hearing entitled ''Examining Corporate Priorities: The Impact of Stock Buybacks on Workers, Communities, and Investors''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

PROMOTING INCLUSION: EXAMINING THE NEED FOR DIVERSITY PRACTICES FOR AMERICA'S CHANGING WORKFORCE

Committee on Financial Services: Subcommittee on Diversity and Inclusion held a hearing entitled ''Promoting Inclusion: Examining the Need for Diversity Practices for America's Changing Workforce''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

DEFENDING THE HOMELAND FROM BIOTERRORISM: ARE WE PREPARED?

Committee on Homeland Security: Subcommittee on Emergency Preparedness, Response, and Recovery held a hearing entitled ''Defending the Homeland from Bioterrorism: Are We Prepared?''. Testimony was heard from Jennifer Rakeman, Assistant Commissioner and Director, Public Health Laboratory,

Department of Health and Mental Hygiene, New York; Umair A. Shah, M.D., Executive Director, Public Health, Harris County, Texas; and a public witness.

THE PUBLIC'S RIGHT TO KNOW: FOIA AT THE DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Committee on Homeland Security: Subcommittee on Oversight, Management, and Accountability held a hearing entitled ''The Public's Right to Know: FOIA at the Department of Homeland Security''. Testimony was heard from James Holzer, Deputy Chief FOIA Officer, Privacy Office, Department of Homeland Security; Tammy Meckley, Associate Director, Immigration Records and Identity Services Directorate, U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services, Department of Homeland Security; Alina Semo, Director, Office of Government Information Services, U.S. National Archives and Records Administration; and Vijay D'Souza, Director, Information Technology and Cybersecurity, Government Accountability Office.

VOTING RIGHTS AND ELECTION ADMINISTRATION IN AMERICA

Committee on House Administration: Subcommittee on Elections held a hearing entitled ''Voting Rights and Election Administration in America''. Testimony was heard from Catherine E. Lhamon, Chair, U.S. Commission on Civil Rights; and public witnesses.

LEGISLATIVE MEASURES

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on the Constitution, Civil Rights, and Civil Liberties held a hearing entitled ''Legislative Proposals to Strengthen the Voting Rights Act''. Testimony was heard from Representative Sewell and public witnesses.

OVERSIGHT HEARING ON THE FEDERAL BUREAU OF PRISONS AND IMPLEMENTATION OF THE FIRST STEP ACT

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, and Homeland Security held a hearing entitled ''Oversight Hearing on the Federal Bureau of Prisons and Implementation of the First Step Act''. Testimony was heard from Kathleen Hawk Sawyer, Director, Federal Bureau of Prisons; Antoinette T. Bacon, Associate Deputy Attorney General, Department of Justice; and public witnesses.

LEGISLATIVE MEASURE

Committee on Natural Resources: Subcommittee on National Parks, Forests, and Public Lands held a hearing on H.R. 2420, the ''National Museum of the American Latino Act''. Testimony was heard from Representatives Serrano and Castro of Texas; Eduardo Díaz, Director, Latino Center, Smithsonian Institution; and public witnesses.

THE CASE FOR CLIMATE OPTIMISM: REALISTIC PATHWAYS TO ACHIEVING NET ZERO EMISSIONS

Committee on Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources held a hearing entitled ''The Case for Climate Optimism: Realistic Pathways to Achieving Net Zero Emissions''. Testimony was heard from Hector De La Torre, Board Member, California Air Resources Board; and public witnesses.

LEGISLATIVE MEASURES

Committee on Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Water, Oceans, and Wildlife held a hearing on H.R. 2795, the ''Wildlife Corridors Conservation Act of 2019''; and H.R. 3742, the ''Recovering America's Wildlife Act of 2019''. Testimony was heard from Representatives Beyer and Dingell; Stephen Guertin, Deputy Director for Policy, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior; and public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 4091, the ''ARPA–E Reauthorization Act of 2019''; H.R. 2051, the ''Sustainable Chemistry Research and Development Act of 2019''; and H.R. 1709, the ''Science Integrity Act''. H.R. 4091, H.R. 2051, and H.R. 1709 were ordered reported, as amended.

CAN OPPORTUNITY ZONES ADDRESS CONCERNS IN THE SMALL BUSINESS ECONOMY?

Committee on Small Business: Subcommittee on Economic Growth, Tax, and Capital Access held a hearing entitled ''Can Opportunity Zones Address Concerns in the Small Business Economy?''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

CHINA'S MARITIME SILK ROAD INITIATIVE: IMPLICATIONS FOR THE GLOBAL MARITIME SUPPLY CHAIN

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Subcommittee on Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation held a hearing entitled ''China's Maritime Silk Road Initiative: Implications for the Global Maritime Supply Chain''. Testimony was heard from Lieutenant General Giovanni K. Tuck, Director for Logistics, J4, Joint Chiefs of Staff; Chad Sbragia, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for China, Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Indo-Pacific Security Affairs, Office of the Secretary of Defense, Department of Defense; Carolyn Bartholomew,

Chairwoman, U.S.-China Economic and Security Review Commission; and public witnesses.

INVESTING IN THE U.S. HEALTH SYSTEM BY LOWERING DRUG PRICES, REDUCING OUT-OF-POCKET COSTS, AND IMPROVING MEDICARE BENEFITS

Committee on Ways and Means: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''Investing in The U.S. Health System by Lowering Drug Prices, Reducing Out-Of-Pocket Costs, and Improving Medicare Benefits''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

SOLVING THE CLIMATE CRISIS: CLEANER, STRONGER BUILDINGS

Select Committee on the Climate Crisis: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''Solving the Climate Crisis: Cleaner, Stronger Buildings''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR FRIDAY, OCTOBER 18, 2019

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

No meetings/hearings scheduled.

House

Committee on Financial Services, Task Force on Artificial Intelligence, hearing entitled ''AI and the Evolution of Cloud Computing: Evaluation How Financial Data is Stored, Protected, and Maintained by Cloud Providers'', 9:30 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on Antitrust, Commercial, and Administrative Law, hearing entitled ''Online Platforms and Market Power, Part 3: The Role of Data and Privacy in Competition'', 9:30 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

3 p.m., Monday, October 21

Senate Chamber

Program for Monday: Senate will resume consideration of the protocol to the North Atlantic Treaty of 1949 on the Accession of the Republic of North Macedonia (Treaty Doc. 116–1), and vote on the motion to invoke cloture thereon at 5:30 p.m.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

9 a.m., Friday, October 18

House Chamber

Program for Friday: Consideration of H.R. 3624—Outsourcing Accountability Act of 2019.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Barr, Andy, Ky., E1300
Bost, Mike, Ill., E1300
Clyburn, James E., S.C., E1297
Garamendi, John, Calif., E1297
Gottheimer, Josh, N.J., E1299
Green, Mark E., Tenn., E1299
Higgins, Clay, La., E1299
Katko, John, N.Y., E1298
Latta, Robert E., Ohio, E1299
Newhouse, Dan, Wash., E1300
Norton, Eleanor Holmes, The District of Columbia, E1298, E1300
Panetta, Jimmy, Calif., E1301
Pappas, Chris, N.H., E1297
Simpson, Michael K., Idaho, E1299
Stefanik, Elise M., N.Y., E1301
Taylor, Van, Tex., E1298
Tlaib, Rashida, Mich., E1298
Torres, Norma J., Calif., E1297
Velázquez, Nydia M., N.Y., E1299, E1301
Young, Don, Alaska, E1301

Congressional Record

The *Congressional Record* (USPS 087–390). The Periodicals postage is paid at Washington, D.C. The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through the U.S. Government Publishing Office, at *www.govinfo.gov*, free of charge to the user. The information is updated online each day the *Congressional Record* is published. For more information, contact the GPO Customer Contact Center, U.S. Government Publishing Office. Phone 202–512–1800, or 866–512–1800 (toll-free). E-Mail, *contactcenter@gpo.gov*. ¶To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 979050, St. Louis, MO 63197–9000, or phone orders to 866–512–1800 (toll-free), 202–512–1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202–512–2104. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Publishing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.