



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 166

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JANUARY 14, 2020

No. 8

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,
January 14, 2020.

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 7, 2020, 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, with time equally allocated between the parties and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

104TH PENNSYLVANIA FARM SHOW

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, recently, I had the pleasure of kicking off the new year by attending the 104th Pennsylvania Farm Show in Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, the largest indoor agriculture exposition in the world.

The Pennsylvania Farm Show dates back to 1917, when the first event showcased 44 commercial exhibitors fea-

turing the latest in farm machinery and 440 competitive exhibitors. Since then, the Pennsylvania Farm Show has become the largest indoor agriculture exhibition in the world.

Dr. Milton Eisenhower, Penn State University president at the time and brother of President Dwight Eisenhower, dubbed the Pennsylvania Farm Show "always the greatest show on Earth" during his 1955 visit.

Thanks to the sustained dedication by Pennsylvania farmers and farm families, tens of thousands of volunteers, and generations of agribusiness owners, the Pennsylvania Farm Show continues to be the greatest show on Earth. Today, the Pennsylvania Farm Show has grown to approximately 6,000 animals, 12,000 exhibits, and 600,000 visitors throughout the week.

Each year, I host a congressional listening session at the farm show to hear directly from farmers, industry experts, and the agriculture advocates about their priorities as well as their concerns.

I want to say thank you to Representatives JOHN JOYCE, FRED KELLER, and DAN MEUSER, as well as Senator BOB CASEY and Pennsylvania Agriculture Secretary Russell Redding, for joining me for the 2020 congressional listening session at the farm show.

Even after more than a decade of serving on the House Agriculture Committee, there is no experience that replaces the value of meeting with our farmers, ranchers, and producers face-to-face.

With the right policies and good investments, rural America can be just as strong as the hardworking men and women who call it home. A robust rural America is not possible without a strong rural economy, and thanks to the passage of the United States-Mexico-Canada trade agreement and a soon-to-be-signed agreement with China, new market opportunities for agricultural exports are on the horizon.

New markets are the key to economic growth and stability for our farm families.

Stability also means having reliable safety net programs in place when times are particularly tough and when the weather is threatening our ability to feed ourselves. Over the years, technology has advanced and the economy has diversified, and keeping up with the demands of a new era is necessary to compete in the modern marketplace.

With connectivity, broadband, and, specifically, 5G, rural businesses will be better equipped to compete. Connectivity also expands opportunities for the next generation in rural America, helping signal to younger people that rural America is a great place to call home, to start a business, and to raise a family.

After spending several days at the Pennsylvania Farm Show, I am increasingly confident that the future of rural America is bright.

RECOGNIZING CHRISTINE KUSTELSKI

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

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Christine Kustelski, the Southside unit director of the Boys & Girls Club of Central Minnesota, for her recent induction into the Youth Intervention Hall of Fame. This prestigious honor, one that only 86 individuals have received over the last 21 years, is given to members of our community who go above and beyond just working with our Nation's youth.

Since 1997, Christine has worked in youth development at the Boys & Girls Club of Central Minnesota, serving nearly 1,200 K-12 youth. Christine assists a range of students, working with children living in foster care or with incarcerated parents or those who have experienced abuse, neglect, and severe poverty.

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

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



Printed on recycled paper.

I thank Christine for meeting the needs of the youth in our community and for her service to others in need. I congratulate her on earning her place in the Youth Intervention Hall of Fame.

RECOGNIZING THE ANOKA COUNTY HUMAN SERVICES STAFF

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the Human Services staff in Anoka County, Minnesota, for receiving the Local Government Innovation Award. These Innovation Awards highlight counties, cities, townships, and schools that have found ways to make a bigger impact in their communities.

Anoka County developed a new apprenticeship program called the Empowers Program. This volunteer initiative provides employment and training opportunities to the workforce of tomorrow.

In a nation struggling with workforce shortages and a growing skills gap, this program helps young people identify what they want to do with their career. The program assists the participants with job searches, individual career planning, paid training, and achieving technical and occupational certificates. The program can even assist with basic needs like a bus pass, clothing for work, or books for school.

Anoka County deserves to be recognized for its efforts to prepare our young people to join the workforce. With 7 million open jobs in this country, our young people need to be equipped to join our growing economy.

I congratulate Anoka County.

RECOGNIZING ELK RIVER AREA SCHOOL DISTRICT'S EXCELLENCE IN TECHNOLOGICAL EDUCATION

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Elk River Area School District. As we closed out 2019, Elk River received an award for the district's efforts to lead in educational approaches involving technology. Sourcewell Technology's annual Impact Education Conference named technology specialists and leaders from the Elk River Area School District as the 2019 Technology Team of the Year.

Elk River earned this prestigious award because of the work the district's technology team undertook to expand the services they provide to their students. Elk River now provides on-demand courses for teachers as well as online resources and training for students and families. In total, the Elk River Area School District has implemented e-learning options that are now available for nearly 14,000 students.

We are fortunate for such incredible educators dedicated to innovating for their learners. I congratulate all the educators and administrators at Elk River Area School District for winning this well-deserved award.

RECOGNIZING RIVERS OF HOPE, NEIGHBORHOOD HEROES HELPING VICTIMS OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Rivers of Hope, a

community-coordinated response to domestic violence.

In the summer of 1989, a group of neighbors concerned about an increase in domestic violence banded together to create Rivers of Hope to provide victims with care and support from their community.

Today, Rivers of Hope has expanded its scope of service, offering legal advocacy, education, support groups, referrals, and a 24/7 free and confidential crisis line for victims of domestic violence. The organization also operates a youth program and a criminal justice intervention program.

In addition, Rivers of Hope has grown beyond the neighbors who founded the organization to now include corporate professionals, business leaders, public servants, public servants from Wright and Sherburne Counties, and other community leaders.

I thank everyone who offers their time and effort to Rivers of Hope, making it the vital resource for victims in our communities. We are grateful for their dedication to making the Sixth Congressional District a better place to live and a safe place for everyone.

LOST JOBS AT WHITE MESA URANIUM MILL AND THE LA SAL URANIUM MINE COMPLEX

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

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the hardworking Utahns in the uranium industry in San Juan County, and especially those who have recently lost their jobs at the White Mesa uranium mill and the La Sal uranium mine complex.

Unfortunately, foreign subsidization of uranium production has had a devastating impact on North American production and has affected the mill's operation; and, as a result, roughly 30 percent of the employees had to be let go at our Nation's last operating uranium mill.

In addition to producing critical minerals, this mill has provided families with good incomes and generated tax dollars to help the local infrastructure. In fact, this facility is the largest private employer in San Juan County.

Since my election to Congress, I have had the privilege to spend significant time in the rural parts of Utah, including San Juan County. I appreciate rural Utah's sense of community and desire to help their neighbors during a time of need.

Unlike the more urban parts of Utah with a business hiring on every corner, rural areas often have fewer economic opportunities. However, the hard-working and entrepreneurial spirit among the residents of San Juan County make me confident they will be successful in their fight through this difficult time and, ultimately, come out stronger for it.

Additionally, I am committed to creating new economic opportunities in

rural areas. Rural Utahns deserve the same quality of life that their urban friends have, including access to broadband, quality medical care, and good-paying jobs. I will continue to work in Congress to bring these vital services to rural Utah.

While it has been a difficult week for many in San Juan County, I know the community will be resilient and persevere.

REMEMBERING THE LIFE OF GEORGIA STATE REPRESENTATIVE JAY POWELL

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

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember the life of Georgia State Representative Jay Powell, who passed away in late November at the age of 67.

At the time of his passing, Representative Powell had served in the Georgia General Assembly for 10 years and had dedicated his time in public service to helping the rural areas of our State. His colleagues remember him as a straightforward talker and remember that, if he said he was going to do something, he did it.

A testament to his honest character, during his tenure, he rose to be one of the most powerful members of the assembly as the chairman of the Rules Committee. There, he played a large part in deciding which bills came up for a vote.

One of his most important priorities included introducing a bill that would require small fees collected by the State, like police fines, to be spent exactly where taxpayers are told they would be spent.

Representative Powell is going to be deeply missed in Georgia and throughout rural Georgia. His family and friends will be in my thoughts and prayers during this most difficult time.

RECOGNIZING PETTY OFFICER 2ND CLASS NATHAN NEWBERG

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Petty Officer 2nd Class Nathan Newberg for being named USO Coast Guardsman of the Year for 2019.

Stationed in Savannah, Georgia, I am so proud that the USO recognized Officer Newberg for his brave efforts to rescue the crew of an overturned cargo ship off the coast of the First Congressional District of Georgia.

In early September, Officer Newberg responded to a 3 a.m. call about the *Golden Ray* cargo ship capsizing. In early September, he was subsequently lowered from a helicopter, crossed along the side of the ship, and descended inside to rescue the *Golden Ray*'s captain and a bar pilot. His effort, along with the rest of the Coast Guard, rescued all 24 of the ship's crew.

In addition to his work with the *Golden Ray*, he has helped evacuate individuals with health conditions from cruise ships, worked to recover coast-guardsmen's bodies that were missing

in action since World War II in Greenland, and completed over 125 aerial flight-hours in support of Coast Guard missions.

I thank Officer Newberg for his service to our country. I congratulate him on being named USO Coast Guardsman of the Year for 2019.

RECOGNIZING NATIONAL PHARMACIST DAY 2020

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize National Pharmacist Day 2020, which was celebrated on January 12.

According to Census data, there are over 200,000 pharmacists across the U.S., with another 25,000 pharmacy aides. Every day, these pharmacists are providing vaccines for a number of illnesses and carefully counseling patients on prescriptions to help heal sickness and reduce pain. Through this work, pharmacists are considered one of the three most trusted professions in America.

Today and throughout the rest of the year, I encourage everyone to visit their pharmacist, ask questions about their prescriptions, and get to know the people who provide their medicine and work to keep them healthy.

As the only pharmacist currently serving in Congress, I am proud to recognize the work these individuals are doing every day to serve their local communities around the country.

□ 1015

A DAY OF RECKONING

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

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Still I rise, Mr. Speaker, because I love my country and I love the people in this country. I love them because we are all created from a common Creator. I love the people of this country.

Not all of the people in the United States, those who are citizens, live within the continental United States. A good many of them live in Puerto Rico. I rise today to speak on behalf of the people of Puerto Rico who are suffering because moneys that have been appropriated by the Congress of the United States of America have not been given to the people of Puerto Rico and have not been delivered to the people of Puerto Rico.

I cannot understand how Congress can appropriate—bills signed, money available—yet we cannot get it to the people who need it. I am told that hospitals are closed. I am told that some people are sleeping in the street. I am told that there is suffering. I haven't been there to see it myself, but the reports are available for all of us.

There is suffering taking place in Puerto Rico, and we in this House would allow what we have signed, sealed, not to be delivered?

What is wrong with us?

People are suffering. We can help. At some point we will have to pay for this, and we are not going to have to pay for

it by losing a congressional office. That is easy. That is not the kind of punishment we are going to get for the way we are treating people. There is going to be a day of reckoning for all of this, knowing that people are suffering and you withhold the money.

The chief executive officer of this country knows what is going on, and we who are here in Congress are aware of what is being denied. All it takes is for the chief executive officer to send it, and it will be done. But it is not taking place.

So I appear today, and I rise because I love my country. I love the people of Puerto Rico. They are Americans by the way, citizens by the way. I love them and I refuse to allow this to happen on my watch without my at least standing here and calling it to the attention of the American public.

I have a duty, a responsibility, and an obligation to say something about this type of behavior, especially when there are 435 of us who could do something about it and have done something about it, but there is one person who declines to allow justice to be done.

Mr. President, what is wrong with you?

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

DE FACTO VETO SETS A DANGEROUS PRECEDENT

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

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to be recognized and address you here on the floor of the United States House of Representatives.

I come before you this morning to remind this House and to speak about the procedure that is pending in the Senate and some activities that need to take place in this House before that is likely to happen, and that, of course, is the impeachment of the President of the United States.

It took place December 18, and we will have been waiting nearly a month before the Articles of Impeachment would be transferred over to the United States Senate which would then begin the enactment of a trial—hopefully a fair trial—with an opportunity for the President to defend himself over in the United States Senate.

I was here in this city for 3 days of the impeachment hearings before the House Judiciary Committee in 1998 and I was able to observe the activities here in this House and how people acted. I will say the people who were defending Bill Clinton were not serious outside the camera and in the House Judiciary Committee.

Here we have an impeachment that has been brought forward on two different charges and we have watched as from the beginning, from clear back in November of 2016, this discussion about

impeaching the President of the United States began. It began on November 9 when the first Democrat stepped up and said: We are going to impeach this President.

We had people who ran for office to get into this Congress who announced: We are going to impeach the—I can't put those words into this CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Mr. Speaker.

So this has been a driven agenda and it began as soon as the other side realized that Donald Trump was the duly elected and legitimate President of the United States.

There are two reasons that this impeachment is taking place here. One of them is because there is a deep, visceral hatred for Donald Trump among the hardcore left in this country that is driving the caucus on that side.

Another reason is because the investigations came about because of the weaponization of the executive branch of the United States. I mean particularly the Department of Justice and within it the FBI, some of the State Department, and much of the intelligence community working together to surveil President Trump's campaign operations and then President-elect Donald Trump's inauguration activities and communications before that and surveillance afterwards.

Also I mean the circumstances that came about when James Comey took information that was proprietary and many say classified and leaked it to a professor of Columbia University with directions to leak it to The New York Times with the objective of creating a special counsel that needed to be Robert Mueller who couldn't have been changed differently by then-Attorney General Jeff Sessions because he had recused himself from Russia.

This is the backdrop of this. Impeachment puts a cloud up in front of the activities that took place that should appall this Nation at the highest level.

So what I ask, Mr. Speaker, is this: Let's get these Articles of Impeachment done in this House this week, let's send them down across the rotunda to the United States Senate, and let's ask the Senate then to go ahead and work your will under your rules.

But my ask is this: having lived through this as a witness back in 1998, we didn't get a clean verdict in the United States Senate. I am going from memory here, I didn't look up these articles and the actual vote, but I remember this: the public never knew from each Senator whether they believed that President Clinton was guilty of the various charges that were brought before him. All wrapped in one question was: If he is guilty, is he worthy of being removed from office?

When you package those things together and you had Democratic Senators defending Bill Clinton, they said: Well, I didn't have to wonder if he was guilty because if he was, it didn't rise to the level to remove him from office.

I would like to know, I think the public wants to know, and I think it is

the constitutional duty of the United States Senate to give us a verdict:

Did the President actually obstruct Congress?

Did he actually abuse power?

What were the definitions of those things?

They are not crimes.

What were the definitions?

Let's find out the judgment of these Senators, yes or no, guilty or not guilty, and then the next question is: Should he be removed from office?

I say not. I didn't see the evidence here. I don't see any crimes, and there have been no crimes.

All it amounts to also is in delaying these Articles of Impeachment if the Speaker can block a majority action from the House of Representatives, then the Speaker can block every action from the floor of the House of Representatives. It is not a sustainable position for the Speaker to refuse to message and have a de facto veto because that would make the Speaker of the House all-powerful with a veto for any piece of action that would come through the floor of the House of Representatives.

Let's get this done this week, and I encourage the Senate to get it done quickly. I would like to see the President stand here before us at the State of the Union address February 4 and be able to announce to the world that he has been exonerated by the United States Senate.

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 23 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

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

PRAYER

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

Almighty God, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

You have promised, O God, that You are with us wherever we are and whatever we are doing—to heal and to help, to give strength and make us whole.

We pray that the Members of this assembly especially, and all of us, will be receptive to Your promises and receive them with confidence and conviction, that, armed by Your spirit, they will be able to forge good legislation which promotes justice, equity, and truth.

May we be mindful that all are created in Your image. Help us to see Your spirit in those who are different from us in age, color, religion, and all

other ways, including in politics, and engage each other with goodwill and respect.

May all that is done today be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUDD) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. BUDD led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. Under clause 5(d) of rule XX, the Chair announces to the House that, in light of the resignation of the gentleman from California, Mr. HUNTER, the whole number of the House is 430.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

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

HONORING THE LEGACY OF MAMIE KIRKLAND

(Mr. HIGGINS of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HIGGINS of New York. Madam Speaker, last month Buffalo's oldest resident, Mamie Kirkland, passed away at the age of 111. Mamie made Buffalo her home in 1923 after spending a lifetime outsmarting racism in Mississippi, Illinois, and Ohio. She fled rioting, burning of homes, and the shooting of residents by an angry racist mob. She witnessed the Ku Klux Klan burn a cross on the lawn of her family home.

Through these memories she inspired the creation of both the Legacy Museum and National Memorial for Peace and Justice.

Four years ago Ms. Kirkland was honored at a gala by the Equal Justice Initiative. When asked to speak on her journey, she said: "I left Mississippi a scared little girl of 7 years old. Now I am 107—and I am not afraid anymore."

I rise to honor the fearless legacy of Ms. Kirkland for the citizens of Buffalo, a city honored to be Mamie's home.

IRAN PROTESTS

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

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, the amazing capabilities of our men and women in uniform, combined with decisive action by President Trump, inspired thousands of civilians throughout Iran to take to the streets over the weekend to protest their government. These individuals braved the threat of live fire, teargas, and further damage to show the Ayatollah and his thugs that enough is enough.

It is a shame that in sharp contrast, House Democrats last week buckled to the Iranian regime and passed a concurrent War Powers Resolution attempting to tie the President's hands and obstruct his already successful Iranian strategy. Furthermore, the Speaker yesterday sadly attempted to downplay these nationwide protests as just "students" upset about the downed airliner.

To the protesters in Tehran, Shiraz, and elsewhere: I say the Speaker of this House does not speak for all of us. We do not downplay your courage, and we stand with you.

DRUG PRICING

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

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, as a professional registered nurse in Congress, I must say how crucial it is for essential medications to be affordable and accessible.

In 2017, 42 percent of Texas residents stopped taking medications as prescribed simply due to cost according to AARP. Over 2.6 million Texans have diabetes, and they must have daily access to affordable and quality insulin.

Mr. Speaker, huge investments from taxpayers go into the development of quality medications, yet just in the first days of 2020 multiple pharmaceutical companies have increased prices on over 400 drugs by 5 percent of the taxpayers' money.

We must do more to protect the vulnerable members of our communities, especially our seniors and the uninsured. With support of this House and Senate, we must continue to work together to lower the cost of prescription drugs for our constituents.

ANTI-SEMITISM

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

Mr. BUDD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to condemn the increasing anti-Semitic violence that has spread in recent months, including the recent stabbing that happened last month in New York.

Mr. Speaker, anti-Semitic and anti-Israel attitudes often emerge because

of a lack of understanding of the painful history directed at the Jewish people and the horrors of the Holocaust.

For this reason, I introduced H. Res. 782 alongside Representatives ZELDIN and KUSTOFF that encourages public schools to design and teach a curriculum about the history of anti-Semitism and the Holocaust and it calls on Federal law enforcement to hold the perpetrators of these attacks accountable.

Our Jewish community is feeling rattled, frightened, and unsafe. We cannot allow these feelings to fester. So in support of this community, I am proud to lead a resolution that will help increase understanding and rid our country of all anti-Semitic hatred.

CONGRATULATING THE UNITED WAY OF CENTRAL MASSACHUSETTS

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

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the United Way of Central Massachusetts as they celebrate their 100th birthday this month and to thank the incredible staff, interns, fellows, volunteers, and community partners who allow this amazing institution to make a difference for so many people.

When I think of organizations that change lives, organizations that mobilize and unite our community to inspire change and create a better world, organizations that look out for the least among us by giving families the tools and stability they need to break the cycle of poverty and get back on their feet, I think of the United Way of Central Massachusetts.

I am so proud and grateful for the work they do every day and the positive impact they have on the folks I am privileged to represent.

On behalf of my constituents and with thanks from the entire United States Congress, congratulations to the United Way of Central Massachusetts for a century of awe-inspiring work, and here is to many more.

HONORING THE LIFE OF FRANK MITCHELL

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

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of a trailblazer and Springfield, Illinois, native, Frank Mitchell, who on Christmas Day at age 70, unfortunately passed away after a fight with lung cancer.

In the spring of 1965 Frank made history right here in the House of Representatives when he became the first African American page since Reconstruction. Nominated by the late Congressman Paul Findley, who represented what makes up much of the

18th Congressional District today, Frank was appointed by then-House Republican leader and future President, Gerald Ford.

As a page, Frank answered calls in the Republican Cloakroom, worked on the House floor, and witnessed many historic events, including the civil rights movement and the debate on the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

Frank's historic appointment was long overdue, and he blazed a path for those who followed him with his work ethic and compassion for everyone he encountered. Frank often said that he couldn't fail because the door of opportunity had to remain open. Frank succeeded in every respect, keeping that door of opportunity open for generations to come.

Our thoughts and prayers are with the Mitchell family, and may Frank rest in peace.

SUPPORTING IRANIAN PROTESTERS

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the people of Iran have taken to the streets in defiance of their oppressive regime and refuted the lies that Soleimani was a beloved general. Already 1,500 people have been killed while protesting the authoritarian regime.

The Epoch Times of January 7 is correct: "The protesters' central demand in Iran is for the mullahs' regime to step down, stop its terrorist adventures abroad, and end its massive corruption at home."

This is why I am cosponsoring H. Res. 791, introduced by Leader KEVIN McCARTHY that supports the protesters of Iran. I am thankful for the courageous leadership of President Donald Trump and his support for the Iranian people.

He tweeted in Farsi: "To the brave, long-suffering people of Iran: I've stood with you since the beginning of my Presidency, and my administration will continue to stand with you. We are following your protests closely and are inspired by your courage."

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

EARTHQUAKES IN PUERTO RICO AND SUPPORT FOR EMERGENCY DECLARATION

(Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico. Mr. Speaker, today I rise on behalf of every single one of my constituents impacted by the ongoing seismic activity in Puerto Rico.

According to the U.S. Geological Survey, the southwestern coast of the island has been the epicenter of over

1,000 earthquakes since December 28 of last year.

On January 7 the island experienced a 6.4 magnitude earthquake that has triggered consequent aftershock tremors that are felt in the entire island, mainly in the municipalities of Guanica, Guayanilla, Yauco, Penuelas, and Ponce.

Mr. Speaker, I urge President Trump to approve the major disaster declaration requested by the Governor of Puerto Rico. This should be the next step to ensure proper and timely recovery efforts on the island as we push through yet another natural disaster.

□ 1215

CONGRATULATING LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY TIGERS

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

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I am here to congratulate the LSU Fighting Tigers for winning the national championship last night, the fourth national championship, a record-setting year, 15–0, 726 points. Joe Burrow is the Heisman Trophy winner, a record-breaking quarterback with 60 touchdowns this year.

LSU alumni are especially proud of what they did last night in the national championship.

I was honored to fly down with President Trump to attend the game. The cheers and standing ovation he got in the Louisiana Superdome was just phenomenal and well deserved, the fifth time the President has been to Louisiana this past year, and rightly so. Our State leads with seafood, oil and gas industry, forestry, and agriculture. You name it, we have got it in Louisiana, and we are very, very proud.

This football team, our baseball team, and our other sports lead the Nation and will continue to do so.

Please join me in congratulating the LSU Fighting Tigers football team for winning the national championship last night.

SUPPORT GRANDPARENTS IN PRIMARY CAREGIVER ROLES

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 5583, the Help Grandfamilies Prevent Child Abuse Act. I am proud to cosponsor this legislation with my colleague, Congresswoman MARY GAY SCANLON of Pennsylvania's Fifth District.

All children deserve a loving and safe home. Sadly, due to the Nation's growing opioid crisis, more and more children are being left without structure, without safety, and, in some cases, without parents. As a result, grandparents have become the primary caregivers for many children.

The Help Grandfamilies Prevent Child Abuse Act will provide resources to assist grandparents in raising their grandchildren and, most importantly, help prevent these children from entering the foster care system.

This bill ensures grandfamilies and kinship caregivers are eligible for services under the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act, or CAPTA. It also provides support to meet the needs of children who have experienced trauma; for example, those exposed to substance misuse. Lastly, the bill calls for training and resources to assist caregivers in navigating the complicated childcare system.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5583 is a good bill. It is a bipartisan bill, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE
CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, January 14, 2020.

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

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on January 14, 2020, at 11:16 a.m.:

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 434.

That the Senate agreed to Relative to the death of the Honorable Jocelyn Burdick former United States Senator for the State of North Dakota S. Res. 468.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

CHERYL L. JOHNSON.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1230, PROTECTING OLDER WORKERS AGAINST DISCRIMINATION ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 76, PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF RULE SUBMITTED BY DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION RELATING TO "BORROWER DEFENSE INSTITUTIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY"; AND PROVIDING FOR PROCEEDINGS DURING THE PERIOD FROM JANUARY 17, 2020, THROUGH JANUARY 24, 2020

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 790 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 790

Resolved, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1230) to amend the Age Discrimination in Employment Act

of 1967 and other laws to clarify appropriate standards for Federal employment discrimination and retaliation claims, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Education and Labor now printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 116-46 shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as the original bill for the purpose of further amendment under the five-minute rule and shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. No further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such further amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such further amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill, as amended, to the House with such further amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 76) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Department of Education relating to "Borrower Defense Institutional Accountability". All points of order against consideration of the joint resolution are waived. The joint resolution shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the joint resolution are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 3. On any legislative day during the period from January 17, 2020, through January 24, 2020—

(a) the Journal of the proceedings of the previous day shall be considered as approved; and

(b) the Chair may at any time declare the House adjourned to meet at a date and time, within the limits of clause 4, section 5, article I of the Constitution, to be announced by the Chair in declaring the adjournment.

SEC. 4. The Speaker may appoint Members to perform the duties of the Chair for the duration of the period addressed by section 3 of this resolution as though under clause 8(a) of rule I.

SEC. 5. Each day during the period addressed by section 3 of this resolution shall

not constitute a legislative day for purposes of clause 7 of rule XV.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, the Rules Committee met and reported a rule, House Resolution 790, providing for consideration of two measures: H.R. 1230, the Protecting Older Workers Against Discrimination Act, and H.J. Res. 76, providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Department of Education relating to "Borrower Defense Institutional Accountability."

The rule provides for consideration of H.R. 1230 under a structured rule, with 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking member of the Committee on Education and Labor. It makes in order five amendments and provides one motion to recommit.

The rule provides for consideration of H.J. Res. 76 under a closed rule, with 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and the ranking member of the Committee on Education and Labor, and it provides one motion to recommit.

Finally, the rule provides for standard district work period instructions from January 17 through January 24, 2020.

Mr. Speaker, since taking the majority a year ago, Democrats have made it a priority to protect our Nation's students and workers. As a member of the Committee on Education and Labor, I am proud that I have played a role in passing legislation that will provide students and workers the support they need to thrive. We have that opportunity once again this week with these bills, both of which I am proud to cosponsor.

First, we are taking a stand against the Department of Education's deliberate disregard for students who have been defrauded by institutions. In 2019, student loan debt reached an all-time high in the United States of \$1.41 trillion. Our Nation is truly in a student debt crisis.

Even more significantly impacted by this crisis are students who have been defrauded by predatory for-profit colleges. On top of their crushing debt, they have useless degrees and none of

the job opportunities that they were promised.

In 2016, following the collapse of two major predatory for-profit institutions, President Obama established the borrower defense rule to help students access relief from their student loans. Instead of helping students, Secretary DeVos modified the rule, creating an intentionally complicated process that restricts how much relief defrauded students can receive.

According to The Institute for College Access and Success, the new rule would forgive only about 3 cents on every dollar borrowed. Even in cases where schools clearly violate the law, this new rule denies students relief if they can't prove the school intentionally defrauded them, can't file their claim fast enough, or can't document exactly how much financial harm they have suffered due to fraud.

Although we don't have the full picture because their investments are shrouded in secrecy, Secretary DeVos' connections to the for-profit college industry led me to believe that her siding with the industry is not a coincidence.

The bill we will consider this week would bring us back to the Obama-era rules that put students first and profit second.

Second, we will bring to the floor the Protecting Older Workers Against Discrimination Act. One in four adults age 65 and older are part of the workforce, and that number is still growing. While some of the reasons behind this shift in the labor force are positive, like better health and job satisfaction, many older Americans must keep working because they are not financially prepared for retirement.

Sadly, aging American adults have a median savings of just over \$150,000 for retirement. If a person is fortunate enough to live a long, healthy life and has 30 years of retirement, that would leave them with just \$5,000 a year, a sum no one could retire on anywhere in this country.

Unfortunately, older workers suffer disproportionately from long-term unemployment and age discrimination in the workforce. Six out of 10 older workers have experienced age discrimination, but a 2009 Supreme Court ruling has made it harder for them to prove it. The decision upended decades of precedent, making it more difficult for older workers to get justice through the courts.

This legislation restores workplace protections for older Americans, paving the way for a more inclusive and diverse workforce.

Taken together, these bills honor our commitment to students and workers and offer us the opportunity to reverse two misguided and harmful policies.

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. DESAULNIER) for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, today's rule provides for consideration of two measures, a bill that seeks to protect older Americans from discrimination in the workplace and a Congressional Review Act resolution to overturn a Department of Education rule on borrower defense to repayment. While both pieces of legislation appear to protect vulnerable Americans, they likely have no chance of becoming law.

First, H.R. 1230, the Protecting Older Workers Against Discrimination Act, adds a section to the Age Discrimination in Employment Act that shifts the burden of proof in age discrimination cases to allow a plaintiff to show that any practice by the employer for which age may be an involved factor, not the sole factor, is covered by the act.

□ 1230

This changes congressional intent and disregards case law.

In 1967, Congress enacted the Age Discrimination in Employment Act to protect applicants and employees over 40 years of age from discrimination on the basis of age in employment matters. It is enforced by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

In 2009, the Supreme Court held that, in the case of *Gross v. FBL Financial Services, Inc.*, the standard of proof for a claim under the Age Discrimination in Employment Act requires that age stand alone as the cause of the adverse employment action rather than in conjunction with other factors.

In 2013, the Supreme Court also ruled in the *University of Texas Southwestern Medical Center v. Dr. Nael Nassar* that the plaintiff must prove that a retaliatory motive was the decisive cause of adverse employment action.

H.R. 1230 would reverse these Supreme Court decisions by allowing mixed-motive claims in Age Discrimination in Employment Act cases, clarifying that age need only be a motivating factor for discrimination, even though other factors also motivated the action unfavorable to the employee. This would actually make it more difficult to prove discrimination because an employer would simply have to show that they would have taken the same action in the absence of age as a motivating factor, which will be more easy to show under the mixed-motive legal framework.

Congress previously rejected amendments to add age discrimination to the Civil Rights Act, resulting in the passage of the Age Discrimination in Employment Act using a different legal procedure. Lowering the standard would apply the legal procedure of the Civil Rights Act to the Age Discrimination in Employment Act. In addition, a lower standard is likely to lead to increased litigation that, in fact, only benefits the plaintiffs' bar.

Other provisions of H.R. 1230 prohibit a court from awarding damages or requiring any employment activity other than injunctive relief. This means that

discriminated parties are precluded from actually receiving monetary relief, and the only true beneficiaries of this law will be trial lawyers.

The Supreme Court stated in the *Nassar* case that "lessening the causation standard could . . . contribute to the filing of frivolous claims, which would siphon resources from efforts by employers, administrative agencies, and courts to combat workplace harassment."

Republicans are committed to eliminating discrimination in the workplace, including for older Americans. Discrimination of any kind is already against the law.

Let me rephrase that. Discrimination of any kind is already against the law through the Age Discrimination in Employment Act, the Americans with Disabilities Act, the Rehabilitation Act, and the Civil Rights Act.

Now, the second measure included in this rule is the Congressional Review Act resolution to overturn a 2019 Department of Education rule called Borrower Defense Institutional Accountability.

In 1994, the Department of Education issued the Borrower Defense to Repayment regulation. In 2015, the Department of Education began considering borrower defense claims prior to default or collection proceedings, prompting a significant increase in applications for loan relief.

On November 1, 2016, the Department of Education published a Borrower Defense to Repayment regulation that did not distinguish between intentional fraud and a simple mistake by an institution of higher education. These regulations went after institutions rather than working to help students. Offending institutions suffered significant financial penalties, resulting in a taxpayer cost of \$42 billion and the loss of access to higher education for millions of students.

These Obama administration regulations were, in fact, overly broad, with the intent of loan forgiveness, despite taxpayer cost.

The Trump administration's Department of Education subsequently issued a notice of proposed rulemaking and reviewed over 30,000 comments prior to publishing a final rule in September of 2019 to revise these 2016 regulations.

And let me just remind you, these 2016 regulations actually came about right at the end of the previous administration. The 2019 regulations, those that were derived after the 30,000 comments, the 2019 regulations will apply only to loans disbursed after July 1, 2020. So existing loans will remain subject to the 1994 or the 2016 rules, depending upon the issue date.

The new regulations will provide loan relief to those students who have been lied to and suffered financial harm. They will also hold institutions accountable, grant due process to all parties, allow for the use of arbitration, and expand the closed school look-back period from 120 to 180 days.

If this rule is not allowed to take effect, the 2016 regulations will remain. The definition of misrepresentation under the 2016 regulation is so broad that nearly everyone will eventually receive loan forgiveness, so this may, in fact, have the effect of making college free.

Now, free college sounds like a great benefit to society, but it is not practical, and it would force those who can't or won't go to college to pay for those who do.

In addition, eliminating the cost to higher education will limit the competitiveness of institutions, reducing the superiority of American colleges and universities.

Now, we heard last night in the Rules Committee that this Congressional Review Act is important to combat for-profit colleges, but the rules apply to all institutions. This means that even those institutions that inadvertently make a mistake, such as not updating a graduation rate on a flyer, will suffer financial penalties and, in fact, may have to close, despite no intentional wrongdoing.

The 2019 borrower defense rule is a significant improvement over the 2016 regulations and will save the taxpayer money, ensure due process, and hold fraudulent higher education institutions accountable.

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

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE).

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

I want to thank Congresswoman SUSIE LEE and Chairman BOBBY SCOTT for their leadership on advocating for America's students.

In the economy that we are in today, some kind of postsecondary training, whether it is an associate's degree, an apprenticeship program, or a 4-year program, is necessary in order to get the skills that are required in order to support a family and earn a decent living, and that is what education should be about in this country.

Sadly, in order to get that education, too many young people and people transitioning into their next job are taking on mountains of debt. Student debt is now \$1.3 trillion, more than credit card debt in this country.

As a result, these students, these graduates, often, or some who drop out are holding back from making other necessary investments to support their families, holding back on buying a home, and holding back on starting families and putting away money for their retirement because they are so saddled with debt.

One of the contributors to this huge increase in student debt has been the effect of predatory for-profit colleges. They have exploited potential students with false promises of high-paying jobs; and, particularly shameful, they have recruited the most vulnerable low-in-

come individuals: first-generation students, veterans. They have recruited them into junk programs.

Education should always be a vehicle to opportunity. Instead, these students are left with a bag of promises and crushing student debt.

This is a real problem. This is a real issue. That is why President Obama's Department of Education enacted the borrower defense rule to outline a clear, transparent process for student loan relief and to institute protections for those students and protections for taxpayers as well, because we are often talking about taxpayer-backed loans. The Obama borrower defense rule would help defrauded students get the loan debt relief that is owed to them under the law.

Secretary DeVos, however, has refused to implement this rule, and as of December 2019, 240,000 defrauded borrowers are still waiting for her to act on their claims. That includes 6,000 people from my home State. This rule further underscores why Secretary DeVos is unsuited for this position.

We have to protect students from these for-profit colleges that have defrauded them, and I encourage my colleagues to join me in supporting this rule and the legislation that will be coming to the floor.

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

Soon we will vote on the previous question, and if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to require the House to immediately proceed to consideration of H. Res. 791, a resolution supporting the protestors in Iran.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. McCARTHY), the Republican leader, to explain the amendment.

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

Mr. Speaker, over the weekend, the world saw powerful images coming out of Tehran. Iranian protestors, many of them students, braved gas and gunfire to gather in the streets and speak out against their oppressive government for lying to its people. We saw video footage of people putting their personal safety at risk so their fellow citizens and the countries of the world could know the truth about what was going on inside Iran.

The Iranian protestors are showing incredible courage, standing up to a government that kills and brutally silences its own people. To get a sense of how brave their actions are, think about this: When Iranians took to the streets to protest late last year, many of them were shot and killed by their

own country's security forces. Death tolls show Iran's Government killed 1,500 people during the 2-month demonstration.

According to experts, this is the bloodiest crackdown on protestors since the Islamic Revolution of 1979. It came after the Supreme Leader of Iran gave a chilling order to "do whatever it takes to end it."

Sadly, attacks on innocent civilians have been all too common in Iran. This is just another horrifying chapter in their long history of harming their own citizens.

What is happening in Iran is a reminder that here in the United States there should never be any hesitation to stand with people in their calls for freedom. From the beginning, America has been a shining beacon of hope for those seeking a free society. Our task is to embrace that identity and the responsibility that comes with it.

Especially now, we cannot shrink from the sources of our national greatness. That is why I stand here today: to ask you to lend freedom your voice and unconditional support.

The resolution I introduced yesterday accomplishes three things:

It condemns the Government of Iran for shooting down Ukraine International Airlines flight 752, which killed 172 innocent civilians;

It expresses unequivocal support for the Iranian protestors; and

It calls on the Iranian regime to not use force against its own people, as it has done so many times before.

This resolution sends a strong message that the United States stands with the Iranian people and we are with them in their demands for free and honest government.

But the resolution also intends to amplify the voice of the Iranian protestors. It does not call for anything Iranians have not already demanded themselves.

This is an issue on which Congress should and must speak with one voice. We already passed similar measures supporting Hong Kong protestors by substantial bipartisan margins. It should not be difficult for us to pass this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I have been thinking a lot about what the Iranian protests mean today and in the future, and two things come to mind: a story and a quote.

□ 1245

The story is a small one. It happened a couple days ago at a university in Tehran. It is about a group of students and two big flags.

The Iranian Government had painted large American and Israeli flags in the middle of the street, as a sign of disrespect expecting people to walk over them. But a group of Iranian students courageously defied the regime's wishes. They would not walk on the flag and booed those who did. Some reported that the students were chanting "our enemy is in Iran, not America."

There are moments in time of history that the craving for freedom gets displayed, be it a young, lone man standing in front of tanks in Tiananmen Square, or be it some students in Tehran with fear just a few months before of being murdered, but not willing to walk on the American flag. A small moment with big meaning, for the students, for Iran and for us. It reminds me of the Hong Kong protestors who waved American flags and sang our national anthem.

The quote I have been thinking of comes from an anthology of speeches that Frederick Douglass read as a young man. The quote is this, ‘Let it be remembered, there is no luxury so exquisite as the exercise of humanity, and no post so honorable as his, who defends the rights of man.’

Mr. Speaker, America is more than a country. We are an idea, an inspiration for those who yearn to be free and have the ability and dignity to determine their own destiny.

So many times in this body as these moments rose around the world, be it the shipyard workers of Poland, be it the craving of the Berlin Wall collapsing and becoming one, be it those in Hong Kong that want just freedom of speech.

Let us not be the Congress that misses the opportunity. Let us not be the Congress that takes 1 week earlier and sends a message to the Iran Government that is much different, that we are divided, that we would not stand up if they murdered their own people again, or we would not stand up if those who are young students who rose and would not walk across an American flag and booed those who would, those who would stand up in Iran and say “the enemy is in Iran, not in America.” Let us not be that Congress.

Let us take this moment in time where history has shown that we are right when we stand with anyone who craves freedom. This resolution is the right way to amplify the call for freedom in Iran.

It is not just those on C-SPAN who are watching, it is the world who is watching. The world is much smaller today than at those other times. We will not have to wait for days or hours for the news to come across. It will be in a tweet, it will be in a text, or it will be in an Instagram.

There are important issues in this Nation, but there are none more important than whether we stand for freedom. I do not want this Congress to walk in shame that they missed this window. I do not want historians to look back in a few decades and see civilians were killed because they stood for freedom and America stood quiet. That is why I am asking that we vote “no” on this PQ. This resolution deserves to be heard, but more importantly, the world deserves to hear this Congress act.

Do you agree that America is more than a country; that America is an

idea, that it could be so great of an inspiration, it would move the students to crave what we fought for? Let’s take this moment in time to tell them we hear them, we stand with them, and this America will always defend freedom here and around the world.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to respond to the comments from my friend from California.

We know the Government of Iran admitted to mistakenly shooting down the Ukraine International Airlines flight. It was a tragedy, and tragedies led to tragedy. The people of Iran stood up and demanded accountability and are standing up from their government today.

This Congress supports those who have stood up to their government demanding transparency and fighting for their rights. That is why the concurrent resolution we passed last week reaffirmed that it is in our national interest to support the people of Iran and other Middle Eastern countries who demand an end to government corruption in violation of basic human rights.

As of this morning, the Foreign Affairs Committee is holding a hearing to examine our policy with Iran. While the Foreign Affairs Committee is hearing from experts on Iran, the House is taking action to protect students and protect Americans from discrimination in the workplace, and that is what this rule is about.

Make no mistake, defeating the previous question is not a vote on the McCarthy resolution, it is a vote to hand over control of the House floor to the minority.

I urge my colleagues to vote “yes” on the previous question so we may proceed to these critical pieces of legislation without delay.

I might add, just on a personal note, I would ask my colleagues to help—and I am sure they have had some cases of this—the Iranian Americans who have come to my office in my district with very troubling stories about their relatives who regularly have come to visit them in this country who are unable to come right now because of the travel ban by this administration.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN), a distinguished member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I have been a professor of constitutional law for 29 years, so I know the relationship between universities and students is sacred. We pledge to teach young people everything we know in order to propel them to become engaged citizens, educated human beings, and effective actors in the economy and society.

When I hear about for-profit colleges and universities ripping off young people and their families and plunging them into debt for unconscionable get-rich-quick schemes, it infuriates me as a professor, as a father, and as a Member of the House of Representatives representing the people of Maryland.

These rip-off institutions like Corinthian Colleges and ITT Technical Institute, which collapsed last year, leaves students with crushing debt, degrees that are not worth the paper they are printed on, and broken promises for the future.

The Obama administration adopted the borrower defense rule to authorize the Department of Education to provide debt relief to student borrowers who have been defrauded by these predatory, low-rent higher ed rip-off academies.

In Maryland, we have 3,754 students waiting for the Department of Education to review their borrower defense claims and relieve them of millions of dollars in loans that the American government disbursed to predatory colleges. Secretary Betsy DeVos, who is to education what Attorney General Barr is to justice, is not only keeping the Department of Education from processing 240,000 defrauded borrower claims nationwide, but she has drafted a new rule to make it nearly impossible for students to obtain relief from fraudulent colleges as of June 2020.

Secretary DeVos wants to replace a system of higher ed with a new system of higher debt. Under the old rule, groups of students defrauded by a predatory college would have received an automatic loan discharge of the debt from the rip-off institution. Under the new rule, defrauded students would have to submit individualized evidence to the satisfaction of the department that rip-off colleges intentionally misrepresented degree program outcomes, quality of instruction, or job placement opportunities. So even where these Bonnie-and-Clyde schools clearly violated the law en masse, students can still be denied relief if they can’t prove that they were individually and intentionally deceived, if they can’t file their claim fast enough, or if they can’t document how much financial harm they have personally suffered.

Billionaire Secretary DeVos, the patron saint of the rip-off academies, is basically telling working class kids across America that life isn’t fair, and now she is making that the law. Most victims of the higher debt industry will never fully recover from the lost time and opportunity, but by allowing these miseducation hucksters to rip them off, we are implicated as a Nation, and we must not fail them again. We must fully forgive every penny that the students were taken on a ride for. We must overrule the DeVos rule.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. TLAIB).

Ms. TLAIB. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding. I appreciate this time to speak on behalf of my congressional district, which I lovingly call the “13th District Strong.”

Mr. Speaker, instead of working on behalf of students, Secretary DeVos is enriching predatory for-profit colleges that leave students with crushing debt

and useless degrees, and I rise today because we have to stop it.

If you want to see harm caused by the legacy of the DeVos-led policies, look no further than my district. In fact, students in Michigan will suffer for years to come because of Secretary DeVos' consistent record of putting for-profit interests first. And who are Secretary DeVos' latest targets, student borrowers who were defrauded by large for-profit colleges. Scams, Mr. Speaker.

I heard from one constituent in my district who was deceived by a for-profit college that suddenly, with no notice closed its doors 6 months into her 1-year program. Now she is burdened with thousands of dollars in loans and nothing to show for them, not even a certificate or a diploma. She did apply for the forgiveness program through the Department of Education but was denied.

If we don't stop this latest DeVos rule, we will guarantee that my constituent will bear the burden of unfairly paying for a diploma she has never received.

It is outrageous that our residents are the ones being punished instead of protected from this type of fraud and abuse. Sometimes I think these words "fraud and abuse" are just not strong enough. These are scams, criminal activity by these corporations coming in and targeting communities like mine that the majority are people of color.

Look at the advertisement, they are targeting specific communities where I have a number of single mothers who want to go back to school and better their lives or other folks who are non-traditional students are who they target. Again, these are the most vulnerable communities that we all represent.

We need to stop Secretary DeVos from this relentless effort to protect the bottom line for corporations at the expense of our residents, the students.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING).

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding.

I rise in opposition to this rule and primarily in opposition to H.R. 1230, that is one of the subjects of this combined rule that we have.

The legislation that is coming before, the Protecting Older Workers Against Discrimination Act, reaches way too far. I am one of the people in this Congress that has met payroll clear back to 1975. I haven't kept track of all the people we hired, but we hired them across the full range that we had the opportunity of their age, whether it was on the young side or whether they stopped showing up on the other side. We want people that can do the job, and we want to take good care of those folks. We want to build a reputation that we are a good place to work. I want to have all of those workers come together at the Christmas party and

join together like family, and that is what happened just this past week with King Construction.

I think about what the impact of this proposed legislation does, and it works in the reverse of what many of the proponents would like to have it do. Certainly, when you take the definition of age discrimination and you expand it to mean if it is only the preponderance of the evidence—what we have in current law is a preponderance of evidence and the but-for language.

In other words, if an employee alleges they have been discriminated against because of age, there could be multiple other factors that were involved in that decision. Yet, as long as age is a component and it could be asserted effectively that that age was a but-for component, then that would be satisfactory as far as the legislation is concerned.

I think what happens instead is employers make prudent decisions, and when they do the hire, they are going to think, I have this applicant before me that is 62 years old. Picking an age, it could be 72 or 75 or less. That employer is going to have to make the calculation, what if this person is just setting me up? Or what if this person can't do the job and I have to remove them or terminate them? You are setting yourself up as an employer for potential liability, and that decision gets made at the hiring end, which means there will be a lot of seniors that don't have an opportunity to work because of the concern about the litigation that could be brought forward.

We have protection now, Mr. Speaker, in law and in state law, and that is where it needs to stay. It is a problem that doesn't exist and doesn't need to be solved.

□ 1300

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

Mr. Speaker, before I recognize the gentleman from Connecticut, I want to mention, like the previous speaker, I am a Member of this House who made payrolls for over 35 years in the restaurant business. I have a different perspective.

I wanted to hire the most talented person in front of me, and I wanted my managers to do the same thing. I don't think this rule, these kinds of laws, will inhibit that.

I understand the intuitive perspective, but if you believe in hiring the best person, I don't think you have to be afraid of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY).

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Rules Committee's motion and passage of the underlying bill, H.J. Res. 76, which will block Secretary Betsy DeVos' antistudent borrower defense rule.

Over the last 5 years, for-profit college chains have, without warning,

closed their doors on enrolled students who had paid their tuition—Corinthian College, ITT Tech, Dream Center, and Education Management Corporation—as have smaller schools like Ridley-Lowell in New London, Connecticut, which shut its doors midterm without notice on a school day 2 years ago.

In 1993, Congress created the borrower defense rule through the Higher Education Act to relieve student loan debt for student victims of fraud. Now, we have a Secretary of Education who wants to gut that law by making students whose classes, diplomas, and certificates have been terminated have to jump through a ridiculous maze of hoops before they can get what Congress intended back in 1993 and what the Obama administration was actually implementing—namely, justice—a complete discharge of student loan debt on the basis that students were victims of fraud.

The convoluted explanation that the DeVos Department used to deny discharge is a smokescreen for the administration's blatant bias in favor of for-profit colleges.

One group that sees the harm that the Education Department will do with the new rule is, surprisingly to some, The American Legion, America's oldest and largest veterans organization. As the National Commander stated recently, thousands of student veterans have been targeted and defrauded over the years by some of these rip-offs and have lost precious GI Bill benefits as a result.

As the commander states: "The rule, as currently written, is fundamentally rigged against defrauded borrowers of student loans, depriving them of the opportunity for debt relief that Congress intended to afford them under the Higher Education Act."

Mr. Speaker, this Chamber should heed The American Legion, stand up for student veterans and all students, and vote for H.J. Res. 76.

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

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. SHALALA), a distinguished member of the Rules Committee.

Ms. SHALALA. Mr. Speaker, the 2016 borrower defense rule created a process for student loan borrowers to demonstrate that their loans did not need to be repaid due to their school's misleading, fraudulent, or otherwise illegal conduct.

Many of those that closed their doors left thousands of students with no credible recourse. Instead of working to protect students and taxpayers, however, the Education Secretary and the Department have repeatedly sided with these bad actors.

By rewriting the borrower defense rule to favor those institutions, the Secretary has made it harder for borrowers to get relief and shifted the cost of providing debt relief from the schools to the taxpayer.

Several independent reports have concluded that this rewrite is fundamentally rigged against defrauded borrowers, depriving them of the opportunity for assistance promised them under the Higher Education Act. According to an analysis based on the Department's data, the changes to the financial triggers in the 2019 rule will result in institutions repaying only 1 percent of the eligible loan debt.

Mr. Speaker, I have led three institutions of higher education. The Secretary has created a bureaucratic nightmare. Even I, after reading the regulation carefully, could not figure out all the information that was necessary to apply for relief.

The Federal Government should be putting students and taxpayers first rather than helping financially irresponsible schools stay afloat.

Mr. Speaker, nearly 20,000 students in my State are currently seeking relief because they were cheated by predatory colleges. I did not come to Congress to protect corporations that seek to take advantage of low-income students, veterans, and taxpayers.

Until we take a definitive stance on for-profit schools, they will continue to defraud students.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the gentleman from California (Mr. DESAULNIER) how many more speakers he has.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Speaker, I have one more speaker.

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

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a September 3 Institute for College Access and Success article titled "Defrauded Students Left Holding the Bag Until Final 'Borrower Defense' Rule."

[From The Institute for College Access & Success, Sept. 3, 2019]

DERAUDED STUDENTS LEFT HOLDING THE BAG UNDER FINAL "BORROWER DEFENSE" RULE

Claiming to protect students and hold colleges accountable, on Friday the Department of Education finalized its so-called borrower defense rule. The rule allows students to seek to cancel student loans connected to fraud and other illegal activity by their colleges. "If a school defrauds students, it must be held accountable," said Secretary of Education Betsy DeVos in the press release.

Yet the Trump Administration's proposal would do virtually nothing to hold schools accountable for their misdeeds or to protect students who were wronged. To really understand the impact of the rule, you have look at page 669 of the notice where—in a table titled "Assumptions for Main Budget Estimate Compared to PB2020 Baseline"—the Department published its own estimates of the likely impact of the rule:

Borrowers will be required to repay the vast majority of loans resulting from colleges' wrongdoing. Only about 3 cents of every dollar borrowed will be forgiven under the borrower defense rule.

Colleges, on the other hand, will rarely face any questions. They will repay only about a penny for every dollar of loans stemming from misconduct.

The Department expects substantial amounts of illegal activity by colleges. In 2021 alone, the Department expects nearly

200,000 borrowers to suffer from colleges' illegal conduct, but their rule would leave borrowers to repay 97 percent of the resulting \$2.5 billion in debt.

Source: TICAS analysis of data provided by the U.S. Department of Education, "U.S. Department of Education Finalizes Regulations to Protect Student Borrowers, Hold Higher Education Institutions Accountable and Save Taxpayers \$11.1 Billion Over 10 Years," August 30, 2019. Available at <https://bit.ly/2lPOWdk>.

Methodology: Figures derived from U.S. Department of Education's publication of the unofficial text of the final rule on its web site on August 30, 2019. U.S. Department of Education, "U.S. Department of Education Finalizes Regulations to Protect Student Borrowers, Hold Higher Education Institutions Accountable and Save Taxpayers \$11.1 Billion Over 10 Years," August 30, 2019. Available at <https://bit.ly/2lPOWdk>. Because Table 3 provides the data by sector, we used other Department data on loan volume by sector to produce a weighted average, on the assumption that these figures are consistent over time. U.S. Department of Education, "Fiscal Year 2020 Budget Proposal," March 11, 2019, page Q-30, <https://bit.ly/2lXI7Xm>. To translate these percentages into the number of affected students, we used other Department data on the number of students borrowing federal loans, again assuming that these figures are similar from year to year. Federal Student Aid Data Center, "Aid Recipients Summary," April 2019, <https://bit.ly/2MGL5wc>. To translate these percentages into dollar terms, we used projected loan volume in year 2021 from the Congressional Budget Office. Congressional Budget Office, "Student Loan Programs—CBO's May 2019 Baseline," May 2019, <https://bit.ly/2lA5ju0>. We examined fiscal year 2021, the first full year of the rule's implementation.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Speaker, according to the Institute for College Access & Success, the DeVos rule would forgive just 3 cents of every dollar borrowed by students. That means those scammed by bad actors and fly-by-night institutions would be forced to repay the vast majority of their loans for degrees they didn't get, often through no fault of their own.

We need to help defrauded borrowers, not defend for-profit colleges. That is what this resolution is all about.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. STEVENS).

Ms. STEVENS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.J. Res. 76 because we can no longer allow the denial of debt relief to students defrauded by predatory colleges.

We can no longer allow a system that looks to line the pockets of the failed for-profits at the expense of students. We can no longer allow Secretary DeVos to ignore a court order as she attempts to turn over every action of the previous administration at the expense of the American taxpayer and the American public.

People have been defrauded; people have been robbed; and we need justice.

Nearly 8,000 Michigan borrowers are waiting for relief from paying their Federal student loans, including Erica Maupin, who was going to school to become a paralegal until she was defrauded by a Corinthian College. Erica had to abandon her dream, and now she

doesn't know how she is going to provide for her family and pay off her debt because the Federal Government isn't keeping its promise.

I am glad that the House is taking this step today. We should all be proud that the House is taking this action. However, we should also recognize it comes at the expense of a great step backward of the current administration.

Because of the step backward that they took, we now have to take another two big steps forward to right this wrong and to bring justice to people like Erica, to people like the Michiganders who are waiting for their justice are are waiting for their debt relief, and for our For the People Agenda.

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

Mr. Speaker, the underlying measures do not protect vulnerable Americans as intended.

H.R. 1230 would make it more difficult to prove age as a motivating factor in adverse employment actions. Republicans remain committed to eliminating all forms of discrimination and ensuring a productive and competitive workforce, but this bill ignores Supreme Court decisions and will place opportunities in the hands of trial lawyers rather than hardworking Americans.

H.J. Res. 76 is simply another partisan attempt to deny President Trump any success, even if it means harming American students.

Mr. Speaker, I remember when President Bush signed a Congressional Review Act overturning some of the ergonomic rules that the Clinton administration issued literally days before that President left office.

At the time, I ran a medical practice. I was a business owner wondering how I was going to pay for and comply with these new rules that seemed burdensome, complicated, and confusing. The repeal of these rules relieved what was sure to be a heavy burden on my shoulders and, certainly, many other small businesses.

Congressional Review Act resolutions have consequences, and we should fully evaluate the effect that they will have on Americans rather than just play politics.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "no" vote on the previous question, a "no" vote on the rule, and a "no" vote on the underlying measures.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, these two issues are extremely important to the American public.

When I think of the comments from my friend from Iowa and the comments about having made a payroll, I reflect on my career making those obligations. He neglected to say that doing

what he suggested employers would do is discriminatory on its face.

I knew that when I instructed my managers and when I interviewed prospective employees, I was not to discriminate based on certain Federal and State categories. So by taking the lead that he assumed that some employers might do, that you wouldn't hire somebody who is older because you might find yourself in court, that would in itself be discriminatory.

What we are doing with this legislation is just bringing this to an equal perspective with other categories. You shouldn't discriminate based on ethnicity, gender, or sexual preference. Why should you have any different performance standards or adhere to the same level for older people?

Given that baby boomers, people of my generation, find they have to work longer and harder, and given the issues around retirement, I would think that all of us would want to make sure that they were protected and that the economy would get the benefit of their wisdom and experience, and not have them discriminated against.

On the second subject, Ben Franklin once famously said at the beginning of this country that an investment in education is always the best investment.

Sadly, with this administration, Mr. Franklin might not say that because young people who are encouraged to get degrees, to get undergraduate degrees and graduate degrees to be part of a knowledge-based economy, to take that access to the best educational system in the world in higher education in this country, it would end with them in debt and with a degree that is worthless in the open marketplace.

I would think that all Members of Congress would want to protect both aging workers and students who are defrauded.

Mr. Speaker, as you can see, we are on the floor this week to restore justice to those who need our help. Struggling students and workers deserve our support, not for us to turn our backs on them.

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

The material previously referred to by Mr. BURGESS is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 790

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 6. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution, the House shall proceed to the consideration in the House of the resolution (H. Res. 791) condemning the actions of the Government of Iran and supporting the protesters in Iran, their demands for accountability, and their desire for the Government of Iran to respect freedom and human rights. The resolution shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution and preamble to adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of House Resolution 791.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 226, nays 191, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 16]		
YEAS—226		
Adams	Finkenauer	McBath
Aguilar	Fletcher	McCollum
Allred	Foster	McEachin
Axne	Frankel	McGovern
Barragán	Fudge	McNerney
Bass	Gallego	Meeks
Beatty	Garamendi	Meng
Bera	Garcia (IL)	Moore
Beyer	Garcia (TX)	Morelle
Bishop (GA)	Golden	Moulton
Blumenauer	Gomez	Mucarsel-Powell
Blunt Rochester	Gonzalez (TX)	Murphy (FL)
Bonamici	Gottheimer	Nadler
Boyle, Brendan F.	Green, Al (TX)	Napolitano
Brindisi	Haaland	Neal
Brown (MD)	Harder (CA)	Norcross
Brownley (CA)	Hastings	O'Halleran
Bustos	Hayes	Ocasio-Cortez
Butterfield	Heck	Omar
Carbajal	Higgins (NY)	Pallone
Cárdenas	Himes	Panetta
Carson (IN)	Horn, Kendra S.	Pappas
Cartwright	Horsford	Pascrill
Case	Houlahan	Payne
Casten (IL)	Hoyer	Perlmutter
Castor (FL)	Huffman	Peters
Castro (TX)	Jackson Lee	Peterson
Chu, Judy	Jayapal	Phillips
Cicilline	Jeffries	Pingree
Cisneros	Johnson (GA)	Pocan
Clark (MA)	Johnson (TX)	Porter
Clarke (NY)	Kaptur	Pressley
Cleaver	Keating	Price (NC)
Clyburn	Kelly (IL)	Quigley
Cohen	Kennedy	Raskin
Connolly	Khanna	Rice (NY)
Cooper	Kildee	Rose (NY)
Correa	Kilmer	Rouda
Costa	Kim	Royal-Allard
Courtney	Kind	Ruiz
Cox (CA)	Krishnamoorthi	Ruppersberger
Craig	Kuster (NH)	Rush
Crist	Lamb	Ryan
Crow	Langevin	Sánchez
Cuellar	Larsen (WA)	Sarbanes
Cunningham	Larson (CT)	Scanlon
Davids (KS)	Lawrence	Schakowsky
Davis (CA)	Lawson (FL)	Schiff
Davis, Danny K.	Lee (CA)	Schneider
Dean	Lee (NV)	Schrader
DeFazio	Levin (CA)	Schrier
DeGette	Levin (MI)	Scott (VA)
DeLauro	Lieu, Ted	Scott, David
DelBene	Lipinski	Serrano
Delgado	Loebback	Sewell (AL)
Demings	Lofgren	Shalala
DeSaulnier	Lowenthal	Sherman
Deutch	Lowey	Sherrill
Dingell	Luján	Sires
Doggett	Luria	Slotkin
Doyle, Michael F.	Lynch	Smith (WA)
Engel	Malinowski	Soto
Escobar	Maloney, Carolyn B.	Spanberger
Eshoo	Maloney, Sean	Speier
Espaiplat	Matsui	Stanton
Evans	McAdams	Stevens
		Suozzi

Swalwell (CA)	Trahan	Waters
Takano	Trone	Watson Coleman
Thompson (CA)	Underwood	Welch
Thompson (MS)	Vargas	Wexton
Titus	Veasey	Wild
Tlaib	Vela	Wilson (FL)
Tonko	Velázquez	Yarmuth
Torres (CA)	Visclosky	
Torres Small (NM)	Wasserman	
	Schultz	

NAYS—191

Abraham	Granger	Palmer
Allen	Graves (GA)	Pence
Amash	Graves (LA)	Perry
Amodei	Graves (MO)	Posey
Armstrong	Green (TN)	Ratcliffe
Arrington	Griffith	Reed
Babin	Grothman	Reschenthaler
Bacon	Guest	Rice (SC)
Baird	Guthrie	Riggleman
Balderson	Hagedorn	Roby
Banks	Harris	Rodgers (WA)
Barr	Hartzler	Roe, David P.
Bergman	Hern, Kevin	Rogers (AL)
Biggs	Herrera Beutler	Rogers (KY)
Bilirakis	Hice (GA)	Rooney (FL)
Bishop (NC)	Higgins (LA)	Rose, John W.
Bishop (UT)	Hill (AR)	Rouzer
Bost	Holding	Roy
Brady	Hollingsworth	Rutherford
Brooks (AL)	Hudson	Scalise
Brooks (IN)	Huizenga	Schweikert
Buchanan	Hurd (TX)	Scott, Austin
Buck	Johnson (LA)	Sensenbrenner
Bucson	Johnson (OH)	Shimkus
Budd	Johnson (SD)	Simpson
Burchett	Jordan	Smith (MO)
Burgess	Joyce (OH)	Smith (NE)
Calvert	Joyce (PA)	Smith (NJ)
Carter (GA)	Katko	Smucker
Carter (TX)	Keller	Spano
Chabot	Kelly (MS)	Stauber
Cheney	Kelly (PA)	Stefanik
Cline	King (IA)	Steil
Cloud	King (NY)	Steube
Collins (GA)	Kinzinger	Stewart
Comer	Kustoff (TN)	Stivers
LaHood	LaMalfa	Taylor
Lamborn	Lamborn	Thornberry
Latta	Long	Timmons
Loudermilk	Tipton	
Lucas	Turner	
DesJarlais	Upton	
Marshall	Van Drew	
Massie	Wagner	
Mast	Walberg	
Emmer	McCarthy	
Estes	McCaul	
Ferguson	McHenry	
Fitzpatrick	McKinley	
Fleischmann	Meadows	
Flores	Meuser	
Fortenberry	Miller	
Fox (NC)	Mitchell	
Fulcher	Moolenaar	
Gaetz	Mooney (WV)	
Gallagher	Mullin	
Gianforte	Murphy (NC)	
Gibbs	Newhouse	
Gohmert	Norman	
Gonzalez (OH)	Nunes	
Gooden	Olson	
Gosar	Palazzo	

NOT VOTING—12

Aderholt	Gabbard	Marchant
Byrne	Kirkpatrick	McClintock
Clay	Lesko	Richmond
Crawford	Lewis	Walker

□ 1343

Messrs. POSEY and SMITH of New Jersey changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. 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 216, nays 200, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 17]

YEAS—216

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

NAYS—200

Abraham	Banks	Brooks (AL)
Allen	Barr	Brooks (IN)
Amash	Bergman	Buchanan
Amodei	Biggs	Buck
Armstrong	Bilirakis	Bucshon
Arrington	Bishop (NC)	Budd
Babin	Bishop (UT)	Burchett
Bacon	Bost	Burgess
Baird	Brady	Calvert
Balderson	Brindisi	Carter (GA)

Carter (TX)	Horn, Kendra S.	Roby
Case	Hudson	Rodgers (WA)
Chabot	Huizenga	Roe, David P.
Cheney	Hurd (TX)	Rogers (AL)
Cline	Johnson (LA)	Rogers (KY)
Cloud	Johnson (OH)	Rooney (FL)
Cole	Johnson (SD)	Rose, John W.
Collins (GA)	Jordan	Rouzer
Conaway	Joyce (OH)	Roy
Cook	Joyce (PA)	Rutherford
Crenshaw	Katko	Scalise
Cunningham	Keller	Schrader
Curtis	Kelly (MS)	Schweikert
Davison (OH)	Kelly (PA)	Scott, Austin
Davis, Rodney	King (IA)	Sensenbrenner
DesJarlais	King (NY)	Sherrill
Díaz-Balart	Kinzinger	Shimkus
Duncan	Kustoff (TN)	Simpson
Payne	LaHood	Smith (MO)
Dunn	LaMalfa	Smith (NE)
Emmer	Lamborn	Smith (NJ)
Estes	Latta	Smucker
Ferguson	Long	Spano
Fitzpatrick	Loudermilk	Stauber
Fleischmann	Lucas	Stefanik
Flores	Luettichmeyer	Steil
Fortenberry	Marshall	Steube
Foxx (NC)	Massie	Stewart
Fulcher	Mast	Stivers
Gaetz	McAdams	Taylor
Gallagher	McCarthy	Thompson (PA)
Gianforte	McCaul	Thornberry
Gibbs	McHenry	Timmons
Gohmert	McKinley	Tipton
Golden	Meadows	Turner
Gonzalez (OH)	Meuser	Upton
Gooden	Miller	Van Drew
Gosar	Mitchell	Watkins
Granger	Moolenaar	Wagner
Graves (GA)	Mooney (WV)	Walberg
Graves (LA)	Mullin	Walden
Graves (MO)	Murphy (FL)	Walorski
Green (TN)	Murphy (NC)	Waltz
Griffith	Newhouse	Weber (TX)
Grothman	Norman	Webster (FL)
Guest	Nunes	Wittman
Guthrie	Olson	Wenstrup
Hagedorn	Palazzo	Westerman
Harris	Palmer	Williams
Hartzler	Pence	Wilson (SC)
Hern, Kevin	Perry	Wittman
Herrera Beutler	Posey	Womack
Hice (GA)	Ratcliffe	Woodall
Higgins (LA)	Reed	Wright
Hill (AR)	Reschenthaler	Yoho
Holding	Rice (SC)	Young
Hollingsworth	Riggleman	Zeldin

NOT VOTING—13

Aderholt	Kirkpatrick	Richmond
Byrne	Lesko	Velázquez
Clay	Lewis	Walker
Crawford	Marchant	
Gabbard	McClintock	

□ 1352

Mr. VAN DREW changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I was absent today due to a medical emergency. Had I been present, I would have voted: “yea” on rollcall No. 16, and “yea” on rollcall No. 17.

ELECTING A CERTAIN MEMBER TO A CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

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

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 793

Resolved, That the following named Member be, and is hereby, elected to the fol-

lowing standing committee of the House of Representatives:

COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES: Mr. García of Illinois.

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

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

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENT OF INDIVIDUALS TO BOARD OF FEDERAL JUDICIAL CENTER FOUNDATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker’s appointment, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 629(b), and the order of the House of January 3, 2019, of the following individuals to the board of the Federal Judicial Center Foundation on the part of the House for a term of 5 years:

Ms. Elizabeth J. Cabraser, Sebastopol, California

Mr. Peter A. Kraus, Dallas, Texas

PRAISE FOR NEWARK MENTORING MOVEMENT

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

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to praise the Newark Mentoring Movement, an organization that wants to turn Newark into “Mentor City.”

Unlike most mentoring organizations, they do not supply mentors. Instead, they do a more valuable thing. They connect politicians with organizations who support mentoring so they can discuss how to increase mentoring opportunities in the future.

The importance of mentors in America has never been greater. Today, more than 30 percent of children come from single-parent homes, and it is incredibly difficult to raise children alone. Mentors give these parents a helping hand. They give their children a role model. They can help increase their grades and increase their self-esteem. In addition, they can put students on a better path and keep them on a positive trajectory.

We need to dedicate more time and resources to provide mentors for children across this great Nation. Every child must be given a chance to succeed.

HONORING FALLEN OFFICER PAUL DUNN

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

Mr. SPANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor one of Lakeland Police Department’s finest. Officer Paul Dunn was a United States Marine Corps veteran and worked in law enforcement

for over 20 years. He started with Lakeland P.D. in 2013 and epitomized courage and sacrifice.

Officer Dunn sadly passed away following a tragic on-duty traffic crash on January 9. He leaves behind a devoted wife, who is a detective with Lakeland P.D. and five children.

This is the second officer Lakeland P.D. has lost over a 5-week period, and their losses have a wide impact on the surrounding communities. Yet the thin blue line that Officer Dunn was a part of continues to serve, continues to protect, and continues to allow us peace of mind.

I am grateful for him and for all of those who don the uniform with dignity, fairness, and justice. I thank them from the bottom of my heart.

Mr. Speaker, our prayers are with the family of Officer Dunn. He was treasured in our community.

□ 1400

HONORING THE LIFE OF JODY WILSON

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

Mr. O'HALLERAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to pay my respects to Jody Wilson, a veteran who passed away last month.

Jody was dearly loved by her friends, family, and community. She served bravely in the United States Army for 9 years.

After her military service, Jody served her community as a clerk, a nurse, and later as a letter carrier for the United States Postal Service. Her kindness, sense of humor, and infectious smile were sources of joy for those who knew and loved her.

Arizona has lost an incredible community member, veteran, and public servant.

Pat and I are keeping Jody's family, friends, and community in our prayers as we mourn her passing.

CELEBRATING INDIANA UNIVERSITY'S BICENTENNIAL

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

Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH. Madam Speaker, on January 20, Hoosiers will celebrate a big milestone. Indiana University will turn 200 and share those 200 years of academic excellence and notable achievements with the whole world.

For 200 years, Indiana University has provided top learning opportunities to Hoosiers and out-of-staters alike, with countless job opportunities to those in the Bloomington area. It is world-renowned for programs like the Jacobs School of Music, the Kelley School of Business, and Hoosier basketball.

Since its establishment in 1820, Hoosiers have graduated from IU and gone off to change the world. Indiana's faculty and alumni include Rhodes schol-

ars, Nobel laureates, Olympic medalists, and Pulitzer Prize winners, just to name a few.

IU's bicentennial will be celebrated on campus in Bloomington by alumni across the globe and through immense contributions every single day that the Hoosiers at Indiana University make.

Big Red 200 is a new supercomputer whose name reflects our bicentennial and the common "Go Big Red" cheer played at football and basketball games. Big Red 200 is the fourth in IU's Big Red computer series and is on pace to become the fastest university-owned supercomputer in the Nation.

As a member of the House Financial Services Task Force on Artificial Intelligence, I have seen the exciting opportunities America has to invest in AI to transform a number of sectors like healthcare and financial services through that continued data sciences research, and I am confident that IU will be at the forefront.

Madam Speaker, I extend congratulations on 200 years, and I look forward to the next 200 years of academic excellence.

REAFFIRM BIPARTISAN SUPPORT FOR UKRAINE

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Speaker, as co-chair of the Bipartisan Congressional Ukraine Caucus, I rise to introduce a resolution reaffirming the House's bipartisan support for Ukraine, our ally.

This time-sensitive measure proclaims the United States' vital strategic interest in preserving liberty and democracy in Ukraine and across Europe.

In 2014, Vladimir Putin's Russia invaded Ukraine without provocation. Over 5 years later, Ukraine remains engaged in a heroic struggle to defend its freedom and sovereignty.

Today, Ukraine represents the scrimmage line for liberty on the European Continent and globally.

This resolution makes clear that we in Congress recognize the sacrifice that Ukrainians make each day to defend liberty in Europe. As our ally, we support her continued defense, growth, and success.

Madam Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to join this timely resolution.

SUPPORT PRO-LIFE MEASURES

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

Mrs. WALORSKI. Madam Speaker, I rise today to mark 47 years since the Roe v. Wade decision and to affirm my commitment to defending the unborn.

The discovery last year of thousands of fetal remains in the garbage of Ulrich Klopfer, Indiana's most prolific abortionist, was a tragic reminder of the terrible cost of abortion.

After this shocking event, I introduced the Dignity for Aborted Children

Act, which would require the dignified burial or cremation of aborted fetal remains, with a strong reporting requirement to hold abortion providers accountable.

I also signed a discharge petition to bring the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act to the House floor for a vote. This commonsense bill would ensure a child born alive after a failed abortion attempt would receive the same kind of medical care any other child would.

Madam Speaker, as we mark 47 years since Roe v. Wade, we have a lot of work to do to stop a radical agenda and stand up for the sanctity of life. Congress can start by passing these two pro-life bills without delay.

RECOGNIZING HISPANIC HERITAGE YOUTH AWARDS

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

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Madam Speaker, right here in Washington, D.C., I had the honor of speaking to families and to 15 beautiful youth, American citizens of the United States of America who are going to be the future doctors, researchers, and teachers of this great United States of America.

What did they have in common? They were all Hispanic youth from this region on the East Coast of the United States, 15 young people who are talking about their dreams for curing cancer, their dreams of becoming teachers to inspire the youth of America. These are the kinds of young people who make this America great.

Another thing that they had in common: most of their parents' primary language was Spanish. But let me tell you, people of this great Nation, the parents whom I met last night love this country so much and appreciate all the opportunities that their wonderful American citizen children have the opportunity to aspire to and to achieve.

Again, we have a great, eclectic Nation, and I was so pleased to meet those 15 young people who already are leaders in our great Nation and will be the leaders of today and tomorrow because this country is great.

CONGRATULATING JOHN P. GILL

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

Mr. HILL of Arkansas. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize John P. Gill of Little Rock, Arkansas, who is being honored with Preserve Arkansas' 2019 Parker Westbrook Award for Lifetime Achievement.

This award recognizes significant individual achievement in historic preservation and is Preserve Arkansas' only award for achievement in preservation over a long period of time.

Throughout his career, both as an attorney and as a historian, John's passion for preservation was evident by his service in a number of capacities throughout central Arkansas, including sitting on the board of Little Rock Visitor Information Center Foundation and leading the efforts to preserve and restore Curran Hall. He also was president of the board of Preserve Arkansas in 2010.

John has demonstrated his passion for preservation through his commitment to service and leadership. I congratulate my friend John Gill on receiving this year's Parker Westbrook Award for Lifetime Achievement.

RECOGNIZING NATIONAL HUMAN TRAFFICKING AWARENESS MONTH

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize National Human Trafficking Awareness Month.

In my home State of California, human trafficking is a massive and dangerous industry, with 375 reported cases of trafficking involving minors in 2018. This must end.

That is why I am a cosponsor of H.R. 836, the Interdiction for the Protection of Child Victims of Exploitation and Human Trafficking Act, introduced by my colleague, Mr. McCaul from Texas.

This bill would establish a pilot program to provide training to Federal, State, and local law enforcement officers on identifying child victims of trafficking, exploited children, and missing children.

Indeed, the cues are out there, if we can see them. If our law enforcement is able to identify victims of human trafficking more quickly, it would lead to a safer environment, and identifying them a lot sooner would save more of the individuals.

Our most vulnerable populations need our help in order to keep them safe from this truly heinous and disgusting crime.

RECOGNIZING PABLO CUEVAS

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

Mr. CLINE. Madam Speaker, if you were to attend any public event in Rockingham County, it is likely that you would have the privilege of meeting Pablo Cuevas.

Today, I rise to recognize Pablo because, after seven terms and a 30-year tenure on the Rockingham County Board of Supervisors, he has recently retired.

Cuevas encapsulates the meaning of public service. An immigrant from Cuba, Mr. Cuevas has not taken lightly the privilege it is to live in America. Over the years, Pablo has given back to his community by not only serving on

the board of supervisors but also on the Broadway Town Council, the Broadway Planning Commission, the Rockingham County Planning Commission, and the James Madison University Board of Visitors.

Some of his greatest accomplishments include constructing new school buildings and expanding industries important to the area, such as agriculture. His dedicated service on the board of directors at the Virginia Poultry Growers Cooperative was invaluable to our region.

His passion for making his community a better place for all who live and visit the valley is going to be sorely missed on the board of supervisors. However, I am sure his wife, Elaine, and his daughter, Erika, will welcome the opportunity to have such a good man back home.

Madam Speaker, I wish Pablo a happy retirement and thank him for sharing his wealth of knowledge and passion for community service with Rockingham County for the past 30 years.

RECOGNIZING EAGLE SCOUT ANDREW ROCK

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

Mr. VAN DREW. Madam Speaker, today, I recognize Andrew Rock from south New Jersey on his attainment of the Eagle Scout rank.

Eagle Scout is the highest rank attainable from the Boy Scouts of America. Only 4 percent of Boy Scouts ever achieve this prestigious recognition.

Eagle Scouts are more likely to dedicate their life to service of all kinds, becoming future leaders in military, business, or politics.

I was proud to attend Andrew's beautiful outdoor ceremony on the lake this past November. The ceremony also highlighted the beautiful traditions of the American Indian people.

Madam Speaker, I congratulate Andrew. We look forward to big things from him in the future. I am proud of him; south Jersey is proud of him; and the United States of America is proud of him.

TALKING DEBT AND DEFICITS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. PORTER). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Madam Speaker, to our stenographer, if I start talking too fast, just give me that horrible look because my staff was telling me last week that I was sounding like a machine gun.

Madam Speaker, this is something I try to do at least half an hour every week. It is basically to have a little bit

of honesty about math and a little optimism about what policy can do to make things work.

Once again, I have a couple of my old slides here. I am sorry that I haven't been able to update them because there are some new numbers, but it is a really simple concept. Let's walk through it.

How many times do you hear Members from both the right and the left get on television and talk about things? Why does no one talk about the debt and deficits? I can tell you why we don't talk about the debt and deficits, because to tell the truth of what is driving the debt and deficits is really uncomfortable.

We are going to try to do a little bit of that math honesty because it is demographics. It turns out, demographics are not Republican or Democratic. It is just math.

We continue to exist in this pretend world, saying: Well, if we would tax rich people more, if we get rid of waste and fraud—none of those.

I have brought these charts here before. There are fractions of fractions of variance.

Why is it so hard for us to tell the truth? Why is it so hard for us to own calculators? We basically are a math-free zone.

This slide is a few months old, and I am sorry about that because there is optimism on the tax cuts in the revenues. As you all know, last fiscal year, we broke over 4 percent revenue growth in a time with lower rates, which none of us modeled. The economy is doing really well there.

□ 1415

Demands on social services have fallen fairly dramatically because of the incredibly robust labor environment. Discretionary spending, turns out the caps that that line is about, the benefits we were getting from the caps, when we did the budgetary deal functionally in September and October, we blew up the caps. So this line is bigger; this line is smaller.

But the punch line here is really, really simple: 90 percent of rising debt deficits between 2019, so last fiscal year, and 2029—90 percent Social Security and Medicare.

Now, those are earned entitlements. We have a societal obligation to keep our promises. But it is mostly Medicare. So we can't have an honest conversation here about debt unless you are willing to actually have an honest conversation about medical costs, healthcare costs.

We are going to pull some slides here that I am just incredibly optimistic that we could actually have a revolution in healthcare costs, but the only way that happens is this place has to grow up intellectually and join this century of technology and opportunities because, once again, let's go back a decade.

The ACA, ObamaCare, what was it really? It was a financing mechanism.

It was who got subsidized and who had to pay.

What did we, as Republicans, do? I still think ours was much better. It wasn't who got subsidized and who had to pay; it was who had to pay and who got subsidized.

We basically debate about healthcare financing. We do not have honest conversations about how to crash the price, because it is a really uncomfortable conversation because the things that would crash the price often actually make us have to have very uncomfortable conversations with our constituencies.

The different groups that are wandering the hallways right across the street right now lobbying us for this or that, they believe in their causes. They are wonderful people. But there is a disruption of technology.

So let's sort of walk through the math once again so we understand that we could have this amazing future if we could just focus on the facts.

This is a slide I have been showing almost for a year. If you and I remove Social Security and Medicare out of the 30-year projection, we have \$23 trillion in the bank. If we pull Social Security and Medicare—and this chart is not inflation adjusted, so you could remove about a third of it if you want to do constant dollars and you will see the difference of what is actual spending and then the financing costs, the interest on those. But if you pull Social Security and Medicare back into that number, we are \$103 trillion in debt.

So think about that difference: 23 cash positive, \$103 trillion in debt.

For those of you who care about your Medicare, you care about Social Security, you actually want these to exist, we must be honest about the math, because if we don't get our act together, we are going to get squeezed and there are no more dollars.

It is math. It is not Republican math; it is not Democratic math; it is demographics.

We have 73 million of us who are baby boomers. We are about halfway through retirement. That is what is driving the future debt.

So the next time you hear someone walk behind a microphone and say, "I am very concerned about the excess spending; I am very concerned about debt and deficits," if their next sentence isn't, "And I am going to work on a revolution to change the costs of healthcare and the things we provide," they are not being honest about how we save this society or how we save this country.

So, one more time, just to get our heads around the scale of the problem, and then we are going to actually talk about solutions.

This is a 2024 chart, so it is only what? Now, that is 3 fiscal years from now.

Nondefense, this is discretionary. This is what we get to vote on. This is defense. Everything you see in a blue shade there is on autopilot.

Do you notice something? The vast majority of spending is on autopilot. We don't vote on it. We don't do policy on it, and it is consuming everything.

So get our heads around something. Just the growth, just the growth of Social Security, Medicare, and the healthcare entitlements, over the next 5 years, just the growth portion equals one of these wedges. It functionally equals the entire Defense Department spending.

So, if you are someone who walks in the door and says, "Well, we spend too much money on defense; get rid of it," do you realize you just took care of only 5 years of the growth? What do you want to do with everything else? Over 10 years, it equals all the discretionary spending.

Once again, it is demographics.

Why is this place so uncomfortable to talk about that? Because it violates the pitches we go home and tell our voters. But it is math and it is honest, and if we keep avoiding the subject, the future becomes incredibly ugly. If we take it on, there is a path where things work.

So every week I come behind this microphone and I say, here is where the problem is, but here are solutions. And the very last slide is the one we do all the time, where we believe we have a formula where you grow the economy very aggressively. You do things from tax policy to immigration policy to trade policy that maximize economic velocity, and you are seeing some of that right now.

If I had come to this room a couple of years ago and said we are going to live in a time where we have more jobs than available workers, where the bottom 10 percent, the working poor in our society, have had the fastest growing wages in modern times, basically double what the mean is—it is working.

We should be, actually, as Republicans and Democrats, trying to figure out what is working, particularly for those quartiles—and I hate that term—those quartiles in our population that we were writing off a couple of years ago: You don't have a high school degree, you don't have skills, we are writing you off. You are part of the permanent underclass.

That was brutal. It was arrogant. It was vicious. It was wrong.

We know, right now, over the last couple of years, the movement of wages for those very people we were writing off 3 years ago, it is working.

How do we keep that going?

If you love and care about people, we need to keep this going, because, in my lifetime, there has never been a period of this type of economic growth and stability. Let's keep it going.

But let's not pretend that our future isn't buried in debt. Once again, if we take a look at it, it is substantially the growth of Medicare.

I intend that this Congress is going to keep its promises, but, mathematically, we are not going to keep our

promises unless we actually deal with the reality.

So when we have come in here, we have tried to show that there is a path, but beyond the economic growth issues.

We have labor force participation. You can't grow the economy unless our brothers and sisters are working, and those are folks who are both older, but we still have a problem with millennial men.

We had a miracle begin a year ago, December, where millennial females started entering the labor force in droves. The math right now says there are more females in the labor market than there are males.

Those are good things, because when we did tax reform, the joint tax folks, you know, the 50 of them who are all freaky smart, said your two problems of continuing the economic expansion will be capital stock—and I know I am getting a little geeky, and I am sorry—but capital stock, available capital for lending, for borrowing, for the growth, and people, available labor.

It turns out they were completely wrong on the capital stock. We have had hundreds and hundreds of billions of dollars more in what we call repatriation come back into the country than we had originally modeled. People are saving much more of their tax savings from tax reform than we ever modeled.

So the United States now is flush with cash. This is working over here. We have great capital stock, and you see it in our interest rates.

Our biggest fragility right now for continued economic expansion is actually labor participation. Now, there are miracles there.

Sure, because we are all really geeky, we all ran and looked at the U-6 unemployment numbers last Friday—not the top line, not where we stayed at 3.5, but the actual, what we used to talk about for years, "What is the real unemployment?" and you saw now we are in the sixes. We broke below 7 percent of real unemployment.

These are the folks who had become and we wrote off as discouraged workers, not participating; their skill sets are outdated. All of a sudden, they are entering the labor force.

We need public policy that continues to encourage that. How do you do that? How do you take someone who says, "I am older, but I am still a skilled worker; yeah, I might need an employer that is willing to make some accommodations for me," how do we create policies that incentivize that?

For our millennial males, how do we create policies that incentivize them? Because if we don't have that labor participation, we can't grow the economy.

The other things that also get uncomfortable, and we are going to talk about those today, is: How do you have a disruption, a disruption in the cost of healthcare?

I want to argue and I am going to make you an argument that we are living on the cusp of miracles.

On one hand, we have technology. Many of you are carrying it in your pocket. That cell phone, that super-computer, and the new sensors and other things, the ability to stay healthy, the ability to know when you have a problem.

Then, on the other side, the miracle cures, the single-shot cure for hemophilia that will be here this year, the experiment that is going on that cures sickle cell anemia. We are in the time of miracles.

Why this side is so important on my little upside-down bell curve is 5 percent of our population is the majority of our healthcare spending. It is our brothers and sisters who have chronic conditions.

What happens if we could get our act together and, through a series of financing and policy and licensing, these new biologic drugs, these new small-molecule drugs, these new things we are learning, get them to market and we are curing people who are part of that 5 percent of chronic conditions? Even if we can cure parts of their struggles, it is wonderful for society, and it is also really good for the cost of healthcare.

So we are going to touch base on just some things that I find fun, because it is part of the—and I know I overuse this term—thought experiment of what is coming.

So we now have almost complete miracles of technology. This is something that was just shown last week at the Consumer Electronics Show. This is a defibrillator you can carry in your purse. You can almost carry it in your pocket. It is just handheld.

This type of technology, as you now know, with the new types of pacemakers, the new abilities to help someone manage everything from hypertension to arrhythmia to now actually being able to restart a heart, this is at the Consumer Electronics Show.

We need to think about these types of disruptions.

Here is one. It turns out, if you were to take a look at how many Americans will lose their life to heart disease, to a heart attack, we now have the ability to monitor, with just almost a single pod like this in your home, just a single patch you put on, talking to your phone. These concepts crash the price of that disease if we could get them adopted.

It means we, as policymakers, have to figure out everything from the elegance of the licensing mechanisms—which the FDA does get some credit. They have been trying to create some kind of a third rail.

If you wear one of the Apple watches, you realize parts of that are coming on a new third rail of: Is it technology? Is it a health device?

These things are coming, and we are building models now that show they can help crash the price of keeping people healthy.

One of the slides I did not bring today but we have talked to the pro-

fessor, the thing that looks like a big kazoo. I am sorry. This is the best way we have to describe it.

You blow into it, and it instantly knows if you have the flu, instantly can bounce off your medical records if you are carrying them on your phone and instantly can order your antivirals.

So this could be in your medicine cabinet at home. You blow into it. They think the future version will be able to pick up bacterial infections, and the one a couple of years in the future will pick up as many as 20 different cancer proteins.

And it is a kazoo. You blow into it. We call it a flu kazoo in our office. People laugh at me for that, but they remember it.

Do you know that technology is illegal?

Think about that. The thing you would blow into that instantly knows you have the flu, that instantly can ping your medical records, knows that you are not allergic or are allergic to this particular antiviral, orders that antiviral and that Lyft or Uber or somehow gets it to your door an hour later, that process right now is illegal under many of our State laws under the way we reimburse under the Social Security Act because an algorithm is writing the prescription.

Should Congress, a few years ago, have slowed down the internet to protect Blockbuster video from Netflix?

You have got to understand, we have these disruptions in our society; we live with them all the time; but we sometimes need to step back and say: Okay. I like going home and hitting a button on my television and seeing all those movies instead of going and getting the little silver disc.

□ 1430

Apparently, Blockbuster Video didn't have armies of lobbyists walking up and down the hallways here in Washington, D.C. trying to protect their portion of the business model.

The technology is here that could crash the price of healthcare. Is that Republican or Democrat? I am going to argue it is just necessary. We do not have a choice. Do you remember the earlier boards? They were about if we don't have a revolution in healthcare costs.

So part of that same thought experiment, over that next 30 years you saw the majority of the debt and deficits are driven by Medicare. Thirty percent of that spending is just diabetes. What happens if—and I accept diabetes I and II are incredibly complex, there are autoimmune issues, there are lifestyle issues, it is complex, but just as part of the thought experiment—the single biggest impact you could have on future deficit spending is a cure for diabetes. Does that help sort of put it into perspective?

Let's actually walk through a couple of these. It turns out, remember how I said I think it is sort of an upside-down

cure? On this side is the use of technology to keep us healthy to be able to manage our health issues, if you need a pharmaceutical get it quickly, get it through use of technology; over here is the curative.

It turns out we are now coming across some studies that are talking about some of the new gene therapies that are crazy expensive, except the model is because of the cures they are producing, it will save billions of dollars in the future because you are cured. The miracles are coming.

Have you seen what we are able to do now in what we call CAR T? That is where we find out the type of cancer you have, we see what types of proteins it is producing, what T cells would properly attack it, and we set your body's immune system to attack. Some of the companies that are producing this technology actually give you a guarantee that if it doesn't work, you don't pay.

We just had a breakthrough a couple weeks ago, it turns out that we may be able to not only grow these in a petri dish, but we may be able to grow parts of those first immune responses to these types of diseases in an agnostic fashion before it is customized to you, so the price is about to crash. What is the value of curing your cancer instead of trying to find a way where you live with it for decades?

This place needs to think through the benefits of: How do we finance the cures? And this is where it gets a little political. I am sorry I am going to hurt some people's feelings, but there is a bill that has moved through this House called H.R. 3. It was a drug pricing bill. If you will be honest and sit and read it in detail, it is basically the keep Big Pharma protected bill because what it does is it wipes out all the small biologic, small molecule companies that are the disrupters.

These are the ones, you know, the product clearance is really simple. The drug that cures hemophilia is here. It is going to be like a million-and-a-half bucks a shot, but in many parts of the country hemophilia A may be a half a million dollars a year for the clotting factor and everything that goes with that. A million-and-a-half dollars a shot is a great investment. You are back in the money after 3 or 4 years. Our discussion should be financing that and getting those rolled out into society really fast.

But if H.R. 3 had existed when they were starting to research that drug, that drug would not be here. In a perverse way, the incentives are, without that drug, the ways of pharma and the infrastructure around that disease, they don't have a disruption. They are not put out of business by a cure.

H.R. 3, I know some of my brothers and sisters on the Democratic side, we have worked on it, we have talked about it, they mean well. There are actually some good things in the bill. But the basic reference pricing mechanisms that come with it, importing the European model, which in Great Britain a

year of healthy life is worth, I think \$38,000. So if the drug costs more than \$38,000, even though it gives you a year of healthy life, they don't buy it. And that is what this bill does, it imports that pricing mechanism into our market.

It is absurd because we should be looking at both pricing mechanisms that crash the price where we can, but cure. How do we cure our brothers and sisters who are part of that 5 percent who have chronic conditions that are the drivers?

We just passed a bill through this body that basically protects Big Pharma's current monopolies and wipes out the disrupters that were going to take their market share. They did it with glee because I think the haters of Big Pharma blinded from understanding who actually won and who gets to just change their business model a little bit and stay protected and who you just wiped out, because that would wipe out those miracles that are coming.

I know that is partisan, and I don't mean to hurt anyone's feelings, but it is the math of the legislation. So these are important.

Another thought, if you want to have a real disruption that you could do before the end of this year, half the pharmaceuticals that will be picked up today at pharmacies will not be used or will not be used properly. Our model says it is a half a trillion dollars a year from not using your pharmaceuticals properly. The person that doesn't take their hypertension pills and ends up having an aneurism, the person over here that takes too many, or the person over here gets confused. Half a trillion dollars a year for noncompliance with pharmaceutical regimes, and half the pharmaceuticals that will be picked up today will not be used or will not be used properly.

The thought experiment is really simple. Go look in your own medicine cabinet. Take a look, and what is sitting in there? What is the value of what is sitting in there? Let's be honest. Almost all of us, if we go, yes, I probably do have hundreds of dollars of value sitting there. Let's just go after one small portion, the efficacy, the person who, if they really take their hypertension pill every morning, and there is a miracle, we think there might be a one- or two-shot-a-year system about to come that may actually intervene instead of having to take the daily pill—but I don't mean to take us down that side.

How about a pill bottle that pings you and says, Hey, Bob, you didn't take your hypertension pill this morning. Don't forget, this is really important. It turns out, just that \$20 piece of technology would save billions of dollars of healthcare costs and stop many tragedies in our families.

I have actually brought the board here that is actually for seniors that looks a little bit like a dome that drops the pills into a little cup and then noti-

fies you, because some people have regimes where they need to take this one in the morning, this one during lunch, these three before going to bed to stay stable. And how many of us have ever had that moment saying, Now did I take it? Did I remember? This technology exists. We need to think about making those as part of our formulary, so we are reimbursed. Because it turns out in those cases it is not the price of the pharmaceutical, it is our efficacy of how we take them. Half a trillion dollars a year, because we don't stay on our regimes of our pharmaceutical prescriptions properly.

If you wanted to have a disruption in healthcare costs tomorrow, make high-value pharmaceuticals, put them in a double blister pack, put them in a cartridge so they stay sterile, and make them returnable. Use technology like this so we take our pharmaceuticals as we are supposed to. Make it so it could also talk to family members or even the physicians' assistants to call in and say, Betty, we are getting a notice that you haven't been opening your pill bottle. The technology is here. Why do we fight it?

Here is also a level of disruption that was being shown at the consumer electronics show, but I need to put this a little more in context.

In the Phoenix area we have an experiment going on. I am blessed, I represent, I truly believe, the greatest congressional district you could ever imagine. I have north Phoenix and Scottsdale, and I have a lot of freaky-smart people in our community and moving into our community. And there is this one business, a couple autonomous automobile engineers got together and said, Hey, we have made a lot of money, we want to take on the biggest issue in our society, which is the cost of healthcare. Let's try an experiment. Let's see if we can create autonomous healthcare clinics.

Think of this, you walk into a Safeway grocery store—it is a little unfortunate, they are in former Theranos spots, but you all get that joke—but you walk in the door, you pick up the iPad, you sign in. You take a picture of your driver's license, a picture of your insurance card. You walk into a booth alone. The instructions pop up on the screen. You put your arm in this, you hold this up, you follow an avatar, you shine this in your mouth, your nose, your ears, you do this, you look into this, and it turns out the algorithm is stunningly accurate. And I believe they have had a couple of their algorithms now certified by the FDA. And there are a dozen clinics now or they have a dozen clinics in a dozen grocery stores.

Are we willing to make that technology legal? Because at the end they have to bring a doctor on the screen to meet the laws. Well, what would happen if that autonomous—what they call in some of the literature, they now refer to them as sensor clinics or sensor healthcare, but we need to think about this. This is here. It is coming very fast.

It turns out at the electronics show last week they were showing one that is a micro size that you could have in your medicine cabinet that does many of those very same types of tests and the algorithm apparently is freaky accurate and can do all sorts of diagnostics. Are we ready for this?

Last year I came and showed a box—that actually is sort of what Theranos had promised, but it actually now exists—it is from an Israeli company, it is certified in the EU, that does all sorts of blood tests. The technology now exists. It is not being offered here because it is too hard to hit our market at this point.

Go back to the beginning slides. The debt and deficit are functionally being driven by our demographics. The cost of those demographics is our healthcare. Are we going to continue to have the absurd debate around here of financing options, which may have effects? There are parts of it that are good, but they don't have a disruption. Are we going to find a way to promote, legalize the next-generation technology that can crash the price of healthcare and make us healthier and cure many of the diseases that crush our brothers and sisters?

So back again—the slide we either start with or end with—we believe to take on the debt-ridden future and keep us from breaking through that 95 percent debt-to-GDP it is not a single solution. Today we just did healthcare technology disruption. But it is everything. It turns out it is economic policies that grow because if we don't grow the math, you can't get anywhere.

Population stability, how do we incentivize family formations? How do you build an immigration system that is much more talent-based, because—let's be brutally honest—since 1971, the United States has been below replacement rate in our birth rates. The last few years we have actually had fairly stable economic times, the last 2 years, great economic times, and our birth rates are still falling.

There is a paper I have in my office that says, in about 8, 9, 10 years, two workers, one retiree. The math doesn't work. So what do you do to encourage family formation? For some Republicans we are going to have to really step up and think about that.

But also for immigration, you need to move to a talent-based system. The elegance of that is you don't care about someone's religion, their race, who they cuddle with, or where they come from. But what you do care about is what they bring to our society to maximize economic expansion. In many ways it is a much more honest and elegant system than this carve-out system that we have today.

Changing the way or creating benefits incentives within the benefits of Social Security and Medicare to stay in the labor force or to come back into the labor force or become a part-time entrepreneur, we need to fix the way we tax certain benefits, the way we

crush people if they are still saving when they are older. We need to deal with the reality of how much longer baby boomers are going to be living. And we have got to get our labor force participation numbers up. It turns out all these things tie together. You can't do one without doing the others to get the economic benefits of it.

And that is what terrifies me about our place here: Are we capable of doing complex policy, when over here I am doing immigration issues, and over here I am doing tax reform issues, and over here I am doing trade issues, and over here I am doing healthcare technology issues; and understanding they are all sympathetic to each other, they all tie together to create the economic philosophy and the changes in our cost structure together? When what we have here is a place where we fight over the naming of a post office.

I understand we are living in a time of political rage, and that is how so many people raise money, how they hold office.

□ 1445

I have a 4-year-old daughter. I am 57 with a 4-year-old daughter. My wife, the same.

You know I am pathologically optimistic, but I am optimistic because I get to get behind this microphone and advocate for what I believe is an actual path that saves us from a debt-ridden future.

I have been doing this now for a year, saying here is the problem, but also offering the steps of a solution.

I will go back to my office now, and the phones won't ring. There won't be any text messages or emails from even fellow Members, let alone the world, saying: Hey, DAVID, can you tell me about this technology? Can you tell me about this? How do we help?

If we don't have that revolution, I am terrified.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROY) for the purposes of a colloquy.

Mr. ROY. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Arizona for highlighting a number of different issues, starting, of course, with spending and talking about the future that we are going to deal with from a fiscal standpoint in our country, particularly the extent to which Medicare and our entitlement situation is going to drive that, but, importantly, getting to the point of disruption, technology, and the ways that we can totally transform healthcare in a way that will both fix our fiscal situation as well as provide the best healthcare in the world.

As the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT) knows, I am a cancer survivor. I am a father, as well, of a 10-year-old and an 8-year-old.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Madam Speaker, I wish he would tell that story more.

Mr. ROY. Madam Speaker, I do, and I try to talk about it. There are others of us in this body who have gone through that sort of thing.

This is what is so critically important, what we are talking about: We have the ability at our fingertips to transform our healthcare system and to save our country from the depths of \$23 trillion, \$24 trillion, \$30 trillion, \$40 trillion of debt. This is where we are headed if we don't go down this road.

I know there is a bipartisan thirst for this, but we have to stop having our leadership in two corners, with shirts and skins squabbling instead of focusing on these kinds of roll-your-sleeves-up solutions.

The question I would ask my friend from Arizona is, what does he see as the obstacles to what we are talking about here, in terms of the current situation with insurance oligopolies and the government bureaucracies that get in the way of innovation, technology, and direct primary care and going to the doctors of your choice, and being able to get that kind of innovation?

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Madam Speaker, look, in some ways, telling the truth is like soaking yourself in kerosene and running around with a lighter.

Congress has functionally become a protection racket. The armies in our hallways, both with Democrats and Republicans, say, "We like this technology, but," and the "but" always happens to be, "you are going to blow up my business model."

How do we as policymakers stop having the arrogance of thinking we know what the future is and, instead, design the rules, reimbursements, licensing, and mechanisms that all go with that so the best technology is constantly winning and today's winner, it turns out, gets crushed tomorrow because a better one comes along?

Today the way we do it is we build walls of protection that say, "This is good. Yeah, there is something incredibly good over here, but."

That is why I use that Blockbuster video example. We all sort of accepted that, hey, we used to go get the little silver disk and shove it in the machine. The creepy guy would give us movie recommendations. He was creepy, but his movie recommendations were really good.

Today, we go home and hit a button. We just lived through that, and the world didn't come to an end.

When it comes to healthcare technology particularly—and I do a similar presentation on environmental technology. There is stunning stuff that could revolutionize those issues. If you are concerned with global warming or greenhouse gases, the technology is here, yet we don't talk about it because we know what we know. The problem is, much of what I and others know is a decade out of date.

Mr. ROY. Madam Speaker, I would ask the gentleman, does he agree with me that when we are talking about this kind of disruption, that this is not a partisan problem, that this is a problem of this body not sitting down and rolling up its sleeves to try to address using innovation and finding how to

break through and not getting into the trap of this town where the power brokers make all the decisions and the lobbyists are driving a lot of what we are doing so powerful insurance companies or powerful government entities are making decisions for you instead of you and your doctor, and technology and innovation?

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Madam Speaker, we have to be a little careful because I find there are certain insurance companies that are ready to offer a technology, sensor-based healthcare, but it is illegal.

There are hospitals I have worked with that desperately want to do an outreach in the community, where they are using data and algorithms to keep people healthy and to know when there is an issue coming.

It is not only us as Members of Congress and what we know and don't know, and the arrogance of how we often do pieces of legislation where we don't future-proof it to use it, and also the incentives that are built in to surviving election, raising money, everything there, I will also argue our bureaucracies have become calcified.

The bureaucracies now have become incredible barriers when they say: "Well, we don't see that in the rules; therefore, you can't do it. Yes, it would help society. Yes, it would make us healthier. Yes, it would."

Mr. ROY. Madam Speaker, by that, government and private sector bureaucracies, and State and Federal.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Exactly, Madam Speaker. States are going to be a real issue, and then different lobbying organizations and different constituencies.

Guess what? We don't have a choice. The single biggest threat to our Nation is the massive wave of debt that is here.

One of our charts, in just a decade or two, we are running \$2½ trillion, almost approaching \$3 trillion, deficits. It is almost all solely driven by our demographics. We have gotten older.

Mr. ROY. Madam Speaker, I would just like to thank the gentleman. I appreciate his time and his dedication to this. Let's do this again.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Madam Speaker, I enjoyed it.

Madam Speaker, there is a path. Will we step up and understand that the path turns out to be complicated? We are going to make some of our constituencies just elated with the opportunity to change. We are also going to terrify some of our constituencies.

There is a way to get there, and believe it or not, it is technology. It is not Republican technology. It is not Democratic technology. It turns out it is math, and the math will always win.

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

STILL I RISE: SENATE IMPEACHMENT TRIAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the gentleman from Texas

(Mr. GREEN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, and still I rise.

I rise because I love my country, and I rise today to talk about impeachment and the trial thereof, the trial associated with impeachment.

Madam Speaker, there is much to be said. However, I assure all that I will not say it all.

I do want to call to the attention of those who are paying attention that we are now about to embark upon a trial in the Senate.

Impeachment was a function of the House of Representatives pursuant to Article I, Section 2 of the Constitution, and the trial is a function of the Senate pursuant to Article I, Section 3 of the Constitution. The trial is to take place in the Senate. The House has done its job.

The House acts similar, not the same, but it behaves in a fashion similar to that of a grand jury—similar but not the same. The House determines whether there is enough evidence for a trial to take place, simply put—similar but not the same as a grand jury.

Then it becomes a function of the Senate to have a trial. The Senate is the only place on planet Earth where a President can be tried.

The President will not be punished at this trial, assuming that the President is found guilty. There is no punishment. The President can be removed from office, but there won't be any punishment similar to what we call punishment, as it were, with a court, for example, wherein you might be fined or accorded some sort of incarceration. None of that has to do with removal from office.

There was a big debate about this trial of the President. In Federalist Paper No. 65, Alexander Hamilton speaks at great length about the trial of the President.

It was contemplated in making a final decision that perhaps the Supreme Court would be the place to try the President. With much debate, without going into the nuances, the details, this was not concluded to be the appropriate place for a trial of the President.

It was finally concluded that the trial would take place in the Senate but that, in doing this, there would be a presiding officer, and this person would be the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court. The Senate tries the case with the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court presiding.

In Federalist Paper No. 65, there was much talk about this trial and how it might move forward. Clearly, the Framers of the Constitution contemplated that the trial would receive evidence, that there would be evidence received. Clearly, a fair reading of Federalist Paper No. 65 would cause one to conclude that.

Of course, the Federalist Papers, as it were, there was a conclusion drawn that in this trial, there would be evi-

dence presented. The evidence would be presented, of course, by the House. We call the persons presenting the evidence managers. They will act as lawyers. The Senate will receive this evidence.

It was anticipated, in my opinion, after perusing Federalist Paper No. 65, that the trial could consist of evidence beyond what the House might present because at a trial, it is expected that one might call witnesses and present documents, present additional evidence.

It is my opinion that this is especially true, and I believe a good many constitutional scholars agree with me, this is especially true if it is known that there are witnesses who have evidence that would be of great value, witnesses who have evidence, material evidence that is relevant, would be of great value in coming to a just conclusion, a trial that would have a just conclusion, a trial that would afford not only the accused to have witnesses to testify but also the managers to have witnesses to testify.

You see, the country, the United States of America, is entitled to a fair trial. The President should have a fair trial, but the people should have a fair trial.

If the trial is to be fair in the Senate and there are witnesses available, then those witnesses ought to be called. If the witnesses are not called, and it is known that there are witnesses, then the question becomes: What are we doing? What is the Senate doing? I say “we”; I mean as a country. I am not a Senator, obviously.

What is the Senate doing? If there are witnesses who are available and are willing to testify, and the Senate decides to simply dismiss the case, what is the Senate doing?

Before I answer that question, let me just share this with you. The truth be told, not only will the President be on trial but also the Senate would be on trial. I will answer what the Senate is doing, but I must say first that the Senate is on trial.

People are watching not only here in the United States of America but across the globe. The world wants to see the kind of justice that the United States of America accords. The world wants to know whether the United States of America will pursue justice such that witnesses who are material and relevant will have the opportunity to testify.

□ 1500

What is the Senate doing if the Senate declines to hear from these relevant witnesses? The Senate is having something less than a trial. No question, because a trial contemplates witnesses and evidence.

If the Senate is going to have what may amount to a briefing, then there is no need to have Chief Justice Roberts. The Framers constituted a trial. They contemplated a trial with the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court presiding.

If we are going to have only a briefing, why have the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court present? This would be tantamount to a briefing, to simply call the Senate to order, receive some comments, some statements, and perhaps whatever the House has sent over. But knowing that a witness is available—multiple witnesses, I might add—and not call any of the multiple witnesses would be tantamount to a briefing.

If the Senate but engages in a briefing, what would we call the results of a briefing? In my opinion, justice delayed, if not denied—justice delayed, if not denied.

The Framers of the Constitution contemplated a trial. Federalist Paper No. 65 contemplates a trial.

The Senate acts as the triers of fact. They conclude with their findings with the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court presiding.

One can easily conclude that the simple dismissal of a case, wherein others are available to give testimony, would cause something less than a trial and, quite frankly, will be an embarrassment to the Senate, to the country, and to our sense of justice. It would be an embarrassment to do such a thing.

As I have read in various publications, this is being contemplated, to simply dismiss the case knowing that there are additional witnesses to be heard.

Could it be that in so doing, whether by accident or with intent, whether by accident or design, if this occurs, could it be that we are now seeing a coverup, a coverup if you know that there are witnesses who are available and who would testify but you denied them the opportunity to testify by simply dismissing the case? Are you participating in a coverup?

I pray that there are enough Senators who will say: “I will not participate in what appears to be a coverup,” and will ask for witnesses to testify. If a majority of the Senators should so ask, there will be testimony presented.

We live in a world where it is not enough for things to be right. They must also look right. It would not and will not look right if the Senate knows that there are witnesses available and declines to call them. It won't look right.

Some would say it is right because the Constitution doesn't have strict guidelines, in terms of how the Senate is to perform. But I assure you, the Framers contemplated a trial.

If there is no trial, a simple dismissal, there are many people who will say that the Senate has engaged in a coverup because evidence that should be revealed has been concealed, has been covered, has been pushed aside.

The Senate, in my opinion, will do our country a disservice if it simply dismisses this cause.

It is my belief that the Senate will not dismiss the cause summarily. It is my belief that the Senate consists of honorable people who are going to take

an oath, and they are going to abide by the oath that they will take.

I was a judge of a small claims justice court. I will tell you that I marveled at how people, after taking the oath as jurors, would rise above the many things that would ordinarily influence them and see to it that justice was done. It is a wonderful thing to see how people take an oath and take that oath seriously.

I believe that a majority of the Senators will take the oath seriously, and I believe that there will be witnesses, or at least one, called to testify.

I believe that this will happen because I think that the Senators who will do this will understand that justice is in their hands and that this justice has much to do with what the witness will say, but it also has much to do with the balance of power that they are there to protect.

The Senators are there to protect the balance of power as it relates to the cause that has been presented to them. The Senators will have to decide whether or not the House of Representatives is going to become less than a coequal branch of government because one of the articles deals with the fact that the President has blocked the appearance of witnesses in the House and has blocked the presentation of certain evidence, documents, if you will, in the House.

Now it is left up to the Senate to determine whether or not they are going to allow a President to block the presentation of evidence and walk away without some consequence.

Blocking evidence without consequence, that is going to be one of the considerations before the Senate. Will you protect the balance of power? Will you assure this country that no one is above the law?

Madam Speaker, I assure you that if the Senators do not take this cause seriously and simply dismiss it out of hand, they are simply saying that the President is above the law.

The President deserves a trial. The country deserves a trial. We ought to have witnesses presented.

There ought to be some degree of deliberation. The Senate acts as the trial jury, the petit jury, if you will, similar to a petit jury, a trial jury, but not the same. It is not the same because they can make decisions about whether evidence will be presented.

I had a constituent ask me whether or not the Chief Justice could decide to receive the evidence, and I had to tell the truth. The response is that the ultimate judge of whether evidence will be received will be 51 Senators. The Chief Justice can make rulings, but the Senators can overrule the Chief Justice with a vote.

The world is watching, and the House of Representatives hangs in the balance, as it relates to the balance of power.

If this Senate simply dismisses out of hand, we will have a President with no guardrails. There will be no guardrails.

It doesn't matter how you feel about the President. The question is: How do you feel about the country that we love? How do you feel about the notion that no one is above the law, a very bedrock principle in this country? How do you feel about this?

What happens once can happen twice, and what happens twice can happen multiple times.

We should not allow this to take place. My clarion call to my brethren, my friends, the ladies and gentlepersons of the Senate, is: Do more than have a briefing. Do more than simply dismiss the cause out of hand.

There will have to be 51 who will conclude that there will be more than a briefing, that there will be a trial.

I assure you that there are many of us who are waiting to see what will happen. Some of us will traverse great distances across the country to be in Washington, D.C., to make it clear that they want to be a part of this history for various and sundry reasons.

The world is watching. We have a duty, a responsibility, and an obligation to the country to have a fair trial, a trial where witnesses are called and witnesses are examined.

This is not unusual. This is what every person in this country anticipates if he or she is charged with an offense. Why would we have the President be above this basic premise of calling witnesses to have a fair trial? Why would we have one person in the country who is above this, above the law? Every person is subjected to the law in this country.

Madam Speaker, I will close with these words: It is not enough for things to be right. They must also look right.

If the Senate does this simply because it has the power, meaning if the Senate simply dismisses because it has the power and doesn't call witnesses, that won't look right, and in my opinion, it won't be right.

The Senate has a responsibility to have a trial, and witnesses must be called. I do believe that witnesses will be called.

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

IMPEACHMENT TIMELINE

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

Mr. BIGGS. Madam Speaker, my eloquent friend so ably made his case, and I would suggest that it is undercut in some respects when one introduces and discusses impeachment the day after the election in 2016, before President Trump even came to office.

That isn't protecting the country, is it? What that is suggesting is that one knows more than the voters of this country.

I am also always intrigued when the complaint comes up about the majority

in the Senate, when the majority in the Senate is going to determine the rules for the trial in the Senate because the Constitution says that the Senate holds the trial.

We just heard that there have to be 51 votes over in the Senate. Oddly enough, I didn't hear complaints when the majority in the House controlled the inquiry. In fact, the term "cover-up" was used preemptively regarding the Senate, but what I saw in the House was a coverup.

We didn't get to introduce all of our witnesses. I sit on the Judiciary Committee. Who did we get as witnesses? We got three or four law professors who came in. That is who got to come in to testify before the Judiciary Committee.

We didn't have the witnesses who had factual evidence come in. We requested. We gave lists. We were told we couldn't have them. That is part of the problem.

Adding to this hypocrisy, we heard over and over again that we must impeach the President of the United States because it is an imminent danger for him to continue in his office. But once that vote was taken, the Speaker held the Articles of Impeachment and would not transmit them. Here we sit, 27 days following that vote, with no transmittal.

We hear that there is going to be a transmittal tomorrow. I am interested to see if that really takes place.

Madam Speaker, I am joined today by a number of my colleagues, and I am grateful to have them here.

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

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

Madam Speaker, I rise today one last time to ask the House to drop these charges against our duly elected President, if, for no other reason, because the process that they have used has been the exact partisan process that was just condemned on the floor by people who were the first to call for impeaching the President, the Speaker of this body.

This is a 2.5-year endeavor, in spite of it being only a few months after the call to Ukraine that is supposedly the abuse of power that the President engaged in.

As for the other charge, they say that it was obstruction of justice, but the House didn't even bother to enforce its own subpoenas.

The impeachment process boldly broke with that of Presidents Nixon and Clinton. The urgency was so great that the House declined to enforce its subpoenas and relied on shaky evidence, trying to move swiftly so they didn't lose the momentum.

□ 1515

Now, when they realize they haven't made the case—not just that it will be needed in the Senate, but for the American people, first and foremost—they

want to strong-arm the Senate into adopting the same unfair partisan course charted here in the House.

Fortunately, it doesn't work like that. Voters deserve better from our House of Representatives, but it is not the House's prerogative to dictate the rules of the Senate.

This partisan impeachment should be dropped today. This political charade is a waste of taxpayer dollars. It is unfair to the President of the United States or anyone else to be treated beneath the law. Certainly no one is above the law, but the President of the United States is certainly not beneath the law.

Rather than give in to our worst partisan inclinations, Congress should strive to work together on real policies that will benefit all of the American people.

Mr. BIGGS. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROY).

Mr. ROY. Madam Speaker, I point out that, in Article I, Section 2, Clause 5, it says: "The House of Representatives shall choose their Speaker and other officers; and shall have the sole power of impeachment."

I would note, also, that in Section 3, when we talk about the Senate: "Judgment in cases of impeachment shall not extend further than to removal from office," et cetera.

Clause 6: "The Senate shall have the sole power to try all impeachments."

This is what the Constitution says. This is not unclear. The United States Senate has the power to try impeachments, yet the Speaker of this body has tried to impose her will on the United States Senate.

If the Speaker is so interested in what is going on in the Senate, maybe the Speaker should run for the Senate.

But what we have today is a body, the House, that acted; and the leader of this body, the Speaker, is refusing to do her duty to transmit the articles to the Senate and has done so despite a lot of rhetoric over the course of the year about the urgency of running impeachment through this body, which now, I think, the vast majority of the American people have seen it for what it was: a political action, a political stunt, to target the President of the United States, to demean the office of the President of the United States, to target him very specifically for political purposes rather than the solemn duty that impeachment is supposed to be reserved for.

So we should now be getting this to the Senate so that the President can have his day to defend himself, his day in court, as it were. He should have his day in the United States Senate. He should be able to defend himself and have lawyers defend against what is being charged against him from this wrongful impeachment out of this House.

So I am hopeful that we will finally get that movement this week and that the President will have the time due

him in the United States Senate and that the United States Senate can get through this in an expedited way so that we can get back to the business the American people sent us here for: dealing with debt, dealing with spending, dealing with open borders, and dealing with men and women in uniform and what they need.

I appreciate the gentleman from Arizona for arranging this.

Mr. BIGGS. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona, (Mr. GOSAR).

Mr. GOSAR. Madam Speaker, Speaker PELOSI and the House Democrats rushed through the weakest impeachment in American history. Devoid of any evidence of wrongdoing by President Trump, Speaker PELOSI and her Caucus allowed their hatred of President Trump to triumph at all costs.

Now House Democrats are demanding the Senate hold a trial dictated by their terms, including witness testimony they failed to obtain themselves.

Since House Democrats want more witnesses, I will gladly offer some names for the Senate to consider.

How about Joe and Hunter Biden? Together, they peddled the influence of the Vice President's office for Hunter Biden's personal financial gain. It is plainly on video.

How about ADAM SCHIFF? He spent 2 years severely misleading the American people about Russian collusion, held secret hearings at the Capitol basement, and was caught redhanded coordinating with the alleged whistleblower.

Ah, yes, why don't we hear from the alleged whistleblower? Reports indicate he worked for Joe Biden, coordinated with ADAM SCHIFF, and has deep anti-Trump views. President Trump deserves to face his secret Democratic accuser.

How did we end up in this impeachment mess? The simple truth is the abuse of the FISA court to spy on the Trump campaign.

Yes, you heard it: the weaponization of the Federal Government against the people. This is the insidious inbreeding of the swamp, corruption, plain and simple. The President and others are victims of a crime.

It is said that those who don't learn from history are doomed to repeat it, and look what is happening with the FISA court now. Just this week, the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court appointed David Kris, an Obama-era DOJ lawyer, to review the abuse of the FISA court, a person who is already engaged in FISA denialism.

Yes, let me be clear, perfectly clear: A FISA abuse denier is now in charge of tackling the FISA abuse. I guess, America, only in the Washington, D.C., swamp.

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

Mr. GOHMERT. Madam Speaker, this is an important time. We have got people who are demanding that the Senate

do what they hypocritically refused to do here in the House, and that is to have a fair investigation and have fair hearings.

And, in fact, we know the majority is the majority; they can change the rules anytime they want to. But they didn't even bother to change the rules. They just said: Do you know what? Even though the rules say that the minority can have a minority witness day, we are going to just ignore that and move on, because time is of the essence.

So we didn't need any evidence to show that our friends were not being completely genuine with their comments, no, because we heard: Clear and present danger; urgent; urgency; got to happen now; we can't wait; we can't follow the rules; we can't hear witnesses here in the House; we have got to have this impeachment done.

And then they sit on it for over a month. Seriously, that says what anybody needs to say.

This was never serious to begin with in the respect that there was a serious charge. There was no serious charge. It is supposed to be about treason, bribery, high crimes, misdemeanors. All of those are crimes, including misdemeanors.

Look at the charges: abuse of power, obstruction of Congress. Those are the two charges that those pushing impeachment are guilty of, not this President.

Madam Speaker, this is a scam. It is a shame.

The Senate should just go in and have a trial, follow the Clinton rules, and that is it. Let's get this done. Let's get it over with. A proper verdict is not guilty, not removed.

Mr. BIGGS. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CLOUD).

Mr. CLOUD. Madam Speaker, as I sat in the basement of this Capitol listening to deposition after deposition, it was very clear that this impeachment shenanigan was never about a real search for truth.

House leadership wanted us to believe, the American people to believe, that this impeachment process began as a result of a July phone call when, in reality, Speaker PELOSI said that this began 2½ years ago. They wanted us to believe that the evidence was irrefutable, when the truth is they polled to figure out, to see what to charge the President with.

The way this is supposed to work in an investigation is that there is a crime that produces evidence that leads to a verdict. When this started with the verdict, it was a search for evidence that was never found, and yet we are sending impeachment articles to the Senate.

This is crazy.

And, of course, it has taken over 4 weeks to get what was urgent—the Speaker said this was urgent. She said this is urgent, so we will be bringing the articles. It has been 4 weeks to get

the articles from here across to the Senate.

This is a straight line. You go straight through this door, walk about 90 seconds and you will be in the Senate; yet, it has taken 4 weeks.

This is crazy and should not happen.

Senator FEINSTEIN said the longer it goes on, the less urgent it becomes. So, if it is serious and urgent, send them over; if it isn't, don't send them over.

I will be voting appropriately on this and the fact that it is not urgent and we haven't sent them over.

Let's get back to the work we were elected to do: keeping this Republic and ensuring the blessings of liberty for future generations.

Mr. BIGGS. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY).

Mr. PERRY. Madam Speaker, we have watched our colleagues on the other side of the aisle since, literally, the week the President was inaugurated say it is time to start the impeachment. They have made that a policy consideration, a policy goal for the whole rest of their time since that time in Congress, working diligently day by day, no matter what the President did, no matter what he said. Whether it was comments about other Members of Congress, whether it is comments in foreign policy, you name it, it was worthy of impeachment.

Madam Speaker, they have cheapened impeachment.

We were told—rightly so—how solemn it is, the most important thing, other than declaring war, that Members of Congress would ever embark on. Yet, during the vote on the floor of the House, when the numbers came through that they had indeed passed impeachment and Members on the other side began to cheer, the Speaker gave them a look and admonished them because, of course, they said it was the most solemn thing that they would do. Yet, we all know, in their hearts, it was what they had desired all along.

I understand disagreements with the President of the other party—I have had my own—but this is about doing the business of the work of the people and the work of this country.

If you disagree, there is a process for that in this country, and that is the election process, where all Americans get to decide whether whatever the President says is too much, whether whatever the President does is too little or too much.

But this is seeking to remove a President from office early because of a disagreement over policy, a disagreement about how one comports himself or not, a disagreement with the President that is personal.

This is beneath the decorum of this establishment and the business that we should be doing. It is disappointing. It is disrupting. It should be voted "no," accordingly, because it is a fool's errand based on no facts, not based on the Constitution and not based on our best will and best judgment.

Madam Speaker, I urge a "no" vote for the Articles of Impeachment to be transmitted.

Mr. BIGGS. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOHO).

Mr. YOHO. Madam Speaker, let's take a look at the chronological timeline since Donald Trump won the primary. I mean, this movement started immediately after that.

You can go to Mark Zaid, the attorney for the whistleblower. You can go on and hear the Members of this body saying: We are going to impeach him.

The vile words that came out of one of the Members from Michigan, saying: We are going to impeach this m—ffer.

Those people shouldn't even be allowed to serve in here with that kind of an attitude and hatred. They set a goal to impeach this President. They didn't have a reason, but they set a goal, and then they searched for that goal.

It was the Steele dossier that was completely fabricated, paid for by the Clinton campaign and DCCC, completely dispelled as false, but yet they went down this. They dispelled the Mueller report. They kept going to find something.

And then ADAM SCHIFF said: We have irrefutable evidence that this President colluded with the Russians. That turned out to be false. The whistleblower, and the second whistleblower, and I could go on, but you guys have heard enough of that stuff.

I want to come back to what our Founding Fathers said. This is Washington's warning to this Republic 223 years ago.

The Constitution rightly sets a high bar for impeachment, but the integrity of the process also depends on the ability of legislators to vote their minds independent of party politics. Removing a President is too important, and lawmakers are given too much latitude to define high crimes and misdemeanors for it to be any other way; otherwise, excessively partisan politicians could overturn an election simply because the President is a member of the opposing party.

It is in regards to this impeachment process that George Washington forewarned us of this moment in history when political parties "may now and then answer popular ends," but "they are likely, in the course of time and things, to become potent engines by which cunning, ambitious, and unprincipled men" and women "will be enabled to subvert the power of the people and to usurp for themselves the reins of government. . . ."

That is what we have here.

□ 1530

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

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, impeachment didn't start with Ukraine. It started before he was elected. It started on July 31, 2016, when the FBI opened an investigation and spied on

four American citizens associated with the President's campaign. That is when it started. It continued after he was elected before inauguration when they go up to Trump Tower and they brief the President on the dossier. The dossier that they already knew was false, the dossier that Michael Horowitz said when they took it to the FISA court they lied to the court 17 times. It continued after inauguration with the Mueller investigation and those 2 years that we went through.

Why are the Democrats so focused on getting to the President?

Why are they so focused about going after the President?

Because they don't like what this guy is getting done. They don't like the fact that he is shaking up this town. They don't like the fact that he is doing what he said he would do. They don't like the fact that he is draining the swamp, and when you drain the swamp, the swamp fights back. And that is exactly what we are seeing from the Democrats in this entire impeachment escapade we have lived through now for 4 months that has needlessly divided our country.

Here is the good news: the American people get it. They understand it. They know the four key facts. They have got the call transcript, there was no quid pro quo. The two individuals on the call, President Trump and President Zelensky have repeatedly said: There was no pushing, no pressure, and no linkage of an investigation to any type of security assistance money. We know the Ukrainians knew at the time of the call that aid wasn't even on hold at the time of the call. Most importantly, they took no action to get the money released.

The American people get the facts. They know the facts are on the President's side, and that is why this whole thing is wrong. They get the facts, and they understand.

Mr. BIGGS. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from Ohio's comments.

I want to add one comment. When you consider the aid that was the subject of this issue where people said that he withheld aid as a quid pro quo, the one thing that America has not heard enough of is this: the aid was released in perfect compliance with the law. It was released in the time constraints required by the law. In fact, it was released 3 weeks prior to its being required to have been released. That has not been said enough, nor has it been understood enough. So that charge has always been bogus.

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

Mr. GRIFFITH. Madam Speaker, we have heard today several times that we were told this was urgent and that things must move quickly. And yet it has been 26 days since it was passed on the calendar, 15 working days, and 10 legislative days have gone by, and yet the Senate has not yet been informed of the Articles of Impeachment.

Now, Madam Speaker, let me get boring. Most politicians won't admit that, but that is what I am going to do because it is important that we understand the process.

So what happens is the Articles of Impeachment were passed by the House. We were told later this week that we are going to vote on managers who will then present the Articles of Impeachment at the bar of the Senate. That is their job. That means to prosecute the case. But the annotations to Jefferson's Manual—that is Jefferson's Manual of Parliamentary Practice and Procedure, for all of you policy-and-procedure wonks back home—we are told in there that the managers who are elected by the House or are appointed by the Speaker in obedience to a resolution of the House take this to the bar of the Senate, the House having previously informed the Senate.

Now, the problem is the House has not previously informed the Senate. And what we are going to do now is we are going to say: well, that is okay, but my summary look at the past indicates that the times that these have been separated, the notice to the Senate that impeachment resolutions were coming and the actual sending over of the managers to present the articles at the bar, the longest previously has been 4 days. Here it has been 26 calendar days, 15 working days, and 10 legislative days, and the Speaker of the House indicates to us that this is all fine and normal.

Madam Speaker, we should all be concerned, not just because we have what appears to be a trumped up—pun not intended—impeachment policy by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, but because if the Speaker can hold up H. Res. 755, the Articles of Impeachment, from being sent over to the Senate thus notifying them that managers will be coming to prosecute or present these impeachment articles at the bar of the Senate, then the Speaker can hold up anything the Speaker doesn't want the Senate having.

There are 435 Members of the United States House. While I do not agree with the impeachment articles, the House voted on them, and the Senate should have had those promptly. It takes a couple of days to get it through the process where all the i's are dotted and t's are crossed. This Speaker did not do that. It is a dangerous precedent because if H. Res. 755 can be held up, then I submit to you, Madam Speaker, anything can be held up. And if a Speaker suddenly decides that he or she does not agree with the will of this House, can they really stick it in their back pocket?

Can they really do a pocket Speaker veto of actions of this House?

Nothing of this nature has ever been contemplated, but that is what the actions of Speaker PELOSI tell us she is trying to do or at least tried to do if she didn't get her way in the Senate. It is unconscionable and against the principles of a democratic republic.

Be warned, be alert, and pay attention. Let's guard our Republic with every ounce of our energy.

Mr. BIGGS. I would ask the Speaker how much time is remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Arizona has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. BIGGS. Madam Speaker, I appreciate those who shared their thoughts on this matter, and I want to just cover a couple of things that I think are absolutely critical to remember. They have been touched on, but not emphasized enough for me, and that is this: when we start looking at how this began and we look at the timeline, you will see that this began before President Trump was elected, it proceeded after he was elected but before he was sworn into office, and then the day he was sworn in, the media said: Let the impeachment begin.

Ten days later the attorney for the whistleblower said:

Let the impeachment begin, let the coup begin, more power to the attorneys.

That is what they were talking about, a search, as one of my colleagues said earlier, for a modus vivendi for impeachment. That is really what this was about.

Or you get in a phone conversation, and in that phone conversation there is an amicable discussion of numerous things. That phone conversation has been misquoted, and it has been deliberately fabricated by the person who no doubt will be one of the House managers going over to the Senate. This is the chairman who basically out of whole cloth created a dramatic reading that was not representative in any way of the actual transcript. This is the same individual who promised us we would get to interview and depose the whistleblower because where this engine got started is with the whistleblower. That never happened.

So along the way, as witnesses were subpoenaed to talk and the President exercised his executive privilege, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle said that we do not have time to go to the court and determine whether that executive privilege is being exerted in an overly broad manner, whether we can narrow it, or whether it is completely inappropriate. We just don't have time. Because do you know why? We have got to impeach this President tomorrow because it is as if he is an absolute destructive force and an immediate danger to this Republic.

The reality is they got their vote, and here we sit. Here we sit, a total of 27 days since the day of the vote. That day was there. We were told it was going to go tomorrow. My colleague from Virginia has very ably explained that there is a distinction between informing the Senate procedurally and having the vote on House managers. But the point he was making, and I wish to also join in, is this: you simply have seen a process that has been devoid of the normal rules of precedent in this House.

When we see these amorphous charges, these articles, passed by this body, it tells you two things that make this a supreme danger to the Republic going forward. All I am pointing to is what my colleague from Florida said, is the danger that the impeachment process will be misused for political purposes.

And that is this: Number one, process matters. Process always matters. It is why we have these wonderful folks who sit in front of us to make sure that we are following the rules of the House and to make sure that we are following the rules of precedent. It is not unlike international law, quite frankly, where all you are relying on is precedent, and you just change it very simply. If you don't have those rules and you don't have integrity to the rules, then the minority rights are abused.

When the minority rights are abused in this place, that means the right of representation of tens of millions of Americans is diffused and abused. So you have that problem.

Then you have the fundamental idea of trying to impeach on things like obstruction of Congress. Well, I just told you how Congress was not obstructed. Congress had a remedy. You cannot have obstruction if you have a remedy. The remedy was to go to the other branch and resolve it. They chose not to.

These are the two problems in the most virulent way.

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

PAYING TRIBUTE TO RICHARD BARNETT

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

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to come to the floor at this time.

I come to pay tribute to a person who is not easy to describe. As a matter of fact, he has been called many things, has been many things, and will always be many things. As a matter of fact, his name is Richard Barnett. He held no title and he held no office. As a matter of fact, he never ran for public office, to my knowledge. But he probably helped more individuals get elected to judgeships in Cook County than anybody in the history of the county.

As a matter of fact, he also happened to have been the manager of my first campaign for public office which was about 40 years ago. After the campaign was over, he went into the hospital. He had taken ill but would not go into the hospital until after the election was done. He finally did go after we had won, and he looked as though he only weighed about 90 pounds which means that he was just that sick, he was just that ill. But he bounced back and went back to work at his actual job which was that of a postal clerk.

He went back and worked until retirement. Then he became very actively engaged in the election of Harold Washington for mayor of the city of Chicago. He took a job and worked for the city until he quit that after Harold had passed away, because he really was not looking for a job or didn't want a job.

He became significantly important because we have all heard the term political machine. We don't hear it as much now as we did in the past, but political machines have been described in many different ways, sometimes good, sometimes not so good, and sometimes bad.

□ 1545

One definition that people generally accept as being fairly common is that a political machine is a political group in which an authoritative leader or small group commands the support of a core of supporters and businesses, usually campaign workers, who receive rewards for their efforts. The machine is based on the ability of the boss or group to get out the vote for their candidate on election day.

The term "political machine" dates back to the 20th century in the United States. In the late 19th century, large cities in the United States—Boston, Chicago, Cleveland, Kansas City, New York, Philadelphia, St. Louis, and others—were accused of forming, building, and making use of political machines.

Chicago, being one of those, emerged as one of the big cities with a strong political machine. The machine was known to totally dominate and control all the machinery of government, especially in the immigrant and Black communities.

When I came to Chicago in 1961, Chicago was seriously segregated, as it is today, and seriously politically organized, much more than it is today. These were what was called the movement years.

This is the period when Dr. Martin Luther King came into Chicago. This is the period when we experienced the War on Poverty, great efforts to reduce and work on some of the issues plaguing individuals who were at the bottom of the socioeconomic scale.

That was when I met Richard Barnett. He was part of a small group of activists who felt and believed that the machine could be defeated.

Notables like Leon Despres, Richard Barnett, himself, and others worked in ways to try to undercut the power and influence. People were meeting a great deal in Chicago, and there were meetings all the time, almost every day. We were young activists and would almost be looking for meetings.

People would talk about everything. They talked about race issues. They would talk about poverty. They would talk about the need for programs. But very seldom would they talk about electoral politics.

Richard was one of the persons who would, and he kind of checked people

out at the meetings. When there was a campaign going on, he might call you up.

I never will forget, he called me and asked me if I would be a poll watcher. I said, what am I going to watch? Am I going to watch the polls?

He said, well, that is not exactly what it means, because I really did not know. I mean, I would go to the meetings and all.

He said: No, you are going to go and watch to make sure that the election is fair.

And I am trying to figure out how in the world can I make sure that an election is fair by watching the poll.

The next time he called, he says: Would you like to be a LEAP judge?

I said: Leap judge? Does that mean I am going to jump over somebody?

He laughed and said: Well, that is not quite exactly what that means either. That means "legal elections in all precincts," and we are working to try to make sure that the elections are fair and that the votes are accurate.

That was Richard. Richard always had a telephone book and a bunch of names, and he was most effective with that.

I also say that it was him and some other folk who got me to run for the city council. I had no intention of running, but I did agree to be chairman of a committee to help find a candidate. But we couldn't find anybody; nobody would run. We broke up the committee, and I ran into the person we were going to run against. He started to do what we call sell wolf tickets.

He says: You guys have been talking about what you are going to do to me, and you can't even find a candidate.

I went home that evening and said to my wife: I think I am going to run for the city council.

She said: Who, you?

I said: Well, yeah, me.

She said: You can't run for no city council. You are not even a precinct captain.

And I said: Well, I didn't know you had to be one to run.

At any rate, I called Richard, and Richard said: Well, if you decide you are going to run, I will help you.

That is exactly what he did, and he has been helping me ever since. He has been helping me every time I run. He has been helping other people every time they run. Never to my knowledge have I known him to get 1 cent for working a campaign or working in anybody's campaign.

He became sort of an icon to those of us who believe in what we called independent politics, meaning independent of bossism, independent of not being able to make up your own mind and make your own decisions.

I guess when I went to his funeral on Saturday, the individuals who were there, they were just down the line, down the line. I think some of what I experienced with Richard, I am sure that you experienced some of it also.

Madam Speaker, I am delighted that Mr. RUSH came over to join me as we

talk about this community icon from our city. I might also add that BOBBY's district was the first district that an African American won after African Americans were all put out or left or didn't come back at the end of the 18th century.

Madam Speaker, I yield time to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RUSH), the Representative from the First District in Illinois.

Mr. RUSH. Madam Speaker, I thank my good friend, the dynamic part of the dynamic duo, my brother who is known far and wide as being a voice of inspiration, a voice of reason, and a mighty voice of valor, my friend and colleague for many, many years, Congressman DANNY K. DAVIS from the great Seventh Congressional District in the State of Illinois.

I thank Congressman DAVIS for honoring the legacy of his friend and mine, Mr. Richard Barnett, who was a true visionary, whose outstanding efforts helped bring Chicago's local government and the State of Illinois' government closer to the people who consented to be governed, to the people who know governments are supposed to serve.

Madam Speaker, Richard Barnett was a man of enormous talents, skills, and abilities. Integral to his vision, though, was a focus on enfranchising those who had been intentionally excluded from the political process by Chicago's political elite.

Richard was a courageous voice for the left out, for the locked out, and for those who were forced to live on the margins of political power in the city of Chicago.

I guess the clearest example of this was the critical role that Richard Barnett played in the election of Chicago's first African American mayor, Harold Washington, and the defeat of Chicago's vaunted Democratic machine.

But we can't look at one election and summarize Richard's contribution by just one election. Richard Barnett's transformative role in Chicago politics would come years earlier, following the untimely assassination of my dear friend and colleague, Fred Hampton.

The story goes that after then-Cook County State's Attorney Edward V. Hanrahan led the political assassination of Hampton, who was chairman of the Illinois chapter of the Black Panther Party, Richard Barnett encouraged all African Americans, all minorities, all good people in the city of Chicago, all those who cared about civil rights, law and order, and justice in our city, to refuse to vote for Edward Hanrahan in the upcoming general election.

□ 1600

That was the election in 1972. This was in spite of the fact that Richard was a Democrat, and most of the African American community was Democrat. We vote with the Democratic machine.

We refused to just be ignored and disrespected, and we defeated the Democratic machine in Chicago in the election of 1972 for Cook County State's attorney but, for the first time in the history of the city of Chicago, elected a Republican as the State's attorney of Cook County, Bernard J. Carey. The evil Edward V. Hanrahan would lose the general election, mostly because of Richard Barnett's political acumen and activism.

This defeat by the Cook County Democratic machine would ignite a political awakening in Chicago that would begin with the 1983 election of Harold Washington. But it would go even beyond that and would go on to inspire African Americans all across the country to run for public office, including yours truly.

Barnett's work elected strong political voices, committed political voices, dedicated, passionate political voices up and down the ballot, year in and year out. Richard Barnett helped elect scores of members of the city council, aldermen, appellate court judges, judges in the circuit court, State representatives, State senators, Members of Congress, other elected officials.

I guess, personally, for me, Richard Barnett's legacy was centered around his strategic and informed advice. I mean, you would just marvel, sitting in a political education class, where Richard Barnett would take a group of—not an organization, but just well-meaning individuals from different places, some Ph.D.'s and some GEDs and no Ds, bring them into a room, spend time telling them about not only how to win an election, but why they should win an election.

Barnett would tell us how to use the very tactics that precinct captains had been using for decades and use it against those same precinct captains. He would teach us how to canvass an election.

The first time I ever heard anything about a canvass, it flowed from Richard Barnett's lips: how to take a poll sheet and go from house to house and building to building and floor to floor asking people would they vote for your candidate, and then summarize that by either putting a plus or a minus.

If they were going to vote for your candidate, they were a plus voter; if they were going to vote against your candidate, then they were a minus voter; and if they were undecided, then you put a zero. And you just didn't stop there. The minuses, you left them alone, but the zeroes, you went back to them.

Richard Barnett told us all of that every day from the announcement to the decision day in an election, and that was election day, and how you had to really be prepared for election day because, as Congressman DAVIS indicated, we didn't have poll watchers in the polls, passing 100 feet outside of the polls. If you didn't go and locate your plus voters and get them to the polls, then you would not win that election.

So Richard Barnett taught us the strategy and the discipline of how to win an election.

Barnett shaped a lot of community leaders, politicians, and activists through his example and through those political education classes. The list is prominent, exalted, endless: Congressman DANNY K. DAVIS; yours truly, Congressman BOBBY L. RUSH; Congressman CHUY GARCÍA; former Congressman Luis Gutierrez. We all sat at Richard Barnett's knee and learned how to win elections from this eminent political strategist and teacher.

Even Barnett's charisma, his character, his teaching transcended into the mindset, the strategies of the former President of the United States.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, the gentleman just talked about Representative GARCÍA, who has just joined us and come in. I think we have got about 5 minutes left.

Mr. RUSH. Certainly, Congressman DAVIS. I just wanted to add my voice to the Richard Barnett story that the Nation must know about.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GARCÍA). We call him "Chuy" in Chicago, but everybody knows him that way.

Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I am delighted to be on the floor this afternoon and to join the gentlemen in honoring the life and the memory and the legacy of Richard Barnett.

Richard was a neighbor of Chicago's Lawndale community. He lived just a few blocks from my house. He worked as a U.S. Postal Service employee prior to his retirement in 1982. He was very devoted to his wife and his children and was involved in his local community—in the schools, in the parks, and in the churches—and every aspect of civic life as a good community resident.

But Richard was also a mentor to me in my earliest days as a candidate for political office. From the early 1980s, when I first stepped up, I learned how to organize in communities of color so that they could become politically empowered at the local, State, and Federal level.

He helped enrich my understanding of the Voting Rights Act and how the Federal law could help Chicago's Latino communities in the early 1980s elect people to Chicago's city council, to the State general assembly, to the Cook County board, and, yes, even to the Federal Government, a position that I can say I hold, in part, because of the mentorship of Richard Barnett.

Richard was deeply committed to dismantling the infamously corrupt and discriminatory and exclusionary Chicago political machine with new political movements that were rooted in Chicago neighborhoods, and he wanted to usher in an era of equitable and honest government.

Richard was instrumental in bringing together multiracial, multiethnic, and

faith coalitions across Chicago to advance progressive public policies.

He helped me in my elections to the Chicago City Council, to the Illinois Senate, to the Cook County board, and to Congress. I will be eternally grateful for all of his assistance and mentorship and friendship over nearly a period of four decades in the city of Chicago.

Richard was a true son of his community, his people, and people all over Illinois and across the country because he sought to empower and to give a voice to the people who were voiceless.

Long live Richard Barnett.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Members may have 5 days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. LEWIS (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today.

Mr. ADERHOLT (at the request of Mr. McCARTHY) for today and the balance of the week on account of family matters.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 13 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, January 15, 2020, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

3539. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Science and Technology Program, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Regulations and Procedures Under the Plant Variety Protection Act [Doc. No.: AMS-ST-19-004] received January 13, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3540. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Specialty Crops Program, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Marketing Order Regulating the Handling of Apricots Grown in Designated Counties in Washington; Increased Assessment Rate [Doc. No.: AMS-SC-19-0048; SC16-922-1 FR] received January 13, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3541. A letter from the FPAC-BC, Commodity Credit Corporation, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's Major interim rule — Agricultural Conservation Easement Program [Docket ID: NRCS-2019-0006] (RIN: 0578-AA66) received January 13, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3542. A letter from the FPAC-BC, Commodity Credit Corporation, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's Major interim rule — Environmental Quality Incentives Program [Docket ID: NRCS-2019-0009] (RIN: 0578-AA68) received January 13, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3543. A letter from the Administrator, Livestock and Poultry Program, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's direct final rule — Beef Promotion and Research Rules and Regulations [No.: AMS-LP-19-0054] received January 13, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3544. A letter from the Director, Regulations Management Division, Rural Development Innovation Center, Rural Development, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Advanced Biofuel Payment Program (RIN: 0570-AA75) received January 13, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3545. A letter from the Alternate OSD FRLO, Office of the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's interim final rule — Commissary Credit and Debit Card User Fee [Docket ID: DOD-2019-OS-0131] (RIN: 0790-AK92) received January 13, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Armed Services.

3546. A letter from the Counsel, Legal Division, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, transmitting the Bureau's final rule — Truth in Lending Act (Regulation Z) Adjustment to Asset-Size Exemption Threshold received January 8, 2020, 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.

3547. A letter from the Program Specialist, Chief Counsel's Office, Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Regulatory Capital Rule: Capital Simplification for Qualifying Community Banking Organizations; Technical Correction [Docket ID: OCC-2018-0040] (RIN: 1557-AE59) received January 9, 2020, 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.

3548. A letter from the Acting General Counsel, National Credit Union Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Payday Alternative Loans (RIN: 3133-AE84) received January 9, 2020, 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.

3549. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, FDA, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Medical Device Submissions: Amending Premarket Regulations That Require Multiple Copies and Specify Paper Copies To Be Required in Electronic Format [Docket No.: FDA-2018-N-0628] (RIN: 0910-AH48) received January 13, 2020, 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.

3550. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, FDA, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Regulation Requiring an Approved New Drug Application for Drugs Sterilized by Irradiation [Docket No.: FDA-2017-N-6924] (RIN: 0910-AH47) received January 13, 2020, 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.

3551. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final NUREG — Surface Deformation [NUREG-0800, Chapter 2] received January 13, 2020, 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.

3552. A letter from the Chair, National Advisory Council on Indian Education, transmitting the Council's 2018-2019 Annual Report to Congress; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

3553. A letter from the Federal Register Liaison Officer, U.S. Census Bureau, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's notice of final rulemaking — Temporary Suspension of the Population Estimates Challenge Program [Docket Number: 191211-0109] (RIN: 0607-AA57) received January 13, 2020, 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.

3554. A letter from the Acting Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Services, Office of General Counsel, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final regulations — Adjustment of Civil Monetary Penalties for Inflation (RIN: 1801-AA20) received January 9, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3555. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final regulations — Adjustment of Civil Monetary Penalties for Inflation (RIN: 1801-AA20) received January 9, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3556. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Office of the General Counsel, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule — Inflation Adjustment of Civil Monetary Penalties received January 8, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3557. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Redding, CA [Docket No.: FAA-2019-0625; Airspace Docket No.: 19-AWP-2] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received January 9, 2020, 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.

3558. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of the Class E Airspace; Coudersport, PA; and Revocation of Class E Airspace; Galeton, PA [Docket No.: FAA-2019-0757; Airspace Docket No.: 19-AEA-13] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received January 9, 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.

3559. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Depart-

ment's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2016-9072; Product Identifier 2015-NM-110-AD; Amendment 39-19797; AD 2019-23-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 9, 2020, 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.

3560. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2019-0983; Product Identifier 2019-NM-171-AD; Amendment 39-21010; AD 2019-25-12] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 9, 2020, 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.

3561. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Embraer S.A. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2019-0499; Product Identifier 2019-NM-088-AD; Amendment 39-21015; AD 2019-25-16] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 9, 2020, 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.

3562. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2019-0603; Product Identifier 2019-NM-087-AD; Amendment 39-21013; AD 2019-25-14] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 9, 2020, 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.

3563. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Viking Air Limited (Type Certificate Previously Held by Bombardier, Inc.; Canadair Limited) Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2019-0710; Product Identifier 2019-NM-060-AD; Amendment 39-21009; AD 2019-25-11] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 9, 2020, 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.

3564. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Fokker Services B.V. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2019-0709; Product Identifier 2019-NM-127-AD; Amendment 39-21008; AD 2019-25-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 9, 2020, 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.

3565. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc., Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2019-0993; Product Identifier 2019-NM-198-AD; Amendment 39-21017; AD 2019-25-18] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 9, 2020, 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.

3566. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Fokker Services B.V. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2019-0703; Product Identifier

2019-NM-106-AD; Amendment 39-21014; AD 2019-25-15] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 9, 2020, 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.

3567. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc., Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2019-0256; Product Identifier 2019-NM-027-AD; Amendment 39-19786; AD 2019-22-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 9, 2020, 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.

3568. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Revenue Procedure 2020-5 (I.R.B. 2020-1) received January 10, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

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. ROY (for himself, Mr. BIGGS, and Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana):

H.R. 5596. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand and improve health savings accounts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma (for herself, Mr. KEVIN HERN of Oklahoma, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. LUCAS, and Mr. COLE):

H.R. 5597. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 305 Northwest 5th Street in Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, as the "Clara Luper Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Ms. MCCOLLUM (for herself, Mr. ROONEY of Florida, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. PHILLIPS, and Mr. UPTON):

H.R. 5598. A bill to provide for the protection of the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness and interconnected Federal lands and waters, including Voyageurs National Park, within the Rainy River Watershed in the State of Minnesota, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. HECK (for himself, Mr. CLAY, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. PERLMUTTER):

H.R. 5599. A bill to amend the Housing and Community Development Act of 1992 to require the deposit of enterprise guarantee fees in the Housing Trust Fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mrs. AXNE:

H.R. 5600. A bill to amend the Worker Adjustment and Retraining Notification Act to provide a notice requirement regarding offshoring; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. NORMAN (for himself, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. GIANFORTE, Ms. CHENEY, Mr. NEWHOUSE, and Mr. MCCLINTOCK):

H.R. 5601. A bill to protect private property rights and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of

such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SCHNEIDER (for himself, Mr. NADLER, Ms. BASS, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. CORREA, Mr. CISNEROS, Mr. COOPER, Mr. PANETTA, Ms. NORTON, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. CASE, Ms. MENG, Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma, Mr. MALINOWSKI, and Miss RICE of New York):

H.R. 5602. A bill to authorize dedicated domestic terrorism offices within the Department of Homeland Security, the Department of Justice, and the Federal Bureau of Investigation to analyze and monitor domestic terrorist activity and require the Federal Government to take steps to prevent domestic terrorism; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Homeland Security, and Armed 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. STEUBE (for himself, Mrs. LESKO, and Mr. HAGEDORN):

H.R. 5603. A bill to provide that for purposes of determining compliance with title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 in athletics, sex shall be determined on the basis of sex assigned at birth by a physician; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. TORRES of California (for herself and Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee):

H.R. 5604. A bill to amend the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act to establish demonstration and pilot projects to facilitate education and training programs in the field of advanced manufacturing; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WALTZ (for himself, Mrs. LURIA, Mr. ZELDIN, Ms. HOULAHAN, Mr. CRENSHAW, and Ms. WILD):

H.R. 5605. A bill to direct the Secretary of Defense to carry out a grant program to increase cooperation on post-traumatic stress disorder research between the United States and Israel; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LIPINSKI (for himself, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. GALAGHER, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. RYAN, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mr. LATTA, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. LAHOOD, and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois):

H. Res. 792. A resolution supporting the contributions of Catholic schools; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. JEFFRIES:

H. Res. 793. A resolution electing a certain Member to a certain standing committee of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. SCHRADER (for himself and Mr. YOHO):

H. Res. 794. A resolution supporting the designation of January 2020 as "National One Health Awareness Month" to promote awareness of organizations focused on public health, animal health, and environmental health collaboration throughout the United States and to recognize the critical contributions of those organizations to the future of the United States; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. ENGEL (for himself and Mr. RYAN):

H. Res. 795. A resolution supporting the commitment of the United States to lawfully protect international cultural sites; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:

H. Res. 796. A resolution congratulating the North Dakota State University Bison

football team for winning the 2019 National Collegiate Athletic Association Division I Football Championship Subdivision title; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. DINGELL (for herself, Mr. PAPPAS, Ms. NORTON, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. ROUDA, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. TLAIB, Ms. MOORE, Mr. MORELLE, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GARCIA of Illinois, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CASTEN of Illinois, Mr. MALINOWSKI, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. HAYES, Mr. COHEN, Ms. HAALAND, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. SOTO, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. POCAN, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. SLOTKIN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mr. CASE, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. NEAL, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. COOPER, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. MCEACHIN, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. STEVENS, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. NADLER, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. BARRAGAN, Mr. NEGUSE, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. SIRES, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Ms. WILD, Ms. WEXTON, Mrs. TRAHAN, Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL, and Ms. MENG):

H. Res. 797. A resolution encouraging the Environmental Protection Agency to maintain and strengthen requirements under the Clean Water Act and reverse ongoing administrative actions to weaken this landmark law and protections for United States waters; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

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. ROY:

H.R. 5596. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution—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 any Department or Officer thereof.

By Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma:

H.R. 5597. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 7 and 18.

By Ms. MCCOLLUM:

H.R. 5598. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution

By Mr. HECK:

H.R. 5599. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 and Clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress), Amendment 10.

By Mrs. AXNE:

H.R. 5600.

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 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. NORMAN:

H.R. 5601.

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

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. SCHNEIDER:

H.R. 5602.

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

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. STEUBE:

H.R. 5603.

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

Article I, Section 8

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;

To borrow money on the credit of the United States;

To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes;

To establish an uniform Rule of Naturalization, and uniform Laws on the subject of Bankruptcies throughout the United States;

To coin Money, regulate the Value thereof, and of foreign Coin, and fix the Standard of Weights and Measures;

To provide for the Punishment of counterfeiting the Securities and current Coin of the United States;

To establish Post Offices and Post Roads;

To promote the Progress of Science and useful Arts, by securing for limited Times to Authors and Inventors the exclusive Right to their respective Writings and Discoveries;

To constitute Tribunals inferior to the supreme Court;

and Offenses against the Law of Nations;

To declare War, grant Letters of Marque and Reprisal, and make Rules concerning Captures on Land and Water;

To raise and support Armies, but no Appropriation of Money to that Use shall be for a longer Term than two Years;

To provide and maintain a Navy;

To make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces;

To provide for calling forth the Militia to execute the Laws of the Union, suppress Insurrections and repel Invasions;

To provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining, the Militia, and for governing such Part of them as may be employed in the Service of the United States, reserving to the States respectively, the Appointment of the Officers, and the Authority of training the Militia according to the discipline prescribed by Congress;

To exercise exclusive Legislation in all Cases whatsoever, over such District (not exceeding ten Miles square) as may, by Cession of particular States, and the acceptance of Congress, become the Seat of the Government of the United States, and to exercise like Authority over all Places purchased by the Consent of the Legislature of the State in which the Same shall be, for the Erection of Forts, Magazines, Arsenals, dock-Yards, and other needful Buildings; And

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the

foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mrs. TORRES of California:

H.R. 5604.

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

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3, which gives Congress the power to regulate commerce

By Mr. WALTZ:

H.R. 5605.

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

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 30: Ms. CHENEY.

H.R. 222: Mr. ARRINGTON.

H.R. 435: Mr. LYNCH.

H.R. 619: Mr. COSTA and Mr. HASTINGS.

H.R. 649: Mr. GOTTHEIMER.

H.R. 714: Mr. JOHN W. ROSE of Tennessee.

H.R. 1043: Mr. CARTER of Texas.

H.R. 1049: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, and Ms. FUDGE.

H.R. 1080: Mr. NEGUSE.

H.R. 1140: Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 1164: Mr. COLE.

H.R. 1166: Ms. WEXTON.

H.R. 1174: Mr. SARBANES and Mrs. MCBATHE.

H.R. 1266: Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1345: Ms. FUDGE.

H.R. 1355: Mr. CLAY, Mr. CICILLINE, and Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 1383: Mr. SMITH of Washington.

H.R. 1570: Mr. WALTZ.

H.R. 1695: Mr. SMITH of Washington and Mr. PETERSON.

H.R. 1753: Mr. BABIN.

H.R. 1834: Ms. GABBARD.

H.R. 1931: Ms. SLOTKIN.

H.R. 2102: Ms. SPEIER.

H.R. 2199: Mr. HORSFORD.

H.R. 2256: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 2271: Mrs. AXNE.

H.R. 2416: Mrs. MILLER.

H.R. 2491: Mr. LEVIN of California.

H.R. 2571: Mr. KELLY of Mississippi.

H.R. 2599: Ms. MATSUI.

H.R. 2650: Mr. VAN DREW.

H.R. 2651: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 2653: Mr. GOTTHEIMER.

H.R. 2694: Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. ALLRED, Mr. KIND, Mr. ROSE of New York, and Ms. WEXTON.

H.R. 2711: Mr. PAPPAS.

H.R. 2850: Mr. BRINDISI, Mr. HECK, Mr. DEFAZIO, and Mr. QUIGLEY.

H.R. 2867: Ms. JAYAPAL.

H.R. 2895: Mr. MURPHY of North Carolina, Mr. GREEN of Tennessee, and Mr. BUTTERFIELD.

H.R. 2912: Mr. CISNEROS and Mr. HASTINGS.

H.R. 2990: Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. COOK, and Mr. WITTMAN.

H.R. 2991: Mr. DOGGETT.

H.R. 3036: Mr. KIND.

H.R. 3048: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 3218: Mr. GROTHMAN.

H.R. 3219: Mr. SHERMAN.

H.R. 3244: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.

H.R. 3364: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

H.R. 3522: Mr. BACON.

H.R. 3536: Mr. ALLRED.

H.R. 3561: Mr. PETERS and Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.

H.R. 3582: Ms. HAALAND.

H.R. 3587: Mr. WILLIAMS.

H.R. 3598: Mr. BOST.

H.R. 3645: Ms. HAALAND.

H.R. 3797: Mr. SMUCKER.

H.R. 3852: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 3862: Ms. PORTER.

H.R. 3969: Ms. GABBARD.

H.R. 4022: Mr. TONKO.

H.R. 4049: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

H.R. 4069: Mr. WOMACK.

H.R. 4090: Mr. NORMAN.

H.R. 4141: Mr. MCKINLEY.

H.R. 4148: Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 4194: Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. PETERSON, and Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas.

H.R. 4216: Ms. JACKSON LEE.

H.R. 4256: Mr. NORMAN.

H.R. 4280: Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, and Mr. COOPER.

H.R. 4301: Ms. SHALALA.

H.R. 4305: Ms. DELAURO, Ms. WATERS, Mr. RICHMOND, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. EMMER, Mrs. TRAHAN, Mr. CARDENAS, and Mrs. DEMINGS.

H.R. 4326: Mr. WEBER of Texas.

H.R. 4346: Ms. BARRAGÁN.

H.R. 4350: Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.R. 4393: Ms. SPEIER.

H.R. 4681: Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. PAPPAS, and Mr. PETERSON.

H.R. 4697: Ms. MCNERNEY, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. STEVENS, and Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 4708: Mr. CORREA, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. STEVENS, Mr. WELCH, Mr. CARDENAS, and Mr. PANETTA.

H.R. 4709: Mr. CORREA, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. STEVENS, Mr. WELCH, Mr. CARDENAS, and Mr. PANETTA.

H.R. 4738: Mr. WRIGHT, Mr. SMUCKER, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, and Mr. KELLER.

H.R. 4801: Mr. BALDERSON, Mrs. AXNE, Mrs. HAYES, and Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 4805: Ms. TORRES SMALL of New Mexico.

H.R. 4817: Mr. GUTHRIE and Mr. MITCHELL.

H.R. 4926: Mr. STAUBER.

H.R. 4960: Mr. NORMAN.

H.R. 4990: Ms. SLOTKIN and Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.

H.R. 4995: Ms. FINKENAUER.

H.R. 5036: Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, and Mr. SARBANES.

H.R. 5052: Mr. HASTINGS.

H.R. 5104: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 5141: Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 5200: Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 5209: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.

H.R. 5230: Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER.

H.R. 5231: Ms. DEAN.

H.R. 5234: Mr. GROTHMAN.

H.R. 5297: Mr. KELLY of Mississippi.

H.R. 5299: Mr. HARDER of California, Mr. VELA, Mr. SUOZZI, and Mr. GOLDEN.

H.R. 5376: Mr. MCADAMS.

H.R. 5395: Mr. COOK.

H.R. 5435: Ms. VELÁQUEZ, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. SOTO, Mr. COHEN, and Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER.

H.R. 5447: Mr. TIPTON.

H.R. 5450: Ms. JAYAPAL.

H.R. 5453: Ms. MATSUI and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 5483: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.

H.R. 5491: Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 5540: Mr. NADLER and Mr. CISNEROS.

H.R. 5552: Mr. MORELLE, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. HORSFORD, Ms. TITUS, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, and Mr. McGOVERN.

H.R. 5557: Ms. CHENEY.

H.R. 5575: Ms. PORTER and Mr. KENNEDY.

H.R. 5577: Mrs. LESKO.

H.R. 5588: Mr. TIPTON.

H.J. Res. 38: Ms. FINKENAUER.

H.J. Res. 66: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.J. Res. 76: Ms. TORRES SMALL of New Mexico, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma, and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.

H. Res. 50: Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. ARRINGTON, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. BURCHETT, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. WEBER of Texas, and Mr. KEVIN HERN of Oklahoma.

H. Res. 60: Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL.

H. Res. 71: Mr. MALINOWSKI.

H. Res. 114: Ms. SCANLON, Mr. HURD of Texas, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. CORREA, and Mr. WITTMAN.

H. Res. 301: Mr. PANETTA.

H. Res. 399: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

H. Res. 641: Ms. JAYAPAL.

H. Res. 745: Mr. MOOLENAAR, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Mrs. DINGELL.

H. Res. 780: Mr. CLOUD, Mr. ROUZER, and Mr. SMITH of Missouri.

H. Res. 782: Mr. WEBER of Texas.

H. Res. 785: Mr. KILDEE, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Ms. SLOTKIN, Mr. REED, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. BALDERSON, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. VAN DREW, Mr. KATKO, and Mr. JOYCE of Ohio.

H. Res. 791: Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. STEIL, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. GOODEN, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee, Mr. HURD of Texas, Mr. BUDD, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. HAGEDORN, Mr. FLORES, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. LATTA, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. PENCE, Mr. BACON, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. GUTHRIE,

Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. BALDERSON, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. RATCLIFFE, Mr. STEWART, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. RESCHENTHALER, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. HICE of Georgia, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. KELLER, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, Mr. JOHN W. ROSE of Tennessee, Mr. MEUSER, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. RIGGLEMAN, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. HUIZENGA, Mr. KINZINGER, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania, Mr. ARRINGTON, Mr. SPANO, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. HILL of Arkansas, Mr. BOST, Mr. SCALISE, Ms. CHENEY, Mr. DUNN, and Mr. FITZPATRICK.



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 166

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JANUARY 14, 2020

No. 8

Senate

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

PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

Eternal God, You are high and lifted up. Deliver us from estrangement or dissension. Teach our lawmakers to disagree with respect, civility, and humility. Lord, lead them into a deeper reverence for You and one another as they remember that patriots reside on both sides of the aisle. May our Senators celebrate the pleasure You receive when colleagues of faith dwell together in unity. Let the words of their mouths and the meditations of their hearts receive Your divine approval.

We pray in Your merciful Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH). The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to address the Senate for 1 minute in morning business.

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

TAIWAN

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, as President pro tempore of the U.S. Senate, I want to recognize democracy working in Taiwan.

On Saturday, the 23 million proud people of Taiwan exercised their democratic right to select their own leaders. I congratulate President Tsai on her

reelection. I would also like to take this moment to congratulate all Taiwanese for being a shining light amidst dark times in other parts of East Asia. All of us remember what has been going on in Hong Kong for the last several months as they try to exercise just rights that the Chinese Government gave them in 1997, when they signed an agreement with the British Government turning back Hong Kong to China, and they would have the rights for the next 50 years to have the same democratic principles they had under the British Empire.

Despite continued intimidation by the Chinese Communist Party across the Taiwan Strait, this proud island stood up to protect its democracy and sovereignty. That is exemplified by the election Saturday.

Let us all congratulate the people of Taiwan for their remarkable accomplishment and continue to work in this Chamber to strengthen U.S.-Taiwan relations.

I yield the floor.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

IMPEACHMENT

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, tomorrow will be 4 weeks—4 weeks—since House Democrats impeached the President of the United States with purely partisan support.

Speaker PELOSI and Chairman SCHIFF did not wait to fill out the factual record. They did not even wait to see their own subpoenas through the legal system. They plowed ahead for two reasons: They said impeachment was too urgent to wait—too urgent to wait—and they said they had already proven their case.

But since then, House Democrats have spent 4 weeks contradicting both

of those claims. They spent 4 weeks demonstrating through their actions that impeachment is actually not that urgent—not that urgent—and they do not actually have much confidence in their case.

An arbitrary 4-week delay does not show urgency. These demands for the Senate to precommit to reopening the House investigation do not show confidence. There is a reason why the House inquiry that led to President Nixon's resignation took 14 months of hearings in addition to the separate special prosecutor. There is a reason why the Clinton impeachment inquiry drew on years of prior investigation and mountains of testimony from firsthand fact witnesses. That is because both of those Houses of Representatives knew they had to prove their case—prove their case before submitting it to the Senate for judgment.

Both situations involved legal battles over executive privilege and extensive litigation, both times not after a trial had been handed to the Senate but beforehand. When the cases were actually being compiled, there were mountains of evidence, mountains of testimony, and long legal battles over privilege. None of this discovery took place over here in the Senate.

The Constitution gives the sole power of impeachment to the House. If the House majority wants to impeach a President, the ball is in their court, but they have to do the work. They have to prove their case. Nothing—nothing in our history or our Constitution says a House majority can pass what amounts to a half-baked censure resolution and then insist that the Senate fill in the blanks. There is no constitutional exception for a House majority with a short attention span.

I think everyone knows this process has not been some earnest, factfinding mission with House Democrats following each thread wherever it leads. The Speaker of the House did not reluctantly decide to impeach after pouring over secondhand impressions of

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



Printed on recycled paper.

civil servants. This was a predetermined political conclusion. Members of her conference had been publicly promising it literally for years.

That is why the investigation stopped long before the House had come anywhere near proving what they allege. They pulled the plug early because the facts were never the point. They were never the point. The point was to check a political box.

For goodness' sake, the very morning after the House's historic vote, Speaker PELOSI literally chastised reporters for asking too many questions about impeachment. She tried to change the subject to economic policy. She said:

Any other questions? . . . Anybody want to talk about the SALT tax. . . . I'm not going to answer any more questions on this—

Referring to impeachment.

Really? Really? You impeach a President of the United States, and the very next morning, there is nothing to see here? Does that sound like the Speaker of the House really thinks the survival of the Republic is on the line? Does anyone really think that if Democrats truly believe the President of the United States was a criminal who is imperiling our country, they would have abandoned the search for evidence because they didn't want to make time for due process; that they would have pulled the plug on the investigation just because it sounded good to finish by Christmas; that they would have delayed the trial for months while they test-drove new talking points; that they would have been trying to change the subject 12 hours after the vote?

I cannot say what Democrats do and do not really believe, but they certainly do not seem to display the urgency or the seriousness you would expect from people who actually thought they had proven the President should be removed.

On television last weekend, the Speaker bragged that "this President is impeached for life," regardless of what the Senate does—regardless of what the Senate does, as if the ultimate verdict were sort of an afterthought.

Likewise, the Senate Democratic leader recently said that as long as he can try to use the trial process to hurt some Republicans' reelection chances, "it's a win-win." That is what this is all about. The Democratic leader just laid it right out there in case anybody had any doubt.

What a revealing admission. Forget about the fate of the Presidency. Forget about the Constitution. As long as the process helps Democrats' political fortunes, our Democratic colleagues call it a "win-win." Do these sound like leaders who really believe we are in a constitutional crisis, one that requires the most severe remedy in our entire system of government? Does it sound like that?

Here is how deep we have come into bizarro world. The latest Democratic talking point is, if the Senate conducts a trial based on what the House itself

looked at, we will be engaged in a coverup. Did you get that? Unless the Senate steps outside of our lane and takes it upon ourselves to supplement the House case, it is a coverup?

Do they think the entire country has forgotten what they were saying just a couple of days ago? We heard over and over that the House case, on its own, was totally damning and convincing. That is what they were saying a few days ago.

Clearly, a majority of the House felt that it was sufficient to impeach, and a number of Senate Democrats were happy to prejudge the case publicly and suggest the House had proven enough for removal.

But now, all of a sudden, the story has reversed. Now, we hardly know anything. Now, the investigation is just beginning. Now, what the House has produced is so weak that they are calling their own investigation a coverup. Who would be the author of this coverup—Chairman SCHIFF?

We have arrived at a simple contradiction. Two things cannot both be true. House Democrats' case cannot simultaneously be so robust that it was enough to impeach in the first place but also so weak that the Senate needs to go fishing. If the existing case is strong, there is no need for the judge and the jury to reopen the investigation.

If the existing case is weak, House Democrats should not have impeached in the first place. I think I am beginning to understand why the Speaker wanted to change the subject to tax policy. Unfortunately, no matter how irresponsibly this has been handled across the Capitol, impeachment is not a political game, and the U.S. Senate will not treat it like one.

A House majority fueled by political animus may have started this with frivolity, but it will fall to the Senate—to the Senate—to end it with seriousness and sobriety. It will fall to us to do what the Founders intended: to take the long view, to move beyond partisan passions, and to do what the long-term good of our institution and our Nation demands.

IRAN

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, every day brings more repudiation of the conventional wisdom of the Democratic foreign policy establishment, breathlessly—breathlessly—amplified by the mainstream media, that the strike on Soleimani would unite Iranians behind the regime. Remember, that is what they were all saying, that the strike on Soleimani would unite Iranians behind the regime. Proud Iranians continue, however, to take to the streets not to rage against America or Israel but to vent their frustration against the corrupt, theocratic regime that has led Iran down a ruinous path.

I spoke about these protests before the strike on Soleimani, and I will continue to speak out about them. I have

long believed the United States should care about human rights and democracy, whether in Russia, China, Hong Kong, Burma, Cuba, Venezuela, Afghanistan, Syria, or Iran. The promotion of human rights and the defense of democracy should not necessarily be the driving force of our foreign policy, but it should be an important component.

I ask my Democratic colleagues who share this view to set aside their hatred for Donald Trump—even just for a moment—and to step back to look at what has been happening across Iran for years: the repression of women, the persecution of ethnic and religious minorities, and the brutal suppression of dissent.

Was the Obama administration right to meet the 2009 Green Revolution with silence?

Consider the story of Iran's only female Olympic medalist, who this week defected—defected—from Iran and requested asylum; or the Iranian state TV broadcasters who quit, apologizing to the public for years of lying on behalf of the mullahs; or the innocent protesters who are being killed and wounded by agents of the state.

These are well-known realities. They were well known when, 12 days ago, the United States took the most dangerous terrorist off the battlefield, but mystifyingly, many voices here in Washington and the media sought to blame the escalating tensions in the region on President Trump.

We heard from leading Democrats that the operation to eliminate Soleimani was one of the administration's "needless provocations"—needless provocations. We heard that the cycle of violence was America's responsibility. All of this—all of it—flies in the face of the reasonable analysis some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle were offering before—before—Donald Trump became President.

In 2007, 30 Democratic Senators joined Republicans to support an amendment warning of the need to prevent "Iran from turning Shia militia extremists in Iraq into a Hezbollah-like force that could serve its interests inside Iraq, including by overwhelming, subverting, or coopting institutions of the legitimate government of Iraq." That was back in 2007, with 30 Democrats.

Few more prescient warnings have been pronounced by this body, but, unfortunately, it went unheeded by the Obama administration, which withdrew U.S. forces from Iraq, effectively abandoning it to Soleimani and his proxies.

As recently as 2015, the Democratic leader warned that the JCPOA failed to address Iran's destabilizing malign activities and that Iran would use its windfall to "redouble its efforts to create even more trouble in the Middle East and, perhaps, beyond." That was the Democratic leader in 2015.

Senator MENENDEZ hit the nail on the head as well. He warned: "If there

is a fear of war in the region, it will be fueled by Iran and its proxies and exacerbated by an agreement that allows Iran to possess an industrial-sized nuclear program and enough money in sanctions relief to significantly continue to fund its hegemonic intentions throughout the region.” Senator MENENDEZ.

So many of our Democratic colleagues understood all this quite clearly when a Democrat occupied the White House, and it came true. It came true. Iran’s aggression only accelerated after the Obama administration’s deal. The question for us is not whom to blame. That much is clear. The question is what to do about it.

As Iran’s aggression became focused on the United States, as the risk to our personnel and interests grew, after months of repeated warnings, President Trump took action. I am glad the strike against Soleimani has provided some justice—some justice—to his countless victims, hundreds of Americans and many more across the Middle East.

We don’t yet know if Soleimani will prove irreplaceable, but his death will significantly disrupt Iran’s death machine and will change Iran’s long-held misconception that they could literally get away with the murder of Americans without a meaningful response. President Trump’s strategy seems to have reestablished deterrence.

The Senate risks jeopardizing what we have gained with this strike if it ties the military’s hands and tells Iran that we have no stomach for this. America can hardly be defeated on the battlefield, but we can be defeated at home on the political front. We can allow ourselves to become divided and play into the hands of our adversaries. Our divisions at home are significant. Let us not allow them to pollute our judgment on foreign affairs. Let’s not make our adversaries’ lives easier by tying our military’s hands.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to resume consideration of the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Peter Gaynor, of Rhode Island, to be Administrator of

the Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security.

Mr. McCONNELL. 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.

IMPEACHMENT

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, the House of Representatives has impeached the President for a very serious offense: coercing a foreign leader into interfering in our elections, using the powers of the Presidency, the most powerful public office in the Nation, to benefit himself—to actually influence the election, which should be decided by American citizens, not by a foreign power. When debating the impeachment clause of the Constitution, the Founders worried about foreign capitals having undue influence over our country. Hamilton, writing in the Federalist Papers, described impeachable offenses as abuses or violations of some public trust.

In the impeachment of President Trump, the question the Senate will be asked to answer is whether the President did, in fact, abuse his public trust and, by doing so, invite the very foreign influence the Founders feared would be a corruption of our democracy. To answer that question, to decide whether the President merits acquittal and removal from office, the Senate must conduct a fair trial. A fair trial has witnesses. A fair trial has relevant documents as a part of the record. A fair trial seeks the truth—no more, no less.

That is why Democrats have asked to call four fact witnesses and subpoena three specific sets of relevant documents related to the President’s misconduct with Ukraine. At the moment, my Republican colleagues are opposing these witnesses and documents, but they can’t seem to find a real reason why. Most are unwilling to argue that witnesses shouldn’t come before the Senate. They can only support delaying the decision until most of the trial is over, like a magic eight ball that keeps saying: Ask again later.

The most the Republican leader can do is smear our request as some partisan fishing expedition intended to damage the President, but the leader himself has warned that the witnesses we have requested might not help the House managers’ case against the President. He is right about that. These are the President’s top advisers. They are appointed by him, vetted by him. They work with him.

We don’t know what those witnesses will say or what the documents will re-

veal. They could hurt the President’s case or they could help the President’s case. We don’t know.

We know one thing. We want the truth on something as weighty and profound as an impeachment trial. Does Leader McCONNELL want the truth? Do Senate Republicans want the truth?

I would remind the leader that our request for witnesses and documents is very much in line with the Senate’s history. The Republican leader keeps citing precedent. Well, here is precedent, Mr. Leader. There have been two Presidential impeachment trials in history. Both—both—had witnesses. The trial of Andrew Johnson had 41 witnesses. There have been 16 completed impeachment trials in the Senate’s entire history. In every one, except one, the trial in 1799 of Senator William Blount, which was dismissed on jurisdictional grounds, every Senate impeachment trial in history has included witnesses.

You want precedent? Precedent says witnesses overwhelmingly.

The long arc of history casts a shadow on the proceedings we are about to undertake. It suggests something obvious—that the Senate has always believed trials were about evidence and getting the truth. Of the 16 impeachment trials, 15 had witnesses and 1 was dismissed early. Do Senate Republicans want to break that lengthy historical precedent by conducting the first impeachment trial of a President in history with no witnesses? Let me ask that question again. This is weighty. This is vital. This is about the Republic. Do Senate Republicans want to break the lengthy historical precedent that said witnesses should be at in impeachment trial by conducting the first impeachment trial of the President in history—in history, since 1789—with no witnesses?

I ask that question because that seems to be where the Republican leader wants us to be headed. The Republican leader has designed a schedule for a Senate trial that might—might—have us vote on witnesses and documents after the presentations from both sides have been concluded—the judicial equivalent of putting the cart before the horse. Of course, Leader McCONNELL has made no guarantee that he will support voting on witnesses and documents at that time—only that supposedly he will be open to the idea.

I want my Republican colleagues to bear in mind that if we consider witnesses at a later date, it could extend the trial by several days, maybe several weeks, as witnesses did during the Clinton trial.

Leader McCONNELL has said that after the arguments are made, we should vote and move on. Do my Republican colleagues really believe Leader McCONNELL will have an open mind about witnesses at a later date when they might extend the trial much longer than he wants? I am not in the prediction business, but I can bet that

when the time comes, Leader MCCONNELL will say that we have heard enough, that the trial shouldn't drag on any longer, that the Senate doesn't need witnesses and documents, and that we should, just as he once said "vote and move on."

Before Senate Republicans are so quick to reject the Democratic proposal for a limited list of relevant witnesses and documents, I want them to consider that our proposal would save the Senate time. We want to confront the issue now, not be forced to extend the trial later. We want both the House managers and the White House defense counsel to have time to incorporate the testimony of witnesses into their presentations. That is the proper way to proceed. That is what happens at trials—collect all the evidence at the beginning, not at the end.

All we are asking is for the President's own men, his appointees, to come forward and tell their side of the story. The American people want a fair trial in the Senate. The American people know that a trial without witnesses and documents is not a real trial; it is a sham trial. And the American people will be able to tell the difference between a fair hearing of the facts and a coverup.

IRAN

Madam President, on Iran, the Senate will soon consider Senator KAINE's War Powers Resolution, which would prevent further hostilities with Iran without congressional approval. It is a crucial vote that will correctly assert this body's constitutional authority over matters of war and peace, and it is certainly timely.

The past few weeks have highlighted the President's impulsive, erratic, and often reckless foreign policy, the consequences of which have made Americans less safe and unnecessarily put our Armed Forces in harm's way. From North Korea, to Syria, to Russia, it is impossible to say the world is a safer place today than when President Trump took office, and it is very possible to say that President Trump, by his impulsive, erratic, and ego-driven actions, has made things worse.

With respect to Iran, the President's recent actions have increased the risk of further hostilities in the Middle East. The President campaigned on getting the United States out of "endless wars" in the Middle East, but the President has deployed thousands more U.S. troops in the Middle East with hardly an explanation to Congress or to the American people.

I have long been concerned that the President's chaotic, impulsive decisionmaking might stumble us into war. With Iran, like with many other places around the globe, the President's policy has brought us closer to the kind of endless war the President promised we would avoid.

It is past time for Congress to place a check on this President. On matters of war and peace, congressional oversight and congressional prerogatives

are not optional. I urge my colleagues on both sides to vote in favor of the Kaine resolution.

Senator SANDERS also has a bill that would deny funding for a war with Iran, of which I am a proud cosponsor. The Senate should consider that legislation as well. As the situation with Iran continues to evolve, the administration must come back and brief Congress on all major developments, troop deployments, and long-term strategy in the region.

CHINA

Madam President, finally, on China, tomorrow the United States will complete a signing ceremony for the so-called phase one trade agreement with China. After 18 months of negotiations, the phase one deal is remarkable for how little it achieves at an enormous price.

President Trump has agreed to scale back some tariffs on Chinese goods in exchange for temporary assurances that China will increase its purchase of U.S. exports over the next few years, particularly in agriculture.

For all the effort and turmoil over the past few years, the deal President Trump will sign tomorrow hardly seems to advance the United States past square one. It fails to address the deep structural inequalities in the trade relationship between China and the United States.

For the past decade, China has stolen American intellectual property through forced technology transfers of our companies and through outright cyber theft. The President's phase one deal doesn't even address this issue. China has routinely subsidized its most important domestic industries. Not just labor-intensive industries but even industries like Huawei are subsidized to gain unfair advantage over American companies. China has dumped goods illegally into our markets. It has manipulated its currency to keep prices low. The President's phase one deal doesn't address any of these issues.

Not only does this deal fail to make any meaningful progress toward ending China's most flagrant abuses, what it does achieve on the agricultural side may well be a day late and a dollar short. China has already made long-term contracts with other producers of soybeans and other goods in places like Argentina and Brazil. American farmers have already lost billions over the last 2 years, watched their markets disappear, and too many American farms have gone bankrupt in the time that it took President Trump to reach this deal.

I have publicly praised the President when he is tough on China, at some political cost. I have said he has had better instincts on China than previous administrations. Few politicians have been talking about securing real reforms to China's economic policies longer than I have. But I fear that with an election around the corner, the President is taking the easy way out—

settling for a weak deal that will cost American businesses, American farmers, and American workers for years and years to come.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip.

IRAN

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, this week we expect to vote on a War Powers Resolution related to operations in Iran. I am pleased that the President's demonstration of strength has restored our position of credible deterrence. Some have challenged that the President's action was escalatory, but the reality is that Iran had become increasingly bold. The United States responded in self-defense, and, as the President has said, it appears that Iran is standing down.

Hopefully Iran's tragic error in shooting down a civilian passenger plane has served as a sobering check on the regime's activities. We have seen thousands of Iranians rallying in the streets in recent days protesting the bringing down of the passenger plane and calling for change. I hope the people of Iran are able to organize and demonstrate in safety and that their hopes and prayers for change are answered.

Soleimani's death provides an opportunity for Iran to rethink its direction, to move away from brutally oppressing its citizens and fomenting violence throughout the Middle East. We should encourage such rethinking by continuing to make it clear through the sanctions the President has imposed and other measures that we will not accept Iranian aggression against Americans or our allies.

IMPEACHMENT

Madam President, on an issue closer to home, at the end of last week, Speaker PELOSI announced that she was finally ready to send over the Articles of Impeachment—the next step in a saga that began 3 years ago. That is right, on January 20, 2017—Inauguration Day—the Washington Post ran an article entitled "The campaign to impeach President Trump has begun."

It is important that we not forget this. We need to remember how we got here. Democrats would like to think that this impeachment was the result of a high-minded, impartial, thoughtful procession. It wasn't. It was the result of a 3-year-long partisan crusade to damage or remove this President.

It is fair to say that the actual impeachment process was the most rushed, most biased, and least impartial impeachment process in history. For evidence, look no further than the Democrats' behavior in the wake of the impeachment vote.

Democrats rushed the Articles of Impeachment through the House because, we were told, it was urgent that the President be removed from office. One Democrat even said that the House was acting hastily because there was "a crime spree in progress." And then what did Democrats do? Instead of

sending the Articles of Impeachment over to the Senate so the Senate could conduct a trial, Speaker PELOSI and the House Democratic caucus sat on the articles for close to a month.

The delay was so flagrantly unjustified that even Senate Democrats started to express their impatience with the House. “If it’s serious and urgent, send them over.” That is a quote from the highest ranking Democrat on the Senate Judiciary Committee. She went on to say: “If it isn’t, don’t send it over.” A fair point. But House Democrats never really believed in the seriousness and urgency of the articles. If they had, they would have sent them over to the Senate immediately.

Of course, while Senate Democrats have gotten impatient with the House, Senate Democrats have also demonstrated a healthy dose of partisanship around the impeachment.

Senate Republicans have proposed modeling the rules for the first phase of this impeachment trial on the rules that governed the Clinton impeachment trial—rules that were agreed to unanimously by Democrats and Republicans at the time—but Senate Democrats are having none of it. These rules were eminently fair and, as I said, were supported by every single Democrat before President Clinton’s impeachment trial. These rules gave both sides—the House impeachment managers and the President and his team—an opportunity to make their case, and they gave Senators an opportunity to question both sides and only then make a determination as to whether additional information or witnesses were needed. These rules were good enough for Democrats and Republicans back then; they ought to be good enough for Democrats and Republicans today.

I am glad Speaker PELOSI is finally sending over the articles so we can move forward with this process and then get back to doing the work the American people sent us here to do, but I am saddened by the damage Democrats have done to the institution and the processes of government.

The overturning of an election—the overturning of the American people’s choice—is a very serious thing. It is a remedy to be wielded only with careful deliberation, in the most serious circumstances.

The Democrats have spent the past 3 years treating impeachment not as a remedy of last resort but as a way of overturning an election where they didn’t like the outcome. That is not what impeachment was intended to be. By hijacking the impeachment process for political purposes, Democrats have made it clear that they believe election outcomes don’t matter and that they believe it should be the Democratic Party, not the democratic process, that decides elections. And that is profoundly disturbing.

This fall, the American people will have a chance to render their verdict on the Trump Presidency. In fact, Presidential primary voting begins in just a

few short weeks. It is a great pity that Democrats have sought to preempt the next Presidential election with a partisan impeachment process in Washington, DC.

I hope we can move beyond this impeachment and the hyper-partisanship the Democrats have engaged in over the past 3 years. This institution should be in the business of governing, not endlessly trying to overturn an election. I hope in the future we can keep impeachment as a serious remedy for the most serious of crimes, not as a political weapon to be used whenever a partisan majority in Congress despises the occupant in the White House.

We will do our constitutional duty in the Senate over the next few weeks, and after that, I look forward to getting back to the business of the American people.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, the Senate as it is currently meeting is in the normal course of business, but in just a few days, this Senate Chamber will change. It will no longer be the Senate considering resolutions and legislation; it will be a Senate considering an impeachment proceeding. It will be a piece of history for those who watch. This will be only the third time in the history of the United States of America that the Senate will be convening for an impeachment proceeding relative to the President of the United States. It is a matter of the most serious constitutional gravity, and I hope all of us as Members of the Senate will consider it and approach it that way.

Under the Constitution, we have a unique role as Members of the Senate. We are the jurors; we are the jury. There are 100 Senators who will decide whether the Articles of Impeachment should be voted on and whether the impeachment of the President of the United States should proceed.

We are also in a unique role under the Constitution in that we aren’t just jurors sitting silently in the jury box. We are also judges in one respect. We set up the procedure, the way the trial moves forward.

Before I was elected to Congress, I used to practice trial law, and jurors had the ultimate word in terms of the fate of my clients, but the jurors didn’t decide the procedure of the trial. That was decided by a judge. When it comes to an impeachment proceeding under the Constitution, the actual process or the procedure of the impeachment trial is decided by the jurors, the Senators. It is very unusual, but it was a decision made by our Founding Fathers to put this ultimate test of impeachment in the hands of the Senators.

Why pick the Senate? It could have gone to the Supreme Court or some other tribunal. Alexander Hamilton said that there were two reasons they wanted to bring the impeachment trial to the floor of the Senate. He said that the Senators, by their nature and polit-

ical composition, would be “independent and dignified”—his words, “independent and dignified.” I hope he is right.

I was here 20 years ago during the Clinton impeachment trial, and I can remember very well how the temperament and mood and environment on the floor of the Senate changed when the impeachment proceedings began. There was the arrival of the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court in his judicial role to sit where the current Presiding Officer of the Senate is sitting and to preside over the trial. Instantly, when you walked into the Chamber and saw the Chief Justice, you knew this was different. This was a new challenge. This was being treated differently by the Constitution.

Then, of course, each of us, having been sworn in to be Senators representing the States that sent us, take a separate oath when it comes to our responsibilities under impeachment. That oath is fairly routine, but it includes one phrase that stands out when I read it. We swear that we will impart “impartial justice” as impeachment jurors—impartial justice. We hold up our hands and swear. We sign the book on the desk at the front of the Senate, as a matter of history, that we have made this oath for impartial justice. That is why I have been troubled, as we lead up to this impeachment proceeding, when I hear some of the statements and speeches that have been made on the floor of the Senate.

The Republican leader from Kentucky said very openly several weeks ago that he was going to work with the President’s defense team to prepare for how he would handle the impeachment proceedings in the Senate. I understand there are some elements of this that just make sense that there would be conversation with the managers of the impeachment as to the procedure to be followed. But what we have heard, even today, on the floor of the Senate is more than just cooperation in setting up the workings of the impeachment proceeding. What we have heard from the Republican majority leader is nothing short of an opening statement at a trial. He has come to the floor even today to question, challenge, diminish, even ridicule the entire impeachment proceeding. To me, that steps over a line—a line where we were sworn to show impartial justice in this proceeding. When the Senator from Kentucky comes to the floor and says, for example, that this is a hurried process, he raises the question as to whether the impeachment proceedings in the House were appropriate. He is correct when he says that the previous impeachments have had lengthy investigations leading up to them. In fact, one I recall before I was elected to Congress involving President Nixon went on for months on questions of the Watergate scandal, which was at the heart of the proposed Nixon impeachment. There were special prosecutors and investigators and people who worked

constantly for month after month after month before the Articles of Impeachment were being prepared. You may recall that President Nixon resigned before the actual impeachment proceeding.

But, then again, there was the Ken Starr investigation under President Clinton. It, too, went on for months with sworn testimony and depositions and videotaped proceedings of witnesses that led up to the impeachment.

This is different. The case is being brought to us by the House of Representatives for the impeachment of President Trump. It is true that in comparison it had a shorter investigative process, shorter than the two I just referenced. But it is also true that the second count of the Articles of Impeachment raises the question as to whether the President cooperated in providing witnesses and evidence that led to the Articles of Impeachment in the House, and that is one of the counts of impeachment against him—that he didn't participate and cooperate.

For the Senator from Kentucky to stand here and say that it should have been a lengthier proceeding in the House—there should have been more witnesses; there should have been more evidence—is to ignore the obvious. One of the counts of impeachment raises the question as to whether the President appropriately denied any cooperation with the House impeachment proceeding.

Secondly, the Senator from Kentucky comes to the floor and consistently says that the suggestion that we should allow witnesses and evidence to be considered is evidence of the weakness of the case coming out of the House of Representatives. Well, there aren't an exact number of parallels between ordinary civil and criminal litigation and impeachment proceedings, but in the world of law and trials, there is usually an opening pleading or proceeding through a grand jury that leads to charges against an individual. I have been through that many times on the civil side—rarely, but once in a while, on the criminal side. The trial itself takes that initial pleading, that initial statement of a case, and elaborates on it, opens up, brings in evidence and witnesses on both sides.

When we talk about witnesses and evidence coming before the Senate on any impeachment proceeding with President Trump, it isn't just on one side of the case. What we are suggesting is there should be witnesses from both sides. Let the President bring those who he believes can speak most convincingly to his innocence. Let the House managers supporting impeachment take the opposite position and find those witnesses who they think tell the story from their side of the case. That is the nature of a trial. The American people have seen it over and over again in their personal lives and in what they have witnessed on television and other places. Both sides

put on their best evidence, and, ultimately, the jury decides the truth of the matter. That is all the Democrats are asking for here.

We are asking that the impeachment proceeding witnesses be allowed on both sides, evidence be allowed on both sides, and, ultimately, as Senator SCHUMER said earlier, we get to the truth of the matter; we make our decision in the Senate; and the American people get to witness this democratic process.

Senator McCONNELL has said in many different places that he resists this idea of witnesses and evidence, but I hope he will reconsider. I hope at least four Republican Senators will reconsider—if they are in Senator McCONNELL's position—and opt, instead, for the historic precedent of witnesses and evidence at a trial.

The Senate will change this week. If you are witnessing it through C-SPAN or in the audience in the Galleries, you will notice it. First, the Senators will be on the floor of the Senate, which is rare, and second, with the Chief Justice presiding, there is a much different air in the proceedings and business of the Senate.

The final point I want to make is that I am troubled by the continued suggestion that the prospect of an impeachment trial is holding the Senate hostage, that we cannot consider serious legislation because of the possibility of an impeachment trial. It is true that once the trial starts, we devote ourselves to it. But that hasn't happened.

So how do the leaders of the Senate on the Republican side explain the year 2019? It was a unique year in the history of the Senate. It was unique for what we failed to do. During the course of the entire year, the Senate considered 22 amendments total. There were 22 amendments on the floor of the Senate. Six were offered by the junior Senator from Kentucky, all of which, I believe, failed. But there were 22 amendments in a year. I can tell you that it is not unusual if you look at the history of the Senate for us to consider 22 amendments in the course of a week, sometimes in the course of a day. But in the entire year, there were only 22 amendments. Why? Because Senator McCONNELL, who has the power under the Senate rules, decided there would be no business before the Senate but for the filling of judicial vacancies and other Executive appointments. That was it. A handful of other pieces of legislation were considered—the Defense authorization bill and, finally, a massive spending bill—but never with amendments. So to suggest that the impeachment trial has something to do with the inactivity in the Senate is to ignore the obvious.

Last year, before there were any Articles of Impeachment, Senator McCONNELL, under his leadership, called for virtually nothing to be debated and considered on the floor of the Senate. I have said this before, and I stand by it.

This is a Senate Chamber, but too many days, in too many respects, it is a storage facility. We are storing the desks of the Senate, once occupied by Senators who came here to work. They offered bills, offered amendments, had real debates and votes. We look at these desks and say: Boy, it must have been a great day in the Senate when you actually did that.

For the Republicans to blame the impeachment process for the inactivity of last year defies common sense. For that reason, I hope that when the impeachment trial ends, Senator McCONNELL of Kentucky, the Republican majority leader, will consider at least 1 of the more than 200 bills that the Democratic House of Representatives has sent us to consider—bills relating to healthcare, bills relating to the price of prescription drugs, bills relating to student loans, bills relating to immigration. They are all sitting somewhere in a file cabinet and a computer somewhere in Senator McCONNELL's office. Maybe we can be the Senate after the impeachment trial. It is in the hands of Senator McCONNELL to make that decision.

WAR POWERS RESOLUTION

Madam President, let me speak to an issue that has been raised this morning, which is timely and critically important. The President tweeted last week to the country: "All is well." As we were teetering on the verge of war with Iran, he tweeted: "All is well."

But now details have come to light, and it is clear that all is not well. U.S. servicemembers of Ain Al-Asad Air Base in Iraq faced a sustained hour and a half of Iranian retaliatory attacks last week—a barrage described by one of the most senior commanders on the base as "designed and organized to inflict as many casualties as possible." Contrary to the tweet by our President that all is well, reports from witnesses suggest that despite heroic planning, we were, in fact, very fortunate—if not lucky—that none of our U.S. personnel were killed.

This gets me to the issue that needs to be brought before the Senate, one that goes to the heart of this Senate's critical, often neglected, constitutional responsibility. It is not whether Iranian General Soleimani was an enemy with American blood on his hands—that is a fact—but it is too simplistic to stop there. We have known that fact for a long time. Previous Presidents of both political parties have known General Soleimani's background—it is not in dispute—but it is a distraction to stop with that conversation.

The real question is whether President Trump, when he made the decision to target General Soleimani, considered the possibility that it would quickly escalate into a much larger confrontation with Iran, which is the possibility of a war—a distinct possibility and one never authorized by Congress.

Based on the administration's briefing last week, which I sat through, I

doubt if even they think they need congressional authorization to ask our sons and daughters, grandsons and granddaughters to participate in another war in the Middle East. The first question asked by Senator MCCONNELL at the briefing, which was attended by the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, was whether there was a need for authorization under the War Powers Act before the United States continued to have its conflict with Iran. The answer that came from the Secretary of Defense was that there was no authorization necessary. He went on to say that he thought even the debate over authorization could be unsettling and troublesome for our troops if it appeared that we were uncertain as to whether we were ready to go to war.

Based on that briefing, I doubt this administration believes any congressional authorization is needed for the military action that has been taken or that might even be contemplated. Quite simply, the fact that the Senate has not exercised its constitutional right, authority, and responsibility to determine whether we should go to war with Iran troubles me. I am deeply concerned that if Iran retaliates further or if the President decides to escalate the confrontation, this Chamber will not even recognize—let alone act on—its constitutional responsibility under Article I, Section 8.

That is why I have joined my colleague and friend Senator TIM Kaine, of Virginia, in invoking the War Powers Act—a law passed over President Nixon's veto after Presidents of both parties deliberately misled the American people on the Vietnam war. It is hard for those who did not live during that era to appreciate what that war did to this Nation. First and foremost, it cost us almost 50,000 American lives, and hundreds of thousands of Americans were injured—men and women in uniform who bravely served our country. They gave their lives and came home with the scars they carried for their lifetimes. The billions of dollars that were spent and our involvement in that war, which divided this country at its core, are hard to put into words in just a few moments.

At the end of it, though, Congress realized that it had failed in its own responsibility to even declare a war against Vietnam. So we passed the War Powers Act and set up a process that said we are not going to let that happen again, that the American people will participate in any future decisions about whether we go to war, and that they will do it through their elected Congressmen and elected Senators.

The War Powers Act passed the Congress, and it was sent to President Nixon. He vetoed it and said we didn't want to give that additional authority to Congress. Then, in a rare, rare moment, Congress overrode President Nixon's veto, and the War Powers Act became the law of the land. That War

Powers Act, I believe, applies to the current situation that is escalating with Iran. That is why I have joined with Senator Kaine in his invoking the War Powers Resolution.

What I find particularly troubling about the administration's march to war in Iran is that the administration's own actions have contributed to the current tensions and problems we have with Iran. Before taking office, Iran's nuclear weapons program was halted because of an historic agreement President Obama negotiated. In cooperation with our allies in Europe, as well as with China and Russia, President Obama negotiated a treaty that required international inspectors to be on the ground in Iran to make certain that Iran lived up to its terms. Of course, Iran was not happy about these inspectors, but it accepted them. On several different occasions, we had representatives of those inspectors come and say, yes, that they had had virtually unlimited access to Iran in order to make certain Iran didn't violate the nuclear agreement. Iran continued in its malign behaviors in the region, but containment was easier without the threat of an Iranian nuclear bomb.

During the campaign, President Trump said the first thing he would do would be to eliminate that international agreement that required international inspectors, which is what stopped Iran from developing a nuclear weapon. It made no sense for the President to take the position that he did, but that is the position that he announced during the campaign, and that is exactly what he did after he was elected President. He withdrew the United States from this agreement that stopped Iran from developing a nuclear weapon. Then he increased sanctions on Iran, and the tensions between our countries grew.

The President pursued a policy of regime change that is very difficult to explain, if not to justify—trying to flatter on one day and to confront on the next day. He proposed to meet with President Rouhani, of Iran, to negotiate a supposedly bigger deal, a better deal. Then he threatened Iran militarily and tightened sanctions soon after. These efforts went nowhere except to increase tensions between the United States and Iran. Iran lashed out on American interests. We were alienated from many of our allies, particularly those who were party to the nuclear agreement, and Iran inched closer to restarting its nuclear program.

In recent weeks alone, President Trump has managed to reverse the recent Iraqi protest settlement that warned Iran to stop meddling in its particular politics, which has led to the real possibility that American troops in Iraq that are critical to countering ISIS will be expelled.

Similarly, after months of anti-government protests in Iran, President Trump has almost instantaneously united the Iranian public opinion against us with the targeting of Gen-

eral Soleimani. Iran has now announced it will exceed the limits of the nuclear program that were imposed by the nuclear agreement, from which President Trump walked away, and our interests around the region are on high alert for fear of a retaliatory attack by the Iranians.

So there are real questions as to how President Trump's Iran policy serves long-term American security interests and as to whether this body is ready to at least debate the possibility of another war with Iran.

Before President Trump plunges us into another reckless Middle East war, shouldn't we first remember how we were fooled into invading Iraq in the first place? I remember full well.

I was a Member of the Senate when we were given the proposal of taking military action against Iraq because of its purported possession of these military devices that were threatening to the United States and to the region. Many of us were skeptical. The weapons of mass destruction charge didn't have the evidence that we thought was convincing. In the end, 23 Senators—22 Democrats and 1 Republican—joined in voting against the invasion of Iraq. I was one of those Senators. I was not convinced there were weapons of mass destruction. After the invasion and after careful inspection, it turned out that there were no weapons of mass destruction—the single event that really brought us into the conflict.

Then, as now, we were led to believe there was an urgent spiraling of events that required U.S. military intervention. Mark me down as skeptical—skeptical as to whether another invasion by the United States of a Muslim nation in the Middle East is in the best interest of national security.

Many around President Trump, particularly Secretary of State Pompeo, have been speaking of this conflict with Iraq for a long period of time. Some of them are the same people who endorsed the invasion of Iraq almost 20 years ago. We are still in Iraq. We have given up more than 5,000 American lives, with many having been injured and with \$1 trillion or more having been spent.

It is possible the Iraqis will just ask us to leave. Think of that. After all that we have put into their country, their legislature—their Parliament—voted several weeks ago to tell us to leave. In fact, one of the great tragedies of the Iraq war and one that few of its architects ever owned up to was that the Iraq war was actually empowering Iran in the region. Iran became a potent force because, in many respects, in its efforts in the Middle East, the United States created that opportunity.

These same unrepentant voices are again beating the drums for regime change in Iran and another war in the Middle East. They do so with a President who has made more than 15,000 false or misleading statements while he has been in office—15,000—with his

even going so far as to trust Vladimir Putin, the leader of Russia, over our own intelligence sources, making it impossible to trust anything he says when it comes to matters as grave as war.

Some have even had the audacity to argue that the 2001 authorization for use of military force in Iraq is somehow a permission slip for the invasion of Iran. That is preposterous. I cannot imagine anyone here who took that vote 18 years ago thought that he was authorizing for future Presidents 18 years later to invade another country in the Middle East. I certainly didn't. The Constitution is clear. Article I, section 8 says the power to declare war is an explicit power of Congress, as it should be. One should never send our sons and daughters into war without having the knowledge and consent of the American people. Our Founding Fathers were wise in making sure this awesome power did not rest with a King or a Queen or anyone pretending to be but with the people of the United States and their elected Representatives.

I have made this same argument and much of the same speech in the past regardless of whether the occupant of the White House was a Democrat or a Republican. This Congress, already afraid to stand up to many of President Trump's worst instincts, must not do so in a march to another war in the Middle East. As such, I urge my colleagues here to do our job and reaffirm the Senate's constitutional role in matters of war.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCOTT of Florida). The Senator from Texas.

IMPEACHMENT

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, on January 20, 2017, at 12:19 p.m., the Washington Post ran a story with this headline: "The campaign to impeach President Trump has begun." Donald Trump had been President for only 19 minutes when that headline ran.

As we have since learned, it has been made abundantly clear that many of our Democratic colleagues simply don't recognize the President as having been legitimately elected, and they have been doing everything they can to remove him from office since he was first elected in 2016.

This has now taken a new form, that of impeachment—an impeachment that occurred 27 days ago when the House voted for two Articles of Impeachment. Their impeachment inquiry lasted 12 weeks, but it became clear that Speaker PELOSI and Chairman SCHIFF and Chairman NADLER were in a big hurry to get those Articles of Impeachment voted out of the House before the holidays. In the end, only the Democrats voted for these partisan Articles of Impeachment. Then the Speaker and the Democrats in the House declared victory.

That is when the breakneck pace of the impeachment process came to a

screeching halt. It appears Speaker PELOSI got cold feet when she realized the President would be afforded a fair trial in the Senate. That was not good enough for her. When we offered President Trump the same terms that President Clinton received during his trial, that wasn't good enough for Speaker PELOSI, for she wanted guarantees from the Senate. The Speaker of the House flatly refused to send the Articles of Impeachment to the Senate in order for her to somehow gain leverage over Senate trial procedures—a responsibility that falls far outside her job description. She was seeking assurances from the majority leader that he would redo the House's shoddy investigative work—something that is not part of our job description under the Constitution.

After weeks of holding the articles hostage with nothing to show for it, the Speaker has, apparently, finally caved. In holding the articles, she managed to accomplish something all too uncommon these days: she brought together Republicans and Democrats from both Chambers. Unfortunately, for the Speaker, this bipartisan, bicameral chorus of voices stood in firm opposition to her decision to withhold the articles.

Last week, she finally announced that she would be sending over the articles this week, and it now looks like a vote is scheduled for Wednesday, tomorrow, where impeachment managers will be identified, and the process of sending it to the Senate will begin in earnest. In a letter to her House colleagues on Friday, Speaker PELOSI indicated she would be sending the articles this week, and it looks like we are rapidly closing on the start of that trial.

As the majority leader has made clear from the beginning, this should be a far cry from the partisan impeachment process we saw in the House. We simply don't want to repeat the circuslike, partisan rush to impeachment that we saw in the House. Our responsibilities as Senators is to sit as a court—literally, as a jury—to consider the case that is being presented by the impeachment managers in the House as well as the President's lawyers.

Despite the Speaker's insistence, we, the Senate—the jury—are not going to be handpicking the witnesses before the trial begins. In no courtroom in America does the jury decide how the case before them will be tried. That is decided by the parties to the lawsuit, whether it is the prosecution in the case of a criminal case and the defense lawyer or the plaintiff and defense counsel in a civil case. The jury's job is to sit and listen and to weigh the evidence and to reach a verdict.

The Senate will—instead of the process Speaker PELOSI is advocating for—follow the only modern precedent we have, and that is the Clinton impeachment trial. If it was good enough for President Clinton, it is good enough for President Trump. We are going to fol-

low that precedent and provide for some order and fairness in the process and, again, not repeat the circus we saw in the House.

Just as we did in 1999, in the Clinton impeachment, we will begin with opening arguments. The impeachment managers, Speaker PELOSI's lawyers, will come over and present their case and argue their case. Then we will turn to the President's lawyers who will have a chance to respond. They can refer to some of the testimony of the 17 witnesses who testified during the House impeachment inquiry. They could offer additional evidence for the Senate to consider.

This is not a question of witnesses or no witnesses. That is a blatant misrepresentation by those who are trying to somehow work the public's understanding of exactly how this will proceed. As in the Clinton impeachment trial, all 100 Senators will have an opportunity to hear the case from both sides before making a decision whether we, the jury, want to have additional witnesses presented. That is what happened in the Clinton case, and that is what should happen with President Trump.

We will have an opportunity to ask written questions, which will be transmitted to the Chief Justice, who will then put those questions to the lawyers representing the impeachment managers and the President. Then we will be able to get information from them based on those questions.

The more I thought about it—ordinarily, in a trial you would have disputed facts, and then you would have the law applied to the facts as found by the jury, but the more and more I have heard about this impeachment inquiry, the more and more I am inclined to believe that the facts are not disputed. If the facts are not really disputed, why would you need additional witnesses?

There are people with opinions, there are people who draw inferences, and there are people who draw their own conclusions, but in the end, that is our job, not the witnesses' job. The witnesses' job is to provide the facts, should they be disputed, and it is our job then to decide whether this meets the constitutional standard of treason, bribery, or high crimes and misdemeanors.

What I find so amazing about these impeachment articles is neither one of them claim that President Trump committed a crime. Unlike the Clinton impeachment, where he was charged with perjury—with lying under oath—President Trump is not charged with any crime.

In the first Article of Impeachment, basically, what we have is a disagreement in the way in which the President handled aid voted by Congress that would then be given to the Government of the Ukraine. That is what this impeachment is about. This is not about high crimes and misdemeanors.

This is about political differences. This is about stylistic differences. This

is where diplomats and others disagree with the way the President handled himself. Well, fair enough, you are entitled to your opinion, but that doesn't make impeachment the appropriate remedy.

Here we are 11 months more or less until the next general election. I, for one, think it is dangerous to have 535 Members of Congress essentially be asked to convict and remove a President 11 months before the next general election; in other words, to substitute our views with those of the voters, the American people. I think that is very dangerous. If it succeeds here, I guarantee this will not be the last time.

Unfortunately, the House has normalized this concept of impeachment essentially for political differences. That is a dangerous concept, and it would be a dangerous precedent if we were to accept it.

This is the third time in American history—the history of our entire country—where this process will go forward in the Senate. We need to be very careful, very sober, very serious, and very deliberate in how we conduct ourselves and how we conduct this trial.

Unfortunately, Speaker PELOSI has violated her own admonition when, in March of 2019, she said that impeachment is too divisive, and it is just not worth it unless it is bipartisan, unless it is compelling. Well, this impeachment is neither bipartisan nor compelling. Speaker PELOSI apparently got stampeded by the more radical members of her caucus into this position, which now she is trying to find some face-saving way out. That is what this is about.

In the end, we know the politics, unfortunately, will continue in the Senate. We know that under the present circumstances, it is highly unlikely that 67 Senators, based on the record we know now, would vote to convict and remove the President. So what is all this posturing and grandstanding about with regard to witnesses or no witnesses—which I said earlier is a false choice. There will be witnesses, and there will be evidence. We are going to let the parties present it, and we are going to listen and make a decision.

This is about the Democratic leader trying to put incumbent Senators who are on the ballot in 2020 in a tough position. That is what this is all about.

In the end, this is not about President Trump. This is about who is going to maintain the majority in the Senate—whether Republicans will or whether the Democratic leader will accomplish his life's dream and become the next majority leader. That is what this is about.

Well, unfortunately, the Speaker's senseless delay tactics have robbed us all of the valuable time that we could have spent conducting this trial and moving on to more constructive business. We are waiting for the Speaker to deliver the articles, but in the meantime we are not sitting around twiddling our thumbs.

UNITED STATES-MEXICO-CANADA TRADE
AGREEMENT

Mr. President, last week, the Senate Finance Committee overwhelmingly passed the U.S.-Mexico-Canada trade agreement, which will replace NAFTA and guide our trade with Mexico and Canada into the future. This is a big deal for Texas and a big deal for the country. About 13 million jobs depend on trade between Mexico, Canada, and the United States.

We waited a long time for the opportunity to take up the USMCA. The heads of all three countries initially signed the deal back in November of 2019, and for over a year this is another example of the House foot-dragging.

At several points, we were left wondering whether the Speaker would intentionally blow up the trade deal over their own political motivations, but fortunately that didn't happen. We had a long delay, but we are finally to the point where the Senate can take up and pass the USMCA now that the House acted just before Christmas. This week, several Senate committees will review various portions of the agreement, and I hope we can actually get this trade agreement approved before we go to the impeachment trial. We will have the War Powers Resolution, which is privileged, and so that will come first, but hopefully there will be an opportunity to pass the USMCA before we go to this impeachment trial.

I have heard from countless of my constituents whose livelihoods depend on strong international trade, particularly with our southern neighbor, and they are eager to see this USMCA put to bed. It is frustrating that this process has already been prolonged and uncertainty has prevailed and kept farmers, ranchers, and manufacturers waiting for months on end, not knowing what ultimately would happen with the USMCA.

So I am ready for the Speaker to deliver her promise and finally transmit the Articles of Impeachment to the Senate so we can conduct that sober, deliberate trial according to the Constitution and then move on from these partisan games and get back to the work we were sent here to do.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to finish my remarks before the vote is called. I don't anticipate I will take very long.

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

NOMINATION OF PETER GAYNOR

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I rise to support the nomination of Peter T. Gaynor to be the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency, FEMA.

I have known and worked with Pete Gaynor for over a decade. Before taking over as FEMA Deputy Administrator in 2018 and becoming the Acting Administrator in 2019, Pete was the

emergency management director for the city of Providence and then the State of Rhode Island.

As a U.S. marine, he was on duty near the Pentagon on September 11, 2001, and helped direct important aspects of the response and recovery efforts in the days and weeks that followed. Later, he went on to serve in U.S. operations in Iraq before returning home to Rhode Island.

As EMA, emergency management agency director in Rhode Island, Pete led the response to federally declared disasters in our State and worked to successfully earn national emergency management accreditation for both the Providence and Rhode Island emergency management agencies. I know he will tap this full experience to serve the American people as FEMA Administrator, and FEMA needs solid leadership.

Indeed, as the flagship Federal Agency for disaster preparedness and response, FEMA faces extraordinary challenges, confronting the very real effects of climate-related disasters, reforming the National Flood Insurance Program, administering critical grant programs, and helping ready the Nation for possible chemical, biological, and radiological attacks.

Make no mistake, I have deep concerns about many aspects of the administration's approach to disaster recovery. Puerto Rico is a case in point. Now it is facing new challenges. As ranking member of the Transportation-HUD Appropriations Subcommittee, I have been dismayed by the Department of Housing and Urban Development's slow-walking of billions of dollars of disaster recovery assistance for Puerto Rico.

As the lead Agency for disaster response and recovery, FEMA must set the standard for professionalism and compassion for people and communities going through the worst experience of their lives. It is my expectation and my confidence that Peter Gaynor will work to make sure it happens.

I urge my colleagues to join me in voting to confirm him.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the pending nomination of Peter Gaynor to be the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays are ordered.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Gaynor nomination?

The yeas and nays were previously ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER),

the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE), the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. JOHNSON), and the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. JOHNSON) would have voted “yea.”

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) are necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 81, nays 8, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 12 Ex.]

YEAS—81

Alexander	Feinstein	Peters
Baldwin	Fischer	Portman
Barrasso	Gardner	Reed
Bennet	Graham	Risch
Blackburn	Grassley	Roberts
Blumenthal	Hassan	Romney
Blunt	Hawley	Rosen
Boozman	Heinrich	Rounds
Braun	Hirono	Rubio
Burr	Hoeven	Sasse
Cantwell	Hyde-Smith	Schatz
Capito	Jones	Scott (FL)
Cardin	Kaine	Scott (SC)
Carper	King	Shaheen
Casey	Lankford	Shelby
Collins	Leahy	Sinema
Coons	Lee	Smith
Cornyn	Loeffler	Sullivan
Cortez Masto	Manchin	Tester
Cotton	McConnell	Thune
Crapo	McSally	Tillis
Cruz	Merkley	Toomey
Daines	Moran	Warner
Duckworth	Murkowski	Whitehouse
Durbin	Murray	Wicker
Enzi	Paul	Wyden
Ernst	Perdue	Young

NAYS—8

Brown	Menendez	Udall
Gillibrand	Schumer	Van Hollen
Harris	Stabenow	

NOT VOTING—11

Booker	Johnson	Murphy
Cassidy	Kennedy	Sanders
Cramer	Klobuchar	Warren
Inhofe	Markley	

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's actions.

The majority whip.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to legislative session and be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

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

RECESS

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:04 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mrs. CAPITO).

MORNING BUSINESS—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

WAR POWERS RESOLUTION

Mr. COTTON. Madam President, in the next few days, Senate Democrats will move to discharge a War Powers Resolution to tie the President's hands in defending this Nation against Iran and terrorist masterminds like Qasem Soleimani. Let's think about how we got here and the implications of this reckless action.

Qasem Soleimani has the blood of thousands of Americans on his hands and hundreds of thousands of innocent souls across the Middle East. For more than 20 years, he was the Supreme Leader's most trusted lieutenant, Iran's terror mastermind, and the man responsible for the deaths of hundreds of American soldiers in Iraq and Afghanistan by supplying the most deadly kinds of roadside bombs soldiers ever faced. He and his proxies and Iranian leaders like him are responsible for bombings of our Embassies in places like Lebanon and Kuwait. They are, in no small part, responsible for the ongoing horror of the Syrian civil war, for the civil war in Yemen. There is no doubt, based on the intelligence we have and this bloodthirsty past, that Qasem Soleimani was in Baghdad on January 2 to plot something very dangerous and very big that was going to target Americans once again.

We should all be thankful that Qasem Soleimani no longer walks the Earth, and we should be proud of the troops who executed that mission. The world is a safer place and America is a safer nation because of it. The people of Iran have been given a voice against the man who was responsible for mowing them down in protests over the years and whose death they have been out on the streets celebrating even though they risk being mowed down by their own security forces once again.

Yet, over the last 2 weeks, the Democrats have been able to do nothing but express their regret for the President's decision to eliminate Qasem Soleimani. And make no mistake—this War Powers Resolution is not about the future; it is about delivering an implicit or, if you listen to their words and don't just read the resolution, an explicit rebuke to the President for ordering the killing of Qasem Soleimani. They certainly want to prevent the President from doing anything like that in the future. That is why they have introduced this War Powers Resolution.

We should always remind ourselves when we are having a war powers debate, as we do from time to time, the War Powers Resolution is unconstitutional. It was passed by a liberal Congress in 1973 at the height of Watergate, and not a single President since then has acknowledged its constitutionality—not a single one, to include all the Democrats.

I hear a lot about the Constitution these days and reclaiming our authority to declare war and to constrain the Executive. I guess all those constitutional experts missed the Federalist Papers and their authoritative explanation of the Constitution and why we have the government we do. We have a House of Representatives with 435 people to be the institution that is most closely tied to popular opinion. We have a Senate to act as the cool and deliberate sense of community. And we have a single President—a single President—to act on behalf of the entire Nation in moments of peril.

Federalist 70, if they would just open up that authoritative explanation of the Constitution, says why there is one President, not a council of two or three or four, as some of the States had at the time of the founding. Because of the division of opinion and perspective and temperament that an executive council would have, there is one President—one President—who can act, as Federalist 70 said, with energy and dispatch and, yes, in some occasions, with secrecy. So if the Founders didn't think we should have an executive council of 3 or 4 or 5 people, imagine what they would have thought about 535 commanders in chief making operational decisions about when to take action on the battlefield.

These debates about War Powers Resolutions are really about how many lawyers and armchair rangers can dance on the head of a pin. Do you think wars and battles are won with paper resolutions? Those wars and battles are won with iron resolution. Do you think the ayatollahs are intimidated by “whereas” clauses and joint resolutions? The ayatollahs are intimidated, deterred, and scared when we incinerate their terror mastermind and we tell them that we will do it again if they harm another American.

Even if you grant the War Powers Resolution constitutional, look at the actual text of this resolution. It makes no exception for Iran developing a nuclear weapon. The ayatollahs could hold a press conference tomorrow or the Supreme Leader could tweet that they are going to rush to a nuclear breakout. The President would have to come to Congress if he would want to take any kind of action to deter it. It makes no exception for designated terrorist organizations and individuals, like the Iranian Revolutionary Guard Corps and its Quds Force, who have killed so many Americans and continue to target them today. It makes no exception for attacks on our allies in the Middle East, nations like Israel.

The sponsor of this resolution will say: Oh, it makes an exception for imminent attacks.

We have seen what that gets us over the last couple of weeks—again, lawyers and armchair rangers arguing about the meaning of “imminence.” Well, I have to say that whether an attack is imminent looks pretty different if you are a soldier on patrol in Iraq than if you are a comfortable Senator sitting behind secure walls and armed guards.

None of this means Congress has no role in matters of life and death on the battlefield. It is very far from it, in fact, and I will take a back seat to no one in asserting that constitutional authority. I would remind my colleagues that when we had an opportunity to insist that Barack Obama’s nuclear deal with Iran be submitted to this Chamber as a treaty, there was one Senator who voted to insist on that—only one. This guy. Ninety-eight other Senators were perfectly willing to create some made-up, phony-baloney procedure that allowed Barack Obama to submit a nuclear arms agreement with a sworn and mortal enemy that chants “Death to America” and put it into effect with a large majority opposed to him, as opposed to the two-thirds majority that our Constitution requires for treaties.

We do have a tremendous degree of constitutional authority in the Congress. We regulate interstate commerce, which means sanctions. We confirm Ambassadors. We confirm the President’s Cabinet. We declare war, which we have done only a few times in our past despite hundreds of instances of introducing troops. But most importantly, and the way to constrain the Executive if this Congress thinks he should be constrained in a particular case, we have the spending power—in particular, the spending power for our Armed Forces. That is the way the Congress—any Congress with any President—can control the use of the Armed Forces by the President. It is something this Congress has done a lot in the past. We did it in Vietnam, did it in Nicaragua, and did it in Somalia.

There were plenty of times where the President has acted in some ways in a much more aggressive and far-reaching fashion than President Trump did just a couple weeks ago—the first Taiwan Strait crisis, Granada in 1983, Libya in 1986, and Iran in 1988. I would even say Libya again in 2011, although most of my Democratic colleagues like to send that down the memory hole since it was a Democratic President.

So I would simply say that if you disagree with the President’s decision to kill the world’s most sadistic, blood-thirsty, terrorist mastermind and you want to stop him from doing so again, file your bill to prohibit the use of any taxpayer funds for such operations. It is very simple. It is one page. I will help you write it, if you need help—one page: No funds will be used to support operations by the Armed Forces against the Government of Iran or any

of its officials. Do it. Have the courage of your convictions.

Why are we not seeing that bill? Because it failed just last year. All of these same politicians offered language on our annual Defense bill to try to prohibit the use of any funds in operations like we just saw, and it failed. We passed a defense bill, as we always do, by overwhelming majorities, which means they don’t have the votes because they know their position is not popular with the American people. Not surprisingly, the American people don’t want their elected leaders to act as lawyers for the ayatollahs.

So if you are not going to act in what is our true constitutional power, spare us the unconstitutional and dangerous War Powers Resolutions and simply let the people who are serious about our national security—from troops on up to the top—do what is necessary to keep this country safe.

Madam President, 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. BARRASSO. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

UNITED STATES-MEXICO-CANADA TRADE AGREEMENT

Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, I come to the floor today to mark another major milestone for the landmark U.S.-Mexico-Canada Trade Agreement. This morning, Madam President, with you in the committee in voting, the Environment and Public Works Committee overwhelmingly passed the USMCA. With the approval of our committee, the USMCA is now one step closer to final passage in the Senate.

We all know that it isn’t perfect, but, still, it is an important deal that benefits all Americans. Passing this deal provides much needed certainty for America’s manufacturers. Our ranchers and our farmers—certainly, in Wyoming but across the breadbasket of the country and the Rocky Mountain West—are counting on it as well.

Americans have waited patiently now for over a year. Speaker PELOSI was the roadblock and held this hostage for an extended period of time. She finally allowed the House to vote on it. Now the Senate is working to move this critical piece of legislation forward and to the President.

Passing USMCA will start the next chapter in the American economic success story. The deal is going to increase our gross domestic product by \$70 billion. Above all, it is a win for American workers. It is going to create 180,000 U.S. jobs, and you know that is just the start. Already, our strong, healthy, and growing economy has been setting records across the board.

It is thanks to Republican pro-growth policies. That is what we look to and point to when we take a look at the record job growth we have had since President Trump has taken office.

In just 3 years, we have created over 7 million new jobs in America. The unemployment rate is at a 50-year low. It is astonishing. Wage growth is the fastest it has been in a decade, especially benefiting lower income workers. Everyone is better off with this growing economy. There is still some untapped potential, and we need to unlock it now.

My home State of Wyoming is poised to reap huge benefits not only from USMCA; our State has much to gain from new trade agreements with China and with Japan as well. The China trade agreement is scheduled to be signed tomorrow and Japan on January 1. Together, these America-first trade deals mean expanded access to export markets. Wyoming farmers and ranchers are very eager to seize these opportunities for future growth.

I would just say, as I conclude, that here is the bottom line. Passing USMCA means more jobs, and it means economic growth. It means more certainty and more stability for our job creators. It means more opportunity and more prosperity for America’s working families. That is the real measure of this. It is time now for the Senate to pass the USMCA.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

FREEDOM PROTESTS

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam President, we are in the wake of another global event or happening, if you will. No matter what it is, we always have people who come in on the back side and, as I say, are a bunch of armchair quarterbacks and Monday morning quarterbacks, and they are trying to put their spin on what should have been done and what wasn’t done. I think that is probably a pretty good analogy when we think about the football game that took place last night.

What ought to be a serious discussion about national security or human rights inevitably devolves into a political argument about who should be allowed to score the most points off the blood and bravery of people who are fighting half a world away. Here is a suggestion for each of us: In times of conflict or unrest, instead of looking to the pundits and listening to a lot of pundits, why don’t we look to the people themselves who are involved in these conflicts?

After the U.S. strike that took out Qasem Soleimani, armchair quarterbacks calling plays for the left picked up on what the propaganda arm of the Iranian regime was selling. Bear in mind, I just said the propaganda arm. After Tehran downed its own jet though, shouldn’t the conversation have pivoted to the outraged protests

not against Americans but against the Iranian Government? After all, those protests were fueled not by the act of one man but by months of domestic turmoil and decades of brutal repression by the Iranian regime against the people of Iran. Of course, it didn't pivot. The false narrative of the mad American President prevailed, even as the people of Iran railed against the brutality of the ayatollahs and the inexplicable recklessness of their own military. They were saying one thing, and the media said something else.

In a stunning display of bravery, the people of Iran risked their lives—yes, they are risking their lives. In November, 304 got shot taking to the streets. The Revolutionary Guard brought about by Soleimani were shooting this week at people who were protesting and begging—begging for a little bit of freedom. It is amazing to me that it doesn't get acknowledged.

The decisive elimination of Soleimani exposed the regime's extreme vulnerability on the global stage, and I think the ayatollahs in Iran know this. This is why we saw them respond with threats against America at large. It is why they strong-armed the Iraqi Parliament into its foolish stand against American troops, why they arrested the United Kingdom's Ambassador for attending a peace vigil, and why they violently retaliated against civilian speech. They know they are losing this argument. Tehran failed at silencing dissent. Their goal is to convince the rest of the world to ignore the protests of the Iranian people.

Authoritarianism is not bound to one particular region or ideology. As we saw last year, the repressive behavior of Communist China backfired on officials in Beijing. In their case, there wasn't an airstrike or an incursion. There was just a simple but disastrous piece of legislation that would have jeopardized the already-strangled human rights of every citizen in Hong Kong—not just a few but everybody, blanket coverage. Don't be caught speaking out against China and against Beijing.

The fallout from that violation is now legendary. Millions took to the streets on behalf of democracy and self-determination and turned Beijing's agenda on its head. Their protests captured the attention of the entire world and inspired others struggling to survive under Communist rule to speak up.

This past Saturday, the people of Taiwan poured some additional salt on Beijing's wounds by delivering a stunning electoral rebuke against the Communist Party. Taiwanese citizens cast a record number of ballots, pulling the pro-democracy ruling party out of a 2-year skid and validating President Tsai's embrace of anti-Beijing protesters in East Asia. Let me tell you, China knows exactly who is to blame for this, but in official statements they are writing off the results of the elec-

tion as a mere fluke, and they are blaming—get this—foreign interference for their humiliation. They couldn't possibly be responsible for this.

I have to tell you, the election may be over, but you can count on China to find other ways to coerce Taipei into submission. They will likely continue to pressure Taiwanese businessmen and workers living on the mainland to toe the party line and engage in more military drills around Taiwan, with the goal of muscling away diplomatic support. It is all part of their playbook.

Threats gilded in official policy are standard operating procedure for authoritarian regimes, but overt crackdowns on dissent still loom large over the heads of their people. Last December, China threatened to sanction the non-governmental organizations that backed pro-democracy legislation in Hong Kong. On Sunday, they suddenly refused entry to activists from Human Rights Watch without even pretending to provide a plausible explanation. Imagine that. They have moved so far in repression, they wouldn't even let Human Rights Watch in the country to see what it is that they are doing to their people.

Make no mistake, regimes like those in China or Iran are vicious and powerful, but right now, they are running on nothing but fear of their very own people, their own citizens. The fear is what drives them to repression, abuse, and murder, but time and again they forget that someone is always watching. The same technology that allows them to spy on and manipulate their adversaries allows freedom fighters to tweet, to live stream, and broadcast some of these crimes that are being committed by these oppressive regimes.

The people of Iran and China have flung themselves onto the frontline of a global fight for individual rights and individual freedom, but don't neglect those risking life and limb in places like Lebanon, where peaceful opposition to authorities is labeled as criminal defamation—imagine that, criminal defamation if you peacefully oppose the authorities—or in Morocco, where journalists have been jailed with impunity for unveiling corruption. You find corruption, you report it in the press, and they lock you up for telling the truth—or Burma or India or Algeria. There are dozens more examples.

If you want to understand what is happening, look to the people. Listen to them and pay attention to their history as they seek to write their future.

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. BARRASSO. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. BLACKBURN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that I be al-

lowed to engage in a colloquy with my friend and colleague, the Senator from Wyoming, Mr. ENZI.

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

REMEMBERING JERALYN JOY
“JERRY” BROWN

Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, we have here a picture of Jerry Brown—Jeralyn Joy Brown—age 89, who passed away peacefully on Wednesday, January 8, 2020, at the Hot Springs County Memorial Hospital in Thermopolis, WY. She was surrounded by her loving family.

For many years, Jerry was a dominant force in Wyoming. For the last 12 years, she was the single most influential voice with the Wyoming Senate delegation. She is my wife Bobbi's mom. Yet Senator ENZI knew her long before I did.

Senator ENZI.

Mr. ENZI. I thank the Senator.

I got to meet this delightful lady in Thermopolis, WY, some 70 years ago. I need to tell you a little bit about Thermopolis, WY, and how I wound up there.

During the war, my dad was a welder on ships, and after the war, he moved around the country doing different welding projects, one of which took him to Thermopolis, WY. He welded on the dam there. Dams in the West are used to control floods. They are big projects, and they have a huge impact on communities. This particular one not only controlled floods, but it turned into a great fishery.

My folks went to Thermopolis, WY, and they also built a trailer park. It was the first modern trailer park in Thermopolis. By “modern,” I mean there was a central building that had indoor showers and flush toilets.

You need to understand a little bit about Wyoming. We are small. At that time, there were two cities in Wyoming. To be a city, you had to have more than 3,000 in population. As soon as you had 3,000 in population, you could declare yourself a first-class city. In those early days, Casper—the energy capital at that time—and Cheyenne—the State capital at that time—exceeded 3,000.

What effect did that have on the communities? The Presbyterians, the Methodists, and the Congregationalists got together and divided up the towns that were small, realizing that they couldn't support all three churches. There was one town that was so small that they actually got together and formed a community church.

What is a community church? That is where these three denominations worked together. At one time, there would be a Presbyterian minister who was there, and 2 years later, there would be a Methodist minister who was there and, 2 years later, a Congregational minister who was there. That is where Jerry Brown was the Sunday school teacher, and that is how I came to meet her.

One of the big realizations, because of this community church thing and the changing of the pastors every 2 years, is that I thought every 2 years the Lord's Prayer changed. She helped me to understand that dilemma.

That is where I got to meet Mrs. Brown. She was a Sunday school teacher, and I wound up in her Sunday school class. She taught the kindergarten class. When we first started, she actually moved up a couple of times with me as the classes got combined and as I got older.

At that very first one, for Bible school, we held it outdoors underneath the pine tree—a huge pine tree. I can still remember sitting there, enthralled with her descriptions as I held my New Testament. Of course, since I was in kindergarten, I couldn't read, but she filled in for that and gave me a great background.

Later, of course, I ran into a book by Robert Fulghum titled, "All I Really Need To Know I Learned in Kindergarten." For me, it was kindergarten Sunday school. And my teacher, of course—well, she was my first Sunday school teacher and my last living Sunday school teacher.

Some of the things she taught were to share everything; play fair; don't hit people; put things back where you found them; clean up your own mess; don't take things that aren't yours; say you are sorry if you hurt someone; and be aware of wonder. And "wonder" is, if you put some seeds—and we did this—in a paper cup with dirt and you water it, the plant goes up, and the roots go down. Some people would say nobody knows why or how, but Mrs. Brown said: That is not true. God has a plan. He knows you. He watches out for you. If you see things going wrong, check your direction because it might not be where God wants you.

All of this was a good basis for my life. I have always appreciated seeing her through the years, particularly when we have visited that church again, which is still a community church, although most of the towns have split those up into more than one denomination. But I have to say that if the criteria is 3,000 people, by the time the town gets to a first-class city size, the one church is so well established that it is hard for another one to actually get established in a small community like that.

As long as there are wonderful people like Mrs. Brown teaching kindergarten, first grade, second grade, and other kids in small communities, this country will be a great place.

I thank her for all the background she gave me and ask for your prayers for her family.

I thank the Senator.

Mr. BARRASSO. I thank Senator ENZI.

She was born May 29, 1930, in Casper, WY—the youngest of eight children—to the Dodge family. As Senator ENZI talked about building the dam in the Thermopolis area, the family lived in

Alcova during the construction of the dams and the reservoirs in that area before moving to Thermopolis, where the family owned and ran the Wigwam Bakery. They had the best bread, doughnuts, and anything you could ever imagine.

She worked a number of places—certainly at the family bakery, but also she worked at the First National Bank. Jerry always volunteered to take the mail from the bank to the post office because she had caught the eye of a young postal employee, Bob Brown. The two were married on September 18 in 1949, and as the Senator knows, they recently celebrated their 70th wedding anniversary.

As newlyweds, Bob was sent to Korea. He had been in World War II. He was sent with a whole group from the basin area of Wyoming, as part of the National Guard, to Korea. They first went to Fort Lewis, WA, and Jerry followed. To pay her way, she had to pick filbert nuts. She was telling me at Christmas the size of the bag that they had to fill with these filbert nuts before they got any pay. Well, it was a full day's work, so the lessons she taught Mr. ENZI about hard work, she knew it personally.

She was a hard worker. She worked at the bakery. She also worked for Dr. Nels Vicklund, Vicklund Pharmacy, in Hot Springs County. She worked for the Hot Springs County treasurer's office. Her really great joy was when she owned and operated her own store in downtown Thermopolis called Country Charm.

As the Senator knows, she was dedicated to her children, Bobbi and Mike, and adored her granddaughter, Hadley. She taught them to work hard, to be kind, and to always do their best.

She was a talented crafter, she enjoyed playing bridge, and she was a collector. She collected Santa Clauses, she collected chickens and pictures of chickens, and she collected rocks from around the world. No matter where I went, I needed to bring back a rock for Jerry. She also, as the gentleman knows, collected friends and memories. She had an encyclopedic memory of Wyoming names, Wyoming places, and Wyoming relationships—who was married to whom and whose cousin was who. She rarely left anywhere without a hug and really loved being everyone's favorite Aunt Jerry. She was also an avid reader—and an NBA fan, of all things. She loved God, loved America, and loved our flag. She was a longtime member of the Community Federated Church, the Order of the Eastern Star, and, as we were talking about in the cloakroom, she was State president of PEO.

Jerry Brown dedicated her life to her family, to her faith, and to her friends. She was committed to her church and her community. She had a well-deserved reputation for being a joiner, a goer, and a doer.

We will celebrate her life on Saturday, January 18, in Thermopolis at the

Community Federated Church, and we miss her dearly. May she rest in peace.

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. LANKFORD. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

IRAN

Mr. LANKFORD. Madam President, as we go back through the calendar just a few months and get some context of what has been building for a while, in May of 2019, four different vessels that were traveling just outside of the Gulf of Oman were hit by mines laid by Iranian leadership. In June, just a month later, two different vessels hit Iranian mines. Those mines weren't just placed in the water flippantly; they were actually placed on the ship. In June of 2019, a U.S. Navy surveillance drone was flying through the Strait of Hormuz in international airspace and was downed by an Iranian missile attack.

As we continue to move forward, we tracked an increase in Iranian activity in cyber attacks across the United States, but at the same time, individuals within our military bases in Iraq were facing more and more of a push against them in not just an external conversation, an actual kinetic attack.

Our supply lines in the fall of last year, as trucks that were leaving from Baghdad and driving down to Kuwait for our supply lines there, were increasingly facing improvised explosive devices, something we had not seen in a long time. Those explosive devices were created and placed by Shia militias with materials provided by Iran.

Then, in October, there were multiple attacks on our facility in Baghdad. In November, there were multiple attacks again on our facility in Baghdad. In December, there were multiple attacks again, each time increasing with more and more attacks.

We hear that term "attack," and it seems almost flippant, but we realize, for the thousands of Americans who work in that area of that diplomatic mission that is there in Iraq, there is a day that happens—it could be the middle of the night, it could be the middle of the afternoon, but a moment happens, month after month, week after week, and sometimes within that, day after day—where the sirens go off, and everyone on campus runs into a bomb shelter, and then the explosions begin around the grounds.

These were not just random attacks. These were designed kinetic rocket attacks coming into our Embassy that built up toward an attack on the U.S. Embassy on December 31, where thousands of people broke through the outer section, setting fires to the building, attacking the facility, smashing

against the glass, trying to get into the next layer that they were not able to penetrate—into the inner layer in the Embassy. But thousands and thousands of rioters were moving toward the base.

As calm was restored on the outside and a security perimeter was established on the outside, they could read what was written on the walls, spray-painted now on the Embassy: “Soleimani is our leader.”

I was interested in talking to a friend of mine just a couple of weekends ago, and he made an interesting comment to me. He said: I didn’t know who Qasem Soleimani was. I had never heard that name before, and then I went back and started doing some research to find out who this guy is and what he is all about.

His comment to me was: I went back and did some research and found out he is a bad guy.

I said: Yes, you don’t know the half of it.

Soleimani is the leader of the Quds Force for the Iranians, was responsible for training the Shia militias in Iraq on how to kill Americans. Over 600 Americans died because of the training and equipping that Soleimani did for the Iraqis who were fighting against us at that time, specifically the Shia militias that Soleimani actually directed.

My neighbor was surprised to learn that Soleimani was the one who actually organized all things with Hezbollah in Lebanon. He had organized Hezbollah also in Iraq. He is the one who was coordinating all that was happening in Yemen, in the civil war that is currently ongoing in Yemen.

He was surprised to see that he was in Syria working with Bashar Assad and to see all that he was doing for that ruthless leader that murdered thousands of his own people. That was Soleimani.

For those of us who are tracking the direct threats against the United States, we are very aware of who he was and what he was all about because he was the point person to try to take the fight to the United States. In the past 6 months, that fight had gone from an “I am going to try to find individuals within Hezbollah or Shia militias somewhere to attack the United States” to being more strategic to bringing the attack directly from his forces under his command to try to take the attack to us. He had become more and more overt and more and more obsessed with attacking the United States.

Over the course of that time period, the Trump administration, over and over again, sent a message to the Iranian leadership: You are playing a very dangerous game, continually attacking American facilities, launching rockets randomly in there, starting fires, stirring up militias to attack us at every turn, attacking our supply lines. If an American is killed, President Trump made it very clear, the United States will respond.

In December, Soleimani pushed it to a whole new level, with a multiple

rocket attack into an American facility, killing an American and wounding four others. The President responded with a very reasoned response: taking an attack to where the Shia militias and Hezbollah were storing the munitions they were using to attack us, destroying that facility, destroying those munitions, taking the fight to four different training facilities where they were equipping the people to bring the attack to us but then also tracking very carefully the person who was actually planning the next set of attacks—Soleimani himself.

The time came in January, when Soleimani had been traveling through Syria, through Lebanon, working with Hezbollah, and then back into Iraq, and he was personally meeting with another terrorist leader in Iraq—one terrorist leader, Soleimani, leading a terrorist organization, meeting with another terrorist leading a terrorist organization there. Both of them were planning together and met up that morning at the airport. A little after 4 o’clock in the morning, they left from the airport, headed to go have their next meeting and planning their next set of attacks.

At that time, the Trump administration took the opportunity, while they were both far from civilians and no one else was on the road, to have a surgical strike and take out two different terrorist leaders, both in the process of planning their next attacks.

What has been interesting to me has been the response of the U.S. Senate and the U.S. House and some of the debate there. We should debate issues like this. These are difficult moments in difficult days. We are not at war with Iran, nor should we be at war with Iran. There are millions of peaceful people in Iran. Thousands and thousands of those people are protesting on the streets right now in Iran against their own government. They are furious at the corruption in their government. They are furious that the people in Iran can’t get food and can’t get fuel because the regime there is spending their money attacking Yemen, attacking Syria, feeding money to Hezbollah and Iraq, feeding money to Hezbollah and Lebanon. The money that should be going to help their own people, the Iranian regime is sending out all over the region to spur their terrorism.

The people there are frustrated and upset with their own government, and they are taking it to the streets under a threat of their own life. In the not-too-recent past, Iranians—whether it be the Green Revolution 10 years ago or just in days past and months past—had taken to the streets by the thousands, and some of them have faced all kinds of retribution coming back at them.

We should be supporting the good people of Iran who are miserable living under that regime. We are not at war with the people of Iran, but we are very clear as a nation, when you are planning an attack against us, and we are

aware of that attack and you have shown the due diligence to take prior attacks, we know you are not just thinking about it. You are actually planning it and about to carry it out.

We have learned our lesson from 9/11, and for the last three administrations, the policy has been very clear. If we know you are in the process of bringing an attack to us in the days and weeks ahead, we will strike first to protect American lives. We will not wait until you kill Americans to come bring a strike to you. That is what happened with Soleimani.

The debate that is happening on the floor now about a War Powers Resolution has been interesting to me because much of the language just affirms the current law. It almost seems to imply the Trump administration didn’t follow the law when they did. The Trump administration continued to track an imminent threat that was coming into the United States. There has been some argument about how imminent is imminent. Some of my colleagues want to know that Soleimani was in the process of carrying out an attack within the next 30 minutes, and if he wasn’t carrying out an attack immediately, in the next day or next hours, we shouldn’t respond. I will tell you, intelligence is not that exquisite. You only know in the movies that someone is about to attack an exact spot at an exact time. That is not real life. With real-life intelligence, you gather information to track what you think is coming, but you don’t get exact dates and exact locations like that.

We knew he was planning this attack. They were zeroing in on the locations, but he was very specific as to the Americans he was coming after.

To be able to bring the attack to him and to notify Congress within 48 hours, which is the law, is consistent with the War Powers Resolution. The President did follow the law. He was justified in being able to carry out the strike against a known, declared terrorist leader—in fact, two of them—in the process of planning their next attack against Americans.

The key thing I join my colleagues in talking about is not trying to be able to press back on the administration but to say that none of us want a war in Iran, including the Trump administration. In every conversation I have had with anyone in the administration, they have all been very clear. They are not planning a war with Iran. They don’t want a war with Iran, but they do want Iran to stop their belligerent terrorist activities against us, against our allies, and against any American they seem to find in the region. I join my colleagues in warning Iran and assuring Iran at the same time that we have no desire for a war with the regime or with the good people of Iran. We should be able to find a way to work together.

Since 1979, when this regime was coming into power, they have taken the fight to Americans and to all of our allies. It is time we pushed back and

said: Stop shedding blood, and let's sit down at the table and be able to work this out.

In the meantime, let's not assume that Soleimani was some innocent bystander. He had a lot of American blood on his hands. Let's take into real life what it really means to live in Baghdad and serve in our diplomatic mission and hour after hour run to bomb shelters as rockets are raining down randomly on your facility. There is plenty of provocation. Now it is time for diplomacy. Let's get this worked out.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROMNEY). The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, first, I want to say to my colleague from Oklahoma that I appreciate his remarks. I was on the floor last week talking about this issue. He is absolutely right. Soleimani was a recognized terrorist, not by the Trump administration but by the global community, including the Obama administration, the United Nations. The two organizations that he had were both considered terrorist organizations. He was responsible for the deaths of hundreds of our constituents and thousands more who were maimed or injured.

When I have been at these briefings, I am sort of getting a different briefing than, apparently, some of my colleagues are. The briefings have been very explicit about the degree with which this particular individual had already attacked and killed so many Americans and, in fact, there were more plans, of course, in the future. That is why he was traveling around the Middle East, meeting with other commanders, including the commander of the Islamic militia group in Iraq that very day.

I think this is a time for us, as the Senator from Oklahoma has said, to be sober and to be realistic about the great threat that he posed to us, and not just in this administration but in previous administrations, and now talk about a way forward, avoiding war with Iran but making sure Iran is held accountable.

To the people of Iran, I say today that we are with you. We understand the fact that your country is one where your own rights have been repressed and you have not had the ability to achieve your dreams. We want that for you, as well. Our arguments are not with you. They are with the Government of Iran.

REMEMBERING CHRIS ALLEN

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I am here today to talk about something very sad. Last week, my staff and I were informed that a colleague of ours, Chris Allen, a Senate staffer in the Senate Finance Committee, passed away unexpectedly.

Chris was an amazing guy. He was diligent, hard-working, and an expert on pensions and tax-exempt organizations. He was a very valued colleague.

I got to know him particularly well over the last couple of years as we worked together on pension issues. He was the one who, along with Charlie Bolton in my office, really focused on the complicated issue of multiemployer pensions and other retirement security issues.

We have a crisis in our country right now. The pension system is in big trouble. Chris Allen played a pivotal role in ensuring that this very important issue was brought to the fore and that we have responsible solutions for it. He was developing a framework to prevent the collapse of that longtime employer system. He also recently prevented pension cuts to over 92,000 retired coal miners through his work. He is the one, I think, most responsible from all of the staff on the Hill for ensuring that we expanded 401(k)s to millions of part-time workers left behind by current law.

Last month, Congress enacted and the President signed the SECURE Act. It is going to help millions of Americans to have more peace of mind in retirement. I don't believe it would have passed the Senate at the end of last year but for Chris. That is how important he was. Through his quick wit and tenacity, he is the one who built the coalitions to get that done, and he built the momentum for it when, frankly, a lot of others had given up. As a result, all Americans are better off.

In this difficult time, my thoughts and my prayers are with his wife Lynda-Marie, his daughters Sophie and Lucie, and all of his family and his many, many friends, as we mourn the loss of a true public servant. I also want to express condolences to Chairman GRASSLEY and the entire staff of the Senate Finance Committee.

Chris will be dearly missed as a friend, a retirement expert, and a model public servant.

SENATE ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I am here today to talk about the path forward on legislation and commonsense solutions that my constituents and all of our constituents would like to see this year. The Senators in this Chamber came back to town this week, along with Members of the House, at one of the most partisan times in our Nation's history.

We just learned that the House is now going to send us Articles of Impeachment. This will be the third Presidential impeachment trial in our entire history and only the second one in the last 151 years.

It will be the most partisan one ever. I agree with the NANCY PELOSI of a year ago, who said: "Impeachment is so divisive to the country that unless there is something so compelling and overwhelming and bipartisan, I don't think we should go down that path because it divides the country." I think she was right about that. Yet, unfortu-

nately, without meeting those criteria, here we are going down that path.

While we face a lot of contentious issues ahead of us, I still believe we can legislate for the benefit of the people we represent, and we must. That is our job. We can't let partisanship cause us to lose sight of all the opportunities we have here every day to come together, to find common ground, and to pass commonsense solutions to address the issues our constituents care most about.

In fact, I would say that under the radar and without fanfare, we have recently done that. At end of last year, we enacted a number of bills and provisions on a bipartisan basis that helped people. I talked about the SECURE Act a moment ago. Despite the headlines about gridlock and dysfunction and impeachment, we have been working on both sides of the aisle to find solutions to some of these real problems—like growing our economy, protecting national security, promoting conservation, or helping the most vulnerable.

OPIOID EPIDEMIC

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, one area where this Senate and the Congress, in general, along with the administration, have made significant progress is combating the ongoing drug addiction crisis in America that has affected so many families represented by all of us in this Chamber.

In my home State of Ohio, we have been on the frontline of this crisis for years. Opioids, in particular, have taken a heavy toll in our communities. In fact, in 2017, our opioid overdose rate in Ohio was almost three times the national average, with nearly a dozen Ohioans dying from these dangerous drugs every single day, making it the No. 1 cause of death in Ohio, surpassing car accidents.

Since 2017, we have begun to make progress, finally, to be able to turn the tide on opioids. In 2018, after a decade of increased overdose deaths every year for the previous dozen years, we finally had a reduction, a 22-percent reduction in overdose deaths. By the way, that led the Nation in terms of the percent decrease. It is still way too high—unacceptably high—but we are starting to make progress.

A lot of it goes back to what is being done here at the Federal level, but also the State level and local level, to address this problem. We have dramatically increased funding here for treatment for recovery, including providing Narcan as a way to save people's lives. It is a miracle drug that reverses the effects of an overdose. We have done some things that are very important. More recently, we have sent these resources through legislation that the President signed into law just last year. There are resources also provided by the State opioid response grants and also by our bipartisan Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act, or CARA, helping our first responders to be able

to use innovative and new approaches to ensure that individuals whose overdoses are reversed go into treatment rather than just overdosing again and again.

The good news is that at the end of the year, the spending bill that Congress passed secured a record \$658 million in funding for these Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act grants, or CARA grants. I was the author of that legislation, initially, along with SHELDON WHITEHOUSE on the other side of the aisle. We started off with closer to \$200 million. Now, we are at \$658 million. Why? Because it is working.

I have been back home, going from place to place, seeing how it works. I have watched some of these first responders in action with social workers and treatment providers who are going into people's homes and getting people into treatment who previously were not. We can't rest on our laurels because we have to do a lot more to address all forms of addiction that are increasingly becoming a problem.

We have seen in Ohio and around the country that psychostimulants have now come back with a vengeance. This would be crystal meth from Mexico and cocaine. It is surging in communities across our State. According to our deputy attorney general in Ohio, law enforcement officials in 2018 tested double the amount of methamphetamine samples as they had in 2017 and triple the amount from 2016. In other words, crystal meth is growing. Higher and higher amounts of it are coming in and more and more people are being affected by this. I heard this at round-table discussions around the State.

I was in Knox County last year, learning that the prosecutor's office estimates that 80 to 90 percent of all drug incidents included crystal meth. Opioids used to be their biggest problem in Knox County, as it has been in all 80 counties in Ohio until recently. Now it is pure crystal meth coming in from Mexico.

I am pleased that the spending bill at the end of last year that we passed just last month changed the way in which our funding is delivered in the fight against addiction. Specifically, included in that is my Combating Meth and Cocaine Act. This is an important bill that allows States the flexibility to use the roughly \$1.5 billion in grant funds allocated specifically to combat opioids. The 21st Century Cures grants, now called the State response grants, can all be used for the treatment and recovery services for new threats like crystal meth and cocaine.

Giving our local communities that flexibility is incredibly important. I have heard it constantly when I am back home. We have now done that. We have been able to help even further to try to reverse the effects, not just of the opioid crisis but of the drug crisis and all forms of addiction.

We have made significant strides in ensuring that we can respond to this

ever-changing addiction crisis. I am proud we are able to do it. As I said at the beginning of this speech, this is a pretty divisive time in Washington, to say the least. No one can deny that. What I hoped to show by highlighting these achievements over the past year is that even in a highly partisan environment, it is possible to bring people together to get things done and pass laws that make a fundamental improvement to the lives of the people we represent.

While lots of time finding that common ground takes more work, it is worth it. The extra effort goes a long way. Fortunately, we are coming into this new session of Congress having already laid the groundwork that we need to do to continue to fight this addiction crisis.

Critical right now to that fight is passing bipartisan legislation that will help us to push back against a particular kind of opioid, the synthetic opioid called fentanyl. Fentanyl came on the scene 5 or 6 years ago with a vengeance. Just as we were making progress on reducing the use of heroin and prescription drugs, suddenly, this fentanyl arrives. It is a synthetic opioid. It is 50 times more powerful on average than heroin. It is now the No. 1 killer. It has been the last few years. In States like mine, Ohio, when you look at the numbers over the past few years, although we are making progress on other opioids, we are not making progress on fentanyl. Why? Because it is being mixed into all kinds of other drugs, including crystal meth, including opioids, including all street drugs. The improvements we have seen are significant, but fentanyl continues to be the No. 1 killer.

Fentanyl, unfortunately, knows no ZIP Code and is devastating individuals and families all across the country. According to the most recent data available from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, there were 72,000 drug-related deaths in the United States in 2017, and 40 percent of those deaths were involving fentanyl. That data showed that the overdose deaths due to fentanyl had increased at a rate of 88 percent per year, on average, since 2013.

It is a real threat to our States. In 2017 alone, we had a record 3,500 overdose deaths in Ohio that were attributable to fentanyl. Last fall, our Narcotics and Gun Enforcement Task Force seized 45 pounds of fentanyl in a single bust in Montgomery County, in Dayton, OH. There was enough of the drug to kill the entire population of Ohio.

That is why the Drug Enforcement Agency made the right call in 2018 to make fentanyl-related substances illegal to possess, transport, or manufacture. This means they have been scheduled. Thanks to that designation, our law enforcement officials have been able to better protect our communities by seizing and destroying large amounts of these fentanyl-related sub-

stances, which are the analogs to fentanyl. So that is good.

Unfortunately, due to Federal law, the DEA was only able to make these dangerous substances illegal on a temporary basis. Think about that. You have this deadly drug that is 50 times more powerful than heroin. Back in 2018, we were able to finally make not just fentanyl but all of its analogs—fentanyl-related substances—illegal. Law enforcement was using that to begin to push back, and now we find it was only temporary. Guess what. We are fast approaching the end of that designation. Next month, on February 6, which is 3 weeks from this Thursday, fentanyl-related substances will once again be legal, and it will be much harder to keep vulnerable communities safe from these deadly substances. We cannot let that happen.

I met earlier today with former Iowa Governor Terry Branstad, who is now our Ambassador to China. For years, many of us have been pushing China to do more to crack down on fentanyl because most of the fentanyl that comes to this country and kills individuals in our communities comes from China. Most of it has been coming through our mail system. We have done a lot to stop that. We have passed the STOP Act, which tightens up the post office's screening process, which has worked very well over the last year. We have also provided more money under the INTERDICT Act in order to provide better equipment not just to our Postal Service but also to the private carriers like DHL and FedEx.

What has happened is, China has also done a better job of making fentanyl illegal and scheduling the precursors and analogs to fentanyl, and we have pushed them very hard on that. I have myself been to China and have personally done that, and I know Ambassador Branstad has pushed China hard on this. Finally, China has begun to start addressing this rampant production in its country.

Terry Branstad told me today—and I agree with him—that the credibility of the United States to continue to provide pressure to China to do the right thing will be eroded dramatically if we don't continue to schedule fentanyl. As we are asking China to do it, we cannot let this designation lapse here. Obviously, what is most important is that we not let it lapse because it is the wrong thing to do and because it will affect all of our communities and all of our families who have been affected by this dangerous drug.

We can't let it happen. That is why, last fall, Senator JOE MANCHIN and I introduced a bill called FIGHT Fentanyl, which codifies the Drug Enforcement Agency's precedent to permanently schedule fentanyl-related substances. So forget these temporary designations that have caused these issues; let's permanently schedule these fentanyl-related substances.

It has very strong bipartisan support. In fact, as of a couple of weeks ago,

every single U.S. State's and territory's attorney general has now endorsed our bill. That is all 50 States and 6 territories. That doesn't happen very often. This is a bipartisan group of law enforcement officials who has said: We support this legislation, the FIGHT Fentanyl Act, that we introduced last fall. I am confident we can get it passed if it comes to the floor for a vote. There are other approaches to it as well that are slightly different than ours. I support those as well.

The point is, we need to pass legislation to ensure that February 6 doesn't come and go without our scheduling these fentanyl analogs. It is a good example of the need to continue working across the aisle on this issue. We have done a good job with it so far. As I have said, even in these contentious times, we have to do it again, and we have to do it soon. I am told that during impeachment, it is impossible or at least very difficult to legislate on any other topic without having unanimous consent. So we need to get this done before next week, before we get the Articles of Impeachment and before the U.S. Senate begins the impeachment trial.

I urge all of our colleagues to focus today on this issue. Join us in this commonsense, lifesaving legislation. Let's work together. The Committee on the Judiciary has been working on this, and others have worked on this. We have legislation at the desk to be able to solve it. I hope we can do it by unanimous consent, but we have to do it. This is lifesaving legislation to keep fentanyl from spreading its poison even further.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

AUTHORIZATION FOR USE OF MILITARY FORCE

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, whether it is tomorrow, later today, or sometime next week, I know there will be an effort here to restrict the President's ability to engage the Armed Forces of the United States in a conflict with Iran.

I think, any time you have something like that come up, there are two most important questions that need to be answered: No. 1, Why? Why do we need this law that you are pursuing? No. 2, What would that law do? Let me try to answer the "why." I can deduce two separate arguments.

The first is the argument that somehow the actions of the United States, for example, of pursuing a maximum pressure campaign against Iran and leaving the Iran deal—according to at least the language of the version I saw, which I know is going to be amended—have included economic, diplomatic, and military pressure and that this is raising the risk of retaliation against U.S. troops and personnel, which will lead to a cycle of escalating back-and-forth violence between Iran and its proxies and the United States, and that

these warnings have been proven to be correct. I guess the first argument is that we left the Iran deal and that this is the reason we are now on the verge of what some view to be an all-out war against Iran.

The second argument is rooted in the constitutional views that some of my colleagues hold that Congress has a role to play and that no extended military engagement should be allowed without there being congressional approval. These are two separate motivations, and I think it is possible to hold that second position and also be motivated by the first. I think, for many of my colleagues, it is solely a constitutional question, which I respect. So let's analyze the "why" for a second.

First of all, I think it is just not true that the reason Iran and its proxies are trying to kill Americans is that we pulled out of the Obama deal with Iran. Iran has most certainly responded with violence to our decision, but that is not what motivated Iran. For example, before there was even an Iran deal from which to pull out, it was already equipping and supplying Shia militias in Iraq with weapons that killed and maimed Americans in the hundreds. In fact, Iran's antagonism toward us predates any discussion about an Iran deal. It predates our presence in the region and the numbers that we currently have there. I think it is also flawed because, during the Iran deal—even when the Iran deal was in place—Iran was still sponsoring all of the same proxy groups with all of the same weapons and was undertaking all of the same targeting.

One of the flaws of the Iran deal and one of the reasons the Iran deal was not a good one was that it actually didn't deal with this activity. The only thing it dealt with was enrichment. It did nothing to limit Iran's missile program, and it did nothing to limit Iran's sponsorship of terrorism. In fact, the only impact it had on its missile program and on its sponsorship of terrorism was that it provided economic activity that generated revenue to fund those things.

Despite the denial and the repeated and bold-faced lies of some who have gone on TV and have said: Oh, there was never any cash transfer, there absolutely was. There was over \$1 billion delivered to the Iranians. They say these were funds that had been frozen. They say this was their money and that this is why it was released to them as part of this deal. The Iranians don't tell you that there is close to \$50 billion in unpaid claims that have been adjudicated in U.S. courts on behalf of Americans who have suffered at the hands of Iranian terror and who have not been paid.

Suffice it to say that the Iran deal was flawed. One of the reasons it was flawed is that it did nothing to prohibit the sponsorship of terrorism, and it actually generated economic activity and the delivery of over \$1 billion in cash. I assure you this was not used to build

bridges, roads, and schools but was used to fund these nefarious activities that Iran undertook before the Iran deal, during the Iran deal, and after the Iran deal.

So the fact that Iran is responding with violence to economic sanctions, which by itself is unacceptable, tells us the nature of this regime is to respond to economic sanctions—not to military action—with violence and efforts to kill Americans. It doesn't mean this is the reason Iran was doing that. Iran was already doing that. It has just been part of its response.

This leads me to the second point. Iran has already been doing it because Iran's goal is not simply to get us back into the Iran deal; its goal is to drive us from the region. Iran does not want an American presence there, and it does not want American influence in the region. Iran does not want it in Iraq, which it has been against from the very beginning, and it doesn't want it in Syria. Yet it is not just limited to Iraq and Syria. Iran doesn't want our presence in Jordan, in Kuwait, or in Bahrain. It doesn't want any American presence in Afghanistan. It doesn't want us anywhere in the region because Iran views it as an impediment to its desire to be a dominant regional power, and Iran views it as an impediment to its ultimate design of destroying the Jewish State.

Iran decided not last week, not last year, and not at the beginning of the Trump Presidency but well over a decade and a half ago that the way it was going to get us to leave the region was by inflicting costs—i.e., with the deaths and the injuries of American service men and women—and that Iran would make it so painful for us to be there and so painful for these countries to host us that we would ultimately leave. That is the reason Iran is undertaking these attacks.

Now, why are we there? It is a good question and a valid one to answer, and I will answer it in the cases of both Syria and Iraq.

We are not there on an anti-Iran campaign the way in which some describe. There is an element of prohibiting Iran from capturing Iraq and turning it into a puppet state. By the way, many Shia politicians in Iraq share that view. They may not want us to be the protector, at least openly, but they are nationalists just like they are Shia.

The fundamental and the principal reason we are in Iraq is as part of NATO's anti-ISIS mission and as a train-and-equip mission. We are there to train and equip Iraqis to fight against ISIS. It has been an effort that has been successful. It has worked. It is interesting that for a time, when Iran shared the same fears of ISIS, you saw Iran sort of stand down a little bit. Even after we pulled out of the Iran deal, Iran pulled back a little bit because it, too, wanted ISIS defeated. Now it argues that, in its mind, ISIS has been diminished and that it is time

for the Americans to go. If you will not leave on your own, then we are going to start killing people until you decide the price of being here is too high.

Here is the bottom line. The reason there are American troops in large parts of this region is for an anti-terror campaign. Iran has decided to use proxies and these deniable attacks—by “deniable,” I mean getting some other group to use the weapons you gave them to attack Americans—so Iran can say: It was not us, even though everyone knows it is Iran. That way, you can sort of try to avoid a direct war with the United States and international condemnation, but everyone knows it is you. That is why Iran is attacking us.

Now, I ask you: What is supposed to be the U.S. response?

First of all, it is in the law. It is a constitutional requirement, and the power resides in the Presidency—the right to defend U.S. service men and women when they come under attack. No. 1, there is a constitutional power and, in my mind, an obligation to defend, to prevent, to repel, and to respond to attacks against American troops who are deployed abroad.

No. 2, it is embedded in congressional authorization for that anti-terror mission to begin with. In both Iraq and Afghanistan, we are present at the authorization given by Congress over a decade and a half ago, and imbedded in that authorization is the right to self-defense.

The third point I would make is that if you look at this argument about AUMF, you would think what we are seeing here looks something like the run-up to the Iraq war or the run-up to the Afghanistan war. This is complete fiction. The Afghanistan war was one in which the Bush White House came to the Congress back then and said: Look, the Taliban is allowing al-Qaeda to act with impunity from its territory, and we are going to go take them out. It was an offensive operation—an invasion. With Iraq, we all know the justification, which turned out not to be the case, about weapons of mass destruction and the like—again, an offensive military operation.

No one in American politics whom I see—certainly no one in the Trump administration—has talked about ramping up and sending 150,000 or 200,000 troops marching into Tehran. No one is contemplating that. The only thing the Trump administration has talked about is that if you attack our troops or if we think you are getting ready to attack our troops, we are going to prevent it if we can. We are going to repel that attack if it happens, and we are going to respond proportionately in return as a deterrent. You don't need congressional authorization to do that.

Imagine the practical implications if that were the case. The President of the United States would have to come to Congress on December 30 because we are under attack and ask us to recon-

vene; everybody fly in, take a vote, debate for a week and a half, and then decide. By that time we would have 300 dead Americans. It is ridiculous. It is not a requirement. It is not even practical.

So I don't understand the purpose of this AUMF. What war are you trying to prevent? Unless you believe that we brought this upon ourselves because we pulled out of the Iran deal—even if you believe that one of the reasons we stayed in the Iran deal was to prevent these sorts of attacks, which I don't think is justified—it is not a justified argument by the very fact that even during the Iran deal they were already doing some of these things and have a long history of doing that. If you argue it and believe it, you can't argue that attacking and killing Americans—violence—is an appropriate response to economic sanctions. You most certainly cannot argue that we cannot have a military response to protect our men and women and our interests in the region. Yet that seems to be the argument embedded in the AUMF.

Some will state that all it does is restate law, and it doesn't have any practical impact in the end. If the House doesn't pass the same thing, what is this really going to mean? That is true in a legal perspective. Let me state what the headlines already say and are going to say. Here is what they are going to say: “Congress votes to limit President's military options” or “Congress votes to limit Trump's ability to respond militarily to Iran.”

I want to be clear because I have heard this from others—the fact that they were being told not to debate this issue. Debate all you want, but those headlines and how they are read in places like Iran are very different than the debate we are having here. How they would read it is that the President has political domestic constraints about how much he can respond to what they do.

We already have a fundamental problem with Iran, and that is, unlike many countries in the world, they don't view or respond to things in the same way. For example, it is pretty clear that their view of what they can get away with is much higher than the reality of what they can get away with, as evidenced by the increasing scale and increasing magnitude of the attacks that their proxies were taking against the United States and the region. So the threat of miscalculation on their part is very, very high. Let's not forget that just a week ago they launched over a dozen rockets at a U.S. military installation where, by the grace of God, no one was killed. But they could have been. You don't launch that many rockets at a U.S. military installation and not expect that some Americans are going to die. So their internal calculus about what they can get away with is already twisted.

Imagine adding to that the perception that somehow the President's hands are tied: No matter what we do,

we can kill 100 Americans because he is really not going to be able to do very much because the Congress took away his power.

You can take the chance that these guys are somehow legal scholars in schools in the American legal system. You can take the chance that they read Congressional Quarterly or whatever publication or that they have read the latest issue of whatever the congressional research office has produced for the practical implications or you can worry that they will misinterpret this vote and its impact for what it means to what they can get away with.

If you want to have a debate, have it. I don't know what you are going to have a debate about. There is no one planning an all-out war against Iran. The administration's strategy is pretty straightforward: If they attack us or are getting ready to attack us, we will respond. If they don't, we won't.

The question of whether there is going to be armed conflict between the United States and Iran is not in the hands of the White House; it is in the hands of the Ayatollah. I assure you, no matter what we vote on here, it is not going to impact their decision over there.

No one—no one I know of—wants a war with Iran. That is not the goal. The goal, hopefully, is to have an Iran that doesn't sponsor terrorism, that doesn't want nuclear weapons, and that acts like a normal country. I bet that is the goal of millions of Iranians themselves.

In the interim, until that day comes, we have an obligation to protect our interests. We have an obligation to protect our men and women whom we have sent into harm's way. For the life of me, I just don't understand what this AUMF seeks to prevent—a war that no one is calling for.

I don't want to imply that we can't have these debates in America, because we can and we should. We are a free society. But I want everybody to be clear about how these debates can be misinterpreted and how these headlines can be misinterpreted by the people who actually have these rockets and control these proxy groups.

The bottom line is that Iran's goal is not just to get us back into the nuclear deal; their goal is to drive us from the region. They want us out, and they have concluded that the way to do that is to use other groups whom they are arming and equipping with increasingly more and more capabilities, meaning bigger and deadlier ammunitions and rockets and the like to kill Americans, and the more Americans who die—even if they are there on an anti-terror mission—the likelier it is that we are going to have to pull them out of there. That is what they want. They want us to leave Iraq so that they can turn it into a puppet State.

They want all NATO and allied presence out of Syria so that they can control Syria entirely. They want to fracture our relationship with Lebanon so

that Hezbollah can control that country. They want to destroy our presence in Bahrain, where the Fifth Fleet is located. You can go on and on.

In the end, I think the question becomes, Are we prepared to retreat from that region entirely? You cannot come here and criticize the President for removing troops from the Syrian-Turkish border and abandoning the Kurds and at the same time argue: But you don't have the power unless we authorize you to defend those very troops if they come under attack by some Iranian proxy group. Yet that seems to be the argument.

You cannot argue: We cannot just pick up and leave the Iraqis at the mercy of the Iranian regime. I assure you that if the President announced tomorrow "I am pulling out of Iraq" or if he said before the Soleimani strike "I am pulling out of Iraq," the floor would be filled with people saying that we have abandoned our allies; we have abandoned the Kurds in Northern Iraq; we have abandoned the Sunnis, who are scared of the Iranians.

You cannot argue that and argue at the same time that you think we need to be present and continue to work toward the functionality of that State and at the same time say: But you need congressional approval to act in defense of the people we send there who wear the uniform—or our diplomats, for that matter. Yet that seems to be the argument behind this AUMF.

The vote is going to be what it is. We are going to have this debate. I remember about a year and a half ago, when tensions were high with North Korea, they wanted an AUMF for that.

You can disagree with this White House all you want. I don't think we have had a more anti-war President in my lifetime than the one we have right now. If you think about it for a moment, almost any other predecessor may have responded with a lot less restraint to some of the provocations and attacks we have seen from Iran and its proxies. He acted in a way that I think history will fully justify and in defense of American lives in taking out Soleimani and disrupting a near-term plot that could have very easily have killed dozens, if not hundreds, of Americans in the near term.

I chuckle when I hear people saying: Well, how do we know what Soleimani was doing? Well, that was his full-time job. He wasn't a stockbroker or realtor or diplomat. His full-time job was to travel the world to set up groups and equip groups so that when he told them to go, they could go kill Americans. That was his full-time job. That is what he was doing there.

I believe when all is said and done, history will fully vindicate the decision that was made.

We will have this debate at some point. I imagine that at some point it will move to the floor. It is a privileged resolution. I just think it is shortsighted, and I hope that some of my colleagues who have signed on to it

thinking that somehow we were exerting Congress's constitutional authority—I have no problem with asserting Congress's constitutional authority when it is actually being challenged, but there is no congressional constitutional authority that can prevent a President or should prevent a President from acting in defense of our men and women in uniform when we deploy them abroad. In my view, that is what this bill, which will shortly be before us, does. That is the practical implication of it, so I hope those who chose to be for it will reconsider.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CRAMER. 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. CRAMER. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to express my opposition to the War Powers Act resolution that is making its way through Congress. I believe it is designed to hurt our President politically, while inflicting long-term damage to our national security and military readiness.

Iranian provocation is nothing new. In the last several months, they have drastically and intentionally escalated tensions in the region. After several measured responses, President Trump made the appropriate decision to eliminate General Soleimani, a terrorist mastermind who ordered and helped carry out many attacks on American personnel and our allies.

I want to emphasize an overlooked point here. General Soleimani was killed in Iraq, not Iran. He was in Iraq, in a car with another known terrorist, driving to meet militia members who recently fired rockets at Americans, killing an American contractor with rocket fire, and tried to storm our Embassy. I am going to remind everybody that our Embassy in Baghdad is sovereign U.S. territory.

Whether through an existing authorization to use military force or the War Powers Act, President Trump was well within his legal bounds to take action against a known terrorist sitting in Iraq plotting attacks against U.S. citizens. It would have been culpable negligence to not act on the intelligence informing us of General Soleimani's position, location, and his imminent plans to attack again soon. I thank God the days of appeasement are behind us and we learned from history. President Trump averted another Benghazi-like tragedy.

The President made Iranian leadership pay a price for its aggression. His decisive action made Iran realize that the cost of escalation was more than they can afford, and it worked. Without the loss of American life, while following our Constitution and laws, President Trump deescalated tensions with Iran and, through a clear message of strength, made war less likely.

My colleagues on the other side of this issue know all of this well. They watched it play out in real time, just like the rest of us. Yet, whether it is their deeply rooted disdain for this President or a misunderstanding of the threats that the United States faces every day, they want to limit the President's ability to protect Americans abroad.

The legislation they are promoting requires termination or in some cases complete withdrawal of our forces without any strategic or tactical considerations. Such actions are not based on military doctrine, the recommendations of senior military leaders, or even foreign policy experts; they would be based solely on politics and would constitute a strategic long-term loss in exchange for what they think would be a short-term political win.

Ultimately, my colleagues who support this resolution refuse to accept the undeniable reality that the concept of peace through strength works. Removing the powers and capabilities of our military leaders that keep our country safe will not make us safer.

Whether through personal animosity toward our President or a misunderstanding of the importance of deterring our enemies, some in this Chamber are advocating for changes that would make our country less safe. I will not support their efforts, and I urge the rest of my colleagues to do the same.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

UNITED STATES-MEXICO-CANADA TRADE AGREEMENT

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, last week, the Senate Finance Committee voted on the U.S.-Mexico-Canada Agreement. It is called USMCA. I did something I have never done. I voted for it. I have never voted for a trade agreement in my time in the House of Representatives and my time in the Senate. In fact, I helped to lead the opposition to the original NAFTA among freshmen Members of Congress because I recognized that every single one of these trade agreements basically had the template of corporate interests at the center of them. In other words, these trade agreements—whether it was NAFTA, or the North American Free Trade Agreement, whether a half generation later it was the Central America Free Trade Agreement, whether it was the free trade agreement with South Korea, or whether it was the Permanent Normal Trade Relations with China—all of them were written by corporate interests serving the profitability of the executives and

the major stockholders of these companies.

They all tended to precipitate this under these trade agreements in this Congress, under Presidents of both parties, I might add. I disagreed with the first President Bush, then President Clinton, then the second President Bush, and then President Obama. All of them would submit trade agreements that were written for corporate interests, I believe, at the expense of workers.

What happened, typically, was that companies that lobbied Congress to pass these trade agreements would shut down production in Provo, UT, in the Presiding Officer's State, or Cleveland or Dayton, in my State. They would shut down production there, move their production overseas, get their tax breaks, and get their low-wage labor, often worked on by—almost always—nonunion workers, sometimes underage workers who were very inexpensive. The products would be manufactured and then sold back into the United States. That became the business model for company after company after company since the North American Free Trade Agreement, where corporations outsourced jobs in order to save money, always at the expense of communities, particularly in the industrial Midwest, always at the expense of workers, and always at the expense of the middle class.

It was welcome news to me when Candidate Trump, with whom I agree with on almost nothing, said he would renegotiate the North American Free Trade Agreement. So I tried to work with him. I told him that I supported his renegotiation.

I worked with Ambassador Lighthizer, the Trade Representative, the Ambassador for President Trump—the so-called U.S. Trade Representative. I said to them that we want workers to be the centerpiece of this trade agreement.

Well, what happened? A year into his Presidency, President Trump proposed the same kind of trade agreement that we had seen all along—a trade agreement where corporations were at the center of the agreement and workers were betrayed.

This is a President who has betrayed workers day after day after day. He refused to raise the minimum wage. He cut overtime pay for 50,000 Ohio workers. He put people in the courts who put a thumb on the scales of justice, choosing corporations over workers and choosing Wall Street over consumers. It is a White House that looks like a retreat for Wall Street executives except on Tuesdays and Fridays, when it looks like a retreat for a drug company executive. That is what the President proposed.

Speaker PELOSI, Senator WYDEN and I, and worker representatives—the AFL-CIO, the UAW, the CWA, the machinists, and the steelworkers—all said: No, we are not going to support another trade agreement that sends

jobs overseas. We want a trade agreement written for workers.

We said to the President and the President's Trade Representative: We are not going to support this unless you include strong labor enforcement standards for workers.

They basically ignored us. We had tried to work with them. They basically ignored us. They insisted we pass their bill.

Finally, after a year—more than a year—the administration came along kicking and screaming and agreed with us only because they knew they couldn't pass a trade agreement without it.

It took the language that Senator WYDEN and I submitted for workers. It works in this way: For the first time, a worker is empowered to challenge the violation of labor law. So a Mexican worker, where the company has broken the law by paying them a sub-minimum wage, where the company has broken the law by refusing them to organize or to allow unions to attempt to organize, where a company breaks the law on worker safety—a worker at that company, anonymously, at that worksite, can file a complaint and set off the clock of the process so we can actually challenge when they break the law.

We know why companies close factories in Ohio and in the State of my friend from Rhode Island, in Cranston, RI. They close factories and open them in Mexico because they can pay lower wages, and they can take advantage of workers who don't have rights. American workers can't compete with that. We know that, and we get a race to the bottom on wages.

What this agreement does is that it puts workers at the center. It allows for real labor enforcement, real enforcement of labor standards. So I voted for this agreement. It passed with only three 'no' votes in the Senate committee. It will likely pass on the floor either this week or next week.

But I want to be straight with American workers. This isn't a perfect agreement. It is one trade deal that Democrats fixed. Democrats and labor fixed it. Republicans opposed the fix but are now voting for it because they still want USMCA, but it will not fix the rest of President Trump's economic policies that put corporations over workers.

Let me give you an example. If you are a company in Dayton, OH, you pay a 21-percent corporate tax rate. If you move to Mexico or you move to France or you move to China, you pay only a 10.5-percent corporate tax rate. So our government continues this because of President Trump's tax bill, the tax bill that caused us now to have a trillion-dollar-a-year deficit—the largest deficit we have had, except in times of recession. That tax bill still will make it attractive for companies to shut down and move overseas. This helps with that.

As I said, I voted yes for the first time on a trade agreement because by

including Brown-Wyden, Democrats have made this agreement, for the first time, pro-worker. We set an important precedent that, from now on, every trade agreement we negotiate—and, I believe, negotiated by Presidents in either party—will include language like Brown-Wyden, making sure that workers are at the table and that trade agreements look out for workers, unlike trade agreements in the past.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 20 minutes in morning business.

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

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, the publication Grist did an article recently about climate change with a bunch of images. I grabbed a few of those images, and I have added a few in this speech because they give a pretty good overview of the mess that we are in on climate change.

Right now, the most devastating wildfires anyone can remember are ripping across Australia. Here, you see an iconic kangaroo going by a building up in flames. Those Australian fires have destroyed thousands of homes. They have killed an estimated 1 billion animals—get your head around 1 billion animals killed—and they have made a day of breathing the air in Sidney, Australia, the equivalent of smoking 37 cigarettes. In fact, I read in the news that in a tennis championship in Australia today, one of the competitors withdrew because the air was so bad that she couldn't finish her match.

Why is this going on? According to the Australia Bureau of Meteorology, Australia has warmed by about a full degree Celsius over the last century. That means a longer, hotter fire season, which loads the dice in favor of extreme winds and heat and bushfire, as they call it in Australia.

Why did it warm in Australia? The cause could not be more clear. This is the measurement of carbon dioxide levels in the Earth's atmosphere, going back hundreds of thousands of years—100, 200, 300, 400, 500, 600, 700, and 800,000 years. That is way back. There was no agriculture then, no wheel then, and, for sure, no Twitter—nothing.

Over time, we have seen this steady range of atmospheric CO₂ levels, running between about 180 and—here is the cresting out—just under 300 parts per million. So it is 800,000 years, all between 180 and 300 degrees. That is a 120-degree range.

We are now out of that range by more than the entire range itself. We are out by more than 120. This chart goes up to 400 parts per million. We are literally off the chart right now at 410 parts per million. Of course, this is connected to heat. That is not news.

The graphics here were compiled by Clayton Aldern and Emily Pontecorvo

of Grist. So let me take this opportunity to thank them.

This next chart shows the increase in carbon dioxide just in the last decade. This is from 2010 to 2019. If you took the previous graph, which is in here somewhere, this is just the tiniest little slice at the very edge of this—just 10 years out of 800,000. That is like one eighty-thousandths of that graph, that tiny little sliver.

In that tiny little sliver, here is what has happened. It has gone from below 390 parts per million up to 410. We hit the magic 400 back in about 2013 for the first time right here with this dot. That was a big deal. The measurement came from NOAA's Mauna Loa Observatory in Hawaii. Never, ever, ever before in human history, over those hundreds of thousands of years, had we seen 400 parts per million, and in just the last decade, it shot up by all this. In fact, in the last 7 years, it shot up more than 10 parts per million.

We know something about what happens as these CO₂ levels go up. We know that the planet warms. That is not news. We have known that since Abraham Lincoln was President. When Abraham Lincoln was riding around Washington in his top hat, scientists had already begun to write about and understand the link between greenhouse gases like carbon dioxide and global warming. Heck, even Exxon scientists knew about this decades ago, and their scientists warned the company about this in reports that we now have. Of course, Exxon did the wickedest possible thing with that information, which was to bury it, deny it, and try to convince the public that the opposite was true.

There is nothing new in any of this information. The science is totally established, and that level is unprecedented in humankind's history. As a result—guess what—things have started to go haywire. This chart shows the cost of annual billion-dollar disasters in the United States, the disasters that cost us \$1 billion each. There is a very clear trendline that draws through this, and it is climbing upward. If you don't believe me, ask an insurance company, ask a reinsurance company.

Now, bear in mind that these costs, the cost of natural disasters, are just one of the big economic threats from climate change. We have warnings about coastal property values crashing. Those come from Freddie Mac, of all places. We have warnings about the carbon bubble crashing. Those come from the Bank of England and many other sovereign banks. We have warnings about insurance markets and about the bond safety of coastal communities.

In fact, those numbers—the numbers of the cost of natural disasters—are actually pretty tiny so far compared to what is projected. What is projected is an estimated tens of trillions of dollars by 2100.

One way this plays out is in my home State. This is northern Narragansett

Bay. Here is Providence, our capital city. Here is Warwick. Over here is Bristol. Everything that is blue on this map is land today. On these blue parts people have homes; people have businesses; the State has infrastructure; there is economic activity; and, my God, there are memories. Well, the blue disappears. The blue disappears. The blue disappears at 10 feet of sea level rise. That is what this measures. This comes off a program called STORMTOOLS run by the Coastal Resources Management Council, our Rhode Island CZMA agency.

Our State officials, based on the latest information from NOAA and from our University of Rhode Island and from the Coastal Resources Management Council, are preparing for scenarios up to 9 feet of sea level rise in Rhode Island by the end of the century—not storm surge, just bathtub-level sea level rise. Add in storm surge, and you not only get over 9 feet; you get over the 10 feet that is displayed here in this graph. The damage to my State is going to be very serious. The very map of Rhode Island will change because of this. Now, some of my colleagues think this is all funny, that this is something we can just yuck it up about and mock the science and call people alarmists when they take this seriously.

It is deadly serious. In fact, a 2017 report from the real estate database company Zillow identified over 4,800 homes in Rhode Island with a collective value at over \$3 billion that would be underwater by 2100 using only a 6-foot bathtub sea level rise figure—\$3 billion just in my small State. That doesn't count the value of the memories. If you have a house near the shore, you very likely have family memories. Some of these places in Rhode Island go back generations—even small, small houses. People have had them. Their grandfather had them. They have memories. All of that is at risk to be lost. So don't think I am not going to fight about this just because somebody else thinks this is funny.

The reason that is happening is the oceans are warming. When you warm water, it expands, so it rises—in addition, of course, to all the trillions of gallons pouring off of Greenland and other land-based icecaps. Look at how the ocean has warmed. The red is the 3-month average. It has more variation in it. The black is the annual average. The blue is the 5-year average that smooths it out a little bit more.

The ocean is absorbing intense amounts of heat. I will tell you how much heat the ocean is absorbing. If you took the Hiroshima atom bomb and you captured all of its energy as heat—it produced light; it produced a variety of other things—the rate at which the ocean is warming is the equivalent—I usually use—of between three and four Hiroshima-sized nuclear detonations per second in the ocean—per second. So, in the time of this speech, there will be dozens, probably

100, Hiroshima-sized nuclear explosions' worth of heat that the oceans have to absorb.

Today a new report came out that says that the number is actually five Hiroshima-sized explosions per second. As they measure it better, as they see it increase more, we are seeing that number. It is not just that they are warming. That would be bad enough. They are becoming more acid. They are becoming more acid because they absorb carbon dioxide at the surface. This is a chemical interface. This took away 90 percent of the extra heat that our fossil fuel emissions have caused, the absorption of the heat by the oceans. At the same time, while it was absorbing 90 percent of the heat, it was also absorbing 30 percent of the carbon dioxide.

Imagine for a second if we were not an ocean planet. Imagine if we were a fully terrestrial planet and we didn't have the oceans to buffer this. You would have to add back that extra third of CO₂, which would be a 50-percent increase on the lower base, and you would have to multiply by 10 the increase from heat. You put those two factors together—this is a very rough number, and the scientists on my staff would be mad at me for saying this, but maybe 15 times the result that we are seeing right now. We are experiencing a fraction of what we would face without the cooling and buffering oceans. Without our oceans, Australia wouldn't just be one location on fire; the whole planet would be a catastrophe.

Those are the chances that we are taking. Why are we taking these chances? We are taking these chances because politicians don't dare say no to the crooked fossil fuel industry that profits from this mess. That is just the sickening political fact that we have to deal with here.

That is steadily moving because the public is beginning to understand this. Notwithstanding a long and very, very expensive campaign of misleading propaganda by the fossil fuel industry, people are starting to catch on. These are the numbers—from 60 up to 72 percent—of people who believe that warming is happening. The number of people who are denying went from 20 percent down to 12 percent. Understanding is up. Denial is down. Ditto for that it is caused by us: 46 up to 59 percent, and 35 down to 30 percent denying. Understanding is up. Denial is down.

So the other thing that is good that is happening behind these numbers is that Americans of a whole variety of persuasions actually favor the solutions that scientists and economists recommend to solve the climate change problem. Now, the fossil fuel industry, in its portfolio of lies, tells you that the remedies to solve climate change will be painful. That is just another fossil fuel lie, and Americans are catching on to that one too. An October 2019 Pew poll found that two-thirds

of Americans want the Federal Government to do more to combat climate change.

One thing that we are getting rid of in a hurry is coal. This represents the cumulative retirements of coal plants. Coal plants are phasing out, with 546 coal plants having closed in the United States since 2010, just in this last decade. In late 2019, Murray Energy became the eighth U.S. coal company in a year to file for bankruptcy. Coal plants anywhere are virtually unfinanceable. We have even seen operating, depreciated coal plants close because just operating that coal plant costs more than financing, building, and operating renewable energy facilities. That is good news for our safety and for our well-being.

Here is our overall energy portfolio and where it has increased. Look at solar go. Ho, ho. Oh, my gosh. It is up about 1,000 percent. It is really, really rocking. The second biggest increase: wind. More are coming on as we begin to develop offshore wind.

Fossil fuels still dominate. You can see this little inlay here—the transportation sector—but Americans are starting to buy more and more electric vehicles. Some really stunning new models are coming to the market. We are, of course, not doing anywhere near enough to encourage their adoption, which means we are likely to lose out, and we are doing this because rogue fossil fuel companies like Marathon Petroleum use political mischief to poke sticks in the wheels of vehicle fuel efficiency standards.

What the fossil fuel industry likes to do is to blame China: Oh, we are not going to do anything because China has to go first. What they omit telling you is that, at the end of 2017, 40 percent of all the electric cars in the world were in China. In 2018, China manufactured nearly half of all electric vehicles worldwide. China dominates global markets for electric buses and for electric two-wheelers—scooters and so forth.

You may recall that Exxon Corporation fabulously predicted to its shareholders—a prediction they have not yet corrected—that there would be zero electric buses by 2040. China is already operating 400,000. We are going to get run away from by China if we don't smarten up and compete.

Here is more good news. The price of digging out and transporting and burning dirty fuels is high: nearly \$110 for a megawatt hour of coal-fueled power. If you look, the most expensive are nuclear power plants; the next most expensive, coal; the next most expensive, solar thermal, which generates heat; the next most expensive, natural gas; and down here, the two cheapest by far are solar photovoltaic and wind.

So we know where these markets are going, with just \$40 per megawatt hour for solar photovoltaic compared to \$110 for coal. Over the last decade, the average cost of solar dropped from \$200 per megawatt hour to less than a quarter

of that. The cost of wind power is down, and offshore wind is emerging. Battery storage now competes on price with gas-fired, peak-demand plants in many areas. Even with the massive subsidy that we all have to pay to prop up fossil fuel, renewables are starting to win on price anyway.

If the price of wind, solar, battery storage, and other renewable technologies continues to drop, we could reach 100 percent renewable energy by the middle of the century, and we will need to if we are going to stay within the 1.5 degrees Celsius safe zone. In fact, here is what you see. The power sector's emissions are declining.

There is a lot of work left to do in transportation—what you might call room for improvement there. There is a lot of room for improvement in industry and a lot of room for improvement in buildings and other. So there is work to be done here.

Of course, these other sectors don't have much of an incentive to solve their emissions problem because it is still free to pollute. We continue to violate the most basic market theory about externalities, and we let these fossil fuel polluters pollute for free. When we let them pollute for free, it takes away any incentive in these other sectors to fix that problem—and, of course, that is goal 1 for the fossil-fuel industry. With a \$650 billion-per-year subsidy, they are throwing everything they have politically at trying to protect that phony, non-market-based, unfair subsidy. And even with it, they are still losing.

We could be doing better in all these sectors if we put a proper market-based price on carbon. So far they have won, if you can call not preparing for a looming calamity to be winning.

Here is a quick summary of the lessons of the 2010s.

One, the science is clear—we have blown by 400 parts per million. We are now in uncharted territory for the human species.

Two, climate change is a massive threat to our economy, particularly with the danger of crashes coming soon in coastal property values and carbon assets.

I just read the letter from BlackRock to CEOs and investors. BlackRock is one of the biggest investment companies in the world. They have warned of what they called capital reallocation. That means things are going to shift—happening as markets anticipate climate hazard—things like facing the danger of coastal property value crashes or carbon asset value crashes. Those crashes create capital reallocation.

I love the way economists talk. All the agony behind that, and they call it capital reallocation. Wrecking the world economy, they call systemic risk.

Three, Americans are getting that climate change is a big problem. It is a big change. It is a big change particularly with young Republicans, who totally get it.

Here is my challenge to my Republican colleagues in the Senate: Sit down with your own young staffers. Sit down with the young staffers in your own office and hear them out about climate change. You will see that there is a big generational divide.

Four, coal is on the ropes. Experts predict huge stranded assets in gas and oil. Solar and other renewables are booming as they outcompete fossil fuel on costs alone. That is a genie even the crooked fossil fuel machine can't put back in the bottle.

Of course, the fossil fuel industry is still up to no good, with its vast array of phony front groups so it does not look like it is them. They have names like the George C. Marshall Institute, the Competitive Enterprise Institute, the Heartland Institute—a bunch of phony front groups filled with stables of paid liars emitting slimy rivers of dark money, polluting our politics as badly as their emissions pollute our planet. That hasn't stopped, and they should be held accountable.

The 2020s are going to be tough, for sure. Australia is seeing the opening episode.

I have an analogy that I will use as I close. I have spent time running rivers. I like running rivers. I like running rivers in inflatables. I like running rivers in kayaks. I have run rivers from the placid Rappahannock in Virginia to the mighty Colorado through our massive Grand Canyon and lots in between. One of the things about running a river that has big rapids is that the first thing you do is you look at the map and you learn where the big rapids are so you can stop, get safely to shore, and figure out whether you can navigate the rapids or whether you need to portage around them.

Well, we had a map for where the rapids are on this. The scientists showed us. They told us. They warned us. But we ignored them. But not paying attention to what you are told on the science map is not your last chance. Going down the river, when you get closer, you can actually start to hear the falls, the rapids roaring up ahead of you.

The wildfires, the flooding, the rising seas, the species relocating around the planet—if that is not a roaring for us to hear now from the planet about the dangers ahead, shame on us. It is enough for us to know that we are actually getting close to big trouble, and we still do nothing.

Then there is a point on the river where it is your last chance. You have no choice as to whether you are going to miss the rapids or the falls ahead. You have ignored all the warnings. You have ignored the map. You haven't listened to the roar, and now you are close. Now you will have to paddle very hard to avoid the roaring rapids ahead. Nature's forces are pulling you inexorably toward the cataract. You will have to paddle for your life to avoid it.

That is where I believe we are right now. I believe that as human kind, as a

country, we have to paddle for our lives right now to avoid being sucked over the climate falls and into dangers that we don't want to see and that we don't want our children to have to see.

Let's wake up here. Let's shake off the shackles of this crooked fossil fuel industry, and let's get paddling for our lives.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. MCSALLY). The clerk will call the roll. The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

TRIBUTE TO DR. SAMIR GUINDI

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, the community in Harlan County, KY, will gather next month in honor of a devoted caregiver and friend as he prepares to begin a well-deserved retirement. Today, I would like to join them in paying tribute to Dr. Samir Guindi for the 45 years of devotion he has given to Southeastern Kentucky.

Dr. Guindi—Sam to his friends—and his wife, Laila, are originally from Egypt. They arrived in Harlan in 1975, where Sam spent much of his career as the only ear, nose, and throat surgical specialist in the area. As a result, his services were constantly in demand, and he dedicated himself wholeheartedly to the vital work. Conservative estimates by his colleagues show Sam conducted more than 200,000 patient visits during his impressive career. He performed approximately 30,000 procedures. Many of the patients Sam treated were children at high risk of ear damage and deafness.

On top of his busy professional schedule, Sam partnered with the well-regarded Appalachian Regional Healthcare System to provide charitable care for families in need. He was based in Harlan, but Sam's work extended into nearby Bell, Letcher, and Perry Counties as well. He spent countless hours on the road to see scores of patients in a single day, often without any compensation. In a region that has long faced a scarcity of medical professionals, Sam's tireless generosity and kindness made a remarkable impact on families in Southeastern Kentucky.

Sam's life has been a wonderful example of selflessness. Both of his sons, Alfi and Sherif, are successful attorneys, and Sherif followed his father into the service of his community by working as a public defender and an assistant Commonwealth's attorney. It is my privilege to join the Guindi family, the Harlan community, and all of Sam's patients in thanking him for his decades of providing vital medical care in Appalachia. I wish Sam the very best as he enjoys a relaxing retirement. I urge my Senate colleagues to join me in commending this outstanding Kentuckian.

TRIBUTE TO TOMMY LOVING

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, it is a pleasure to join the residents of Warren County, as well as law enforcement professionals throughout Kentucky, in congratulating my friend Tommy Loving as he marks 50 years of distinguished service in law enforcement next month. With a dedication to service, Tommy has been instrumental in the protection of Kentucky's families and communities. He continues to answer the call of duty each and every day, and our Commonwealth is safer as a result.

Tommy's career in law enforcement began at age 21 when he joined the Kentucky State Police, KSP, as a dispatcher. He would wear the gray uniform for more than two decades, serving as a trooper and then sergeant at posts across the Commonwealth.

In response to the ongoing struggle against illegal drugs, local leaders established the Bowling Green-Warren County Drug Task Force in 1997. They asked Tommy to put his experience to work protecting families from the spike of substance abuse as the organization's inaugural director. For the last 23 years, Tommy has done just that.

The task force is a collaborative team from the local police department, the county sheriff, Western Kentucky University's police force, the KSP, professionals from the Kentucky Governor's and Attorney General's Offices, and Federal law enforcement. These officers, bolstered by chemists, prosecutors, and support staff, lead the fight against the spread of dangerous substances in Warren County. As Kentucky continues to endure the devastating consequences of the opioid epidemic and a resurgence of methamphetamine use, the task force's expertise is vital now more than ever.

Because of his decade-long record leading this highly specialized team, Tommy was asked to take on an additional responsibility as the executive director of the Kentucky Narcotic Officers' Association, KNOA. With a mission to assist law enforcement personnel throughout the State with training and support as they combat illicit drug abuse, KNOA has increased the wellbeing of communities throughout the Commonwealth.

In recognition of his success in both local and State law enforcement, Tommy was selected to be the regional director for the National Narcotics Officers' Association Coalition in 2010. Now, he coordinates with officers and policymakers across six States and our Nation's Capital to share best practices and enhance public safety. Other States are looking to Kentucky for leadership, and Tommy's experience is benefiting families and communities around the country.

Thankfully, last year Kentucky saw the largest decrease in drug overdose fatalities in a decade. It was a long-awaited glimmer of hope in our fight against addiction. The service of law

enforcement officers, like Tommy, is a critical part of our comprehensive response to the addiction epidemic, and I hope he and his colleagues are proud of their contributions to this good news. In 2018, the KNOA Board unanimously voted to bestow on Tommy their Lifetime Distinguished Service Award for his decades of work protecting families and communities from substance abuse.

It is a distinct pleasure for me to join the chorus praising Tommy for his half-century in law enforcement. We may never be able to repay the selfless sacrifices of the brave men and women who protect our communities, but we can and should show our gratitude. Tommy's leadership and service are a great asset to Kentucky, and I know I speak for many when I say thank you. As he celebrates this milestone, I hope my Senate colleagues join me in sharing our congratulations with Tommy Loving and thanking him for his faithful service to Kentucky families.

REMEMBERING CHRISTOPHER ALLEN

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, I rise today to speak about a dedicated husband, father, son, public servant, and Marylander, Chris Allen.

Sadly, Chris passed away last week. He was 58 years old. He leaves behind a wife Lynda-Marie, and two daughters, Sophie and Lucie.

Chris spent years in the office of my friend Senator ROBERTS, relentlessly advocating on behalf of his constituents. More recently, he worked for Senator GRASSLEY on the Republican staff of the Senate Finance Committee, where he pushed for pragmatic policy solutions to improve the life of retirees and the pension system.

Those of us who were lucky enough to know Chris know he lifted the spirits of those around him through his wry sense of humor and infectious positivity. At work, he was experienced, passionate, and knowledgeable about his work, always searching for good policy with bipartisan support.

For those lucky enough to work with Chris, he made lifelong friends and allies. He will not soon be forgotten.

The world is a little less upbeat without Chris here. I hope you will join me in praying for his family and friends.

TRIBUTE TO LIEUTENANT COLONEL SARAH D. ECCLESTON

Mr. TESTER. Madam President, I rise today to recognize LTC Sarah D. Eccleston for her exemplary dedication to duty and service to the U.S. Army and to the United States of America.

Over the past year, she has served as the congressional analyst and congressional liaison in the Office of the Army Surgeon General.

LTC Sarah Eccleston was born and raised in Dillon, MT, and began her Army service in 2001 as a cadet in the Reserve Officer Training Corps, ROTC.

In 2004, she was commissioned as a distinguished military graduate from the University of Utah ROTC Program and received her bachelors of science degree in nursing from Westminster College, Salt Lake City, UT.

On her initial assignment as a lieutenant, she served as a staff nurse on a 32-bed multidisciplinary medical-surgical unit at the Carl R. Darnall Army Medical Center at Fort Hood, TX. She then attended the Critical Care Nurse Course at Brooke Army Medical Center, BAMC, in Fort Sam Houston, TX, where she began working as a clinical staff nurse in the surgical trauma intensive care unit at BAMC.

In 2009, she deployed with the 10th Combat Support Hospital out of Fort Carson, CO, to Baghdad, Iraq, where she worked as a critical care nurse. Shortly thereafter, she began working as the 2nd Brigade ROTC nurse counselor at Fort Dix, NJ. She completed her time with ROTC in May of 2012 and was selected for long-term health education and training through Widener University, where she received a master's in nursing. After graduating as a critical care clinical nurse specialist, Lieutenant Colonel Eccleston was assigned to Madigan Army Medical Center in Fort Lewis, WA, where she oversaw policy and quality of practice in three intensive care units.

Prior to her current assignment, in the summer of 2018, Lieutenant Colonel Eccleston was selected to serve as the executive nurse fellow to the Chief and Deputy Chief of the Army Nurse Corps.

After graduating as a critical care clinical nurse specialist, Lieutenant Colonel Eccleston was assigned to Madigan Army Medical Center at Joint Base Fort Lewis-McChord, WA, where she oversaw policy and quality of practice in three intensive care units.

Montanans and all Americans owe LTC Sarah Eccleston the deepest gratitude for her decade of active service to this Nation. I wish Sarah and her family all the best as they continue their journey of service.

(At the request of Mr. ROUNDS, the following statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.)

TRIBUTE TO NORMA KAEHLER

• Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, I am pleased to recognize Mrs. Norma Kaehler on the occasion of her retirement. Norma has been a hero of the aviation community for more than two decades. Most recently, she served as the managing director for government and corporate affairs at American Airlines Group.

Not many may remember this, but Norma got her start on Capitol Hill working for Senator Mack Mattingly of Georgia, and she never forgot that taking care of constituents is our No. 1 priority around here. She has always worked on behalf of the employees of American Airlines on Capitol Hill, tens of thousands of airline pilots, mechanics and maintenance personnel, flight

attendants, gate agents, and everyone in the back office—all responsible for ensuring planes depart and land on time—have benefited from her advocacy on their behalf. I can personally attest to this during her tireless advocacy of legislation I sponsored that protected the retirement benefits of American Airline employees after the 2013 merger.

In the course of her career, Norma Kaehler has worked for multiple airlines: Trans World Airlines, American Airlines, and American Airlines Group; and she played a major role in every FAA reauthorization bill enacted by Congress. Through it all, Norma remained an unflappable, passionate advocate for aviation. I know I join her family and American Airlines in thanking Norma for her years of service and contributions to the aviation community.

Congratulations on your retirement. We will miss you around here. •

TRIBUTE TO JULIUS P. KNAPP

Mr. WICKER. Madam President, I rise today to commend Julius “Julie” P. Knapp for his service to our Nation during the past 45 years. Mr. Knapp retires this month from his position as the FCC’s Chief of the Office of Engineering and Technology, OET, where he helped usher in the modern age of communications and was instrumental in making spectrum available to fuel our Nation’s economic growth in this area. If you are accessing a mobile device right now, using Wi-Fi, or buying the latest wireless gadget, you are likely benefiting from Julie Knapp’s work.

Mr. Knapp is well known and respected here in Congress for his technically precise and straightforward testimony at countless hearings. Mr. Knapp is a world-recognized expert in communications and is widely viewed as a leader on technical policy issues because of his expertise, his pragmatic and fair approach, and his ability to “translate” complex engineering issues to policymakers on all sides of an issue. He has briefed generations of congressional staffers on the intricacies of spectrum management and provided significant and substantial input on spectrum legislation. Many Members of this body have discussed communications industry developments with Julie, including low power FM, wireless and satellite issues, 4G LTE, Wi-Fi, and 5G, among others.

When the public looks at Julie Knapp’s career, we can see a parallel to the timeline of America’s communications industry’s growth. He graduated from high school in New Hyde, NY, in 1969, and he received his engineering degree from the City College of New York in 1974. Less than a month later, he went right to work for the American people. He rose through the ranks at the FCC, beginning as a 22-year-old certifying radio frequency devices and growing into a seasoned professional in the increasingly important equipment

authorization branch. He became Chief of the FCC laboratory, Chief of the Policy and Rules Division for OET, and finally Chief of OET, where he has served with extraordinary distinction since 2006.

Mr. Knapp’s outstanding work has brought him numerous awards and accolades within the government and in the engineering community. In 2012, he received one of the highest honors for a civil servant, the Presidential Distinguished Rank Award. He also has received the FCC’s Gold and Silver Awards and the Eugene C. Bowler Award for exceptional professionalism and dedication to public service.

Mr. Knapp has served the United States through multiple administrations, never asking for more than the opportunity to make a difference—and along the way, making a lasting, positive impact. He epitomizes the concept of civil service. We all owe Julie Knapp a debt of gratitude and our sincerest thanks for dedicating his life to building America’s communications systems and making these services universally available to all of us and for doing so with grace and humility.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

REMEMBERING PAUL ‘PETE’ DYE, JR.

• Mr. RUBIO. Madam President, today I honor the life of Paul “Pete” Dye, Jr., who was a legend in the sport of golf and the most iconic golf course architect in the modern era. Just one of five architects to be inducted into the World Golf Hall of Fame, his death on January 9, 2020, marks an end to an illustrious career of dedication and contribution to the sport.

Born on December 29, 1925, in Urbana, OH, Dye was first introduced to golf by his father, who built Urbana Country Club, a nine-hole course on their family’s land in Champaign County. As a high schooler, Dye won the State championship and went on to medal in the State amateur golf championship.

While many know Dye as an iconic course designer, he was also deeply committed to our great Nation. In 1944 at the age of 18, Dye enlisted in the U.S. Army during World War II.

Dye leaves behind an extraordinary legacy, including the world-renowned “Island Green,” the 17th hole at TPC Sawgrass in my home State of Florida, where Dye lived for many years. Florida was a special place for Dye, and it was also where he met his wife, Alice Holliday O’Neal, while he was enrolled at Rollins College. They went on to have two sons, P.B. and Perry, who to this day have continued their father’s work, honoring him by designing courses under the Dye Designs banner.

With immense gratitude for his work and service, I am honored to pay tribute to Pete’s life. •

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 10:04 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. 457. An act 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.

The message also announced that the House has passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 2398. An act to amend the United States Housing Act of 1937 and title 38, United States Code, to expand eligibility for the HUD-VASH program, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to submit annual reports to the Committees on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate and House of Representatives regarding homeless veterans, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4302. An act to authorize public housing agencies to share certain data regarding homeless individuals and families for the provision of housing and services, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4335. An act to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to require the Securities and Exchange Commission to issue rules that prohibit officers and directors of certain companies from trading securities in anticipation of a current report, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4458. An act to require the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System to issue reports on cybersecurity with respect to the functions of the Federal Reserve System, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4841. An act to require the prudential banking regulators to provide annual testimony to Congress on their supervision and regulation activities, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5315. An act to amend the Financial Institutions Reform, Recovery, and Enforcement Act of 1989 to establish a Financial Agent Mentor-Protege Program within the Department of the Treasury, and for other purposes.

H.J. Res. 80. Joint resolution approving the request of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs for a waiver under section 1703E(f) of title 38, United States Code.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The President pro tempore (Mr. GRASSLEY) announced that on today, January 14, 2020, he has signed the following enrolled bills, which were previously signed by the Speaker of the House:

H.R. 583. An act to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to provide for enhanced penalties for pirate radio, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2476. An act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to provide funding to secure nonprofit facilities from terrorist attacks, and for other purposes.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills and joint resolution were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 2398. An act to amend the United States Housing Act of 1937 and title 38, United States Code, to expand eligibility for the HUD-VASH program, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to submit annual reports to the Committees on Veterans' Af-

fairs of the Senate and House of Representatives regarding homeless veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

H.R. 4302. An act to authorize public housing agencies to share certain data regarding homeless individuals and families for the provision of housing and services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

H.R. 4335. An act to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to require the Securities and Exchange Commission to issue rules that prohibit officers and directors of certain companies from trading securities in anticipation of a current report, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

H.R. 4458. An act to require the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System to issue reports on cybersecurity with respect to the functions of the Federal Reserve System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

H.R. 4841. An act to require the prudential banking regulators to provide annual testimony to Congress on their supervision and regulation activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

H.R. 5315. An act to amend the Financial Institutions Reform, Recovery, and Enforcement Act of 1989 to establish a Financial Agent Mentor-Protege Program within the Department of the Treasury, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

H.J. Res. 80. Joint resolution approving the request of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs for a waiver under section 1703E(f) of title 38, United States Code; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bill was read the first time:

S. 3193. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to list fentanyl-related substances as schedule I controlled substances, 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-3713. A communication from the Deputy Chief Management Officer, Office of the Chief Management Officer, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to Section 921 (b) (3) of the John McCain Fiscal Year 2019 National Defense Authorization Act; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-3714. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Manpower and Reserve Affairs), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the mobilizations of selected reserve units, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 8, 2020; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-3715. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Acquisition, Logistics and Technology), transmitting, pursuant to law, an annual report relative to the Department's Chemical Demilitarization Program (CDP); to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-3716. A communication from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmit-

ting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Regulations and Procedures Under the Plant Variety Protection Act" (RIN0581-AD86) (Docket No. AMS-ST-19-0004) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 13, 2020; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-3717. A communication from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Marketing Order Regulating the Handling of Apricots Grown in Designated Counties in Washington; Increased Assessment Rate" (Docket No. AMS-DC-19-0048) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 13, 2020; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-3718. A communication from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Beef Promotion and Research Rules and Regulations" (Docket No. AMS-LP-19-0054) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 13, 2020; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-3719. A communication from the Program Specialist, Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Regulatory Capital Rule: Capital Simplification for Qualifying Community Banking Organizations; Technical Correction" (RIN1557-AE59) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 9, 2020; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-3720. A communication from the Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the remaining obstacles to the efficient and timely circulation of \$1 coins; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-3721. A communication from the Departmental Privacy Officer, Bureau of Safety and Environmental Enforcement, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Privacy Act Regulations; Exemptions for the Investigations Case Management System" (RIN1014-AA41) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 13, 2020; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-3722. A communication from the Director of Congressional Affairs, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Surface Deformation" (NUREG-0800, Chapter 2) (SRP 2.5.3) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 13, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3723. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; California; Northern Sierra Air Quality Management District; Reasonably Available Control Technology" (FRL No. 10003-96-Region 9) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 13, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3724. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; Georgia; Non-attainment New Source Review" (FRL No. 10004-19-Region 4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 13, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3725. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Air Plan Approval; Illinois; Emissions Statement Rule Certification for the 2015 Ozone Standard” (FRL No. 10004-21-Region 5) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 13, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3726. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Air Plan Approval; Missouri; Sampling Methods for Air Pollution Sources” (FRL No. 10004-15-Region 7) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 13, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3727. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Air Plan Approval; New Mexico; City of Albuquerque-Bernalillo County; New Source Review (NSR) Preconstruction Permitting Program” (FRL No. 10003-44-Region 6) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 13, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3728. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Air Plan Approval; Washington; Update to the Adoption by Reference, Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council” (FRL No. 10003-85-Region 10) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 13, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3729. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State of Montana; State Implementation Plan Revisions for Open Burning” (FRL No. 10003-37-Region 8) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 13, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3730. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Approval and Promulgation of State Air Quality Plans for Designated Facilities and Pollutants; New Mexico and Albuquerque-Bernalillo County, New Mexico; Control of Emissions From Existing Other Solid Waste Incineration Units” (FRL No. 10003-60-Region 6) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 13, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3731. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “California; Final Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Management Program Revisions” (FRL No. 10003-98-Region 9) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 13, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3732. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Extreme Area Submission Requirements, Coachella Valley Nonattainment Area; California Ozone” (FRL No. 10003-97-Region 9) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 13, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3733. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fenhexamid; Pesticide Tolerances” (FRL No. 10002-21-OCSPP) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 13, 2020; to the Committees on Environment and Public Works; and Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-3734. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants; Surface Coating of Metal Cans and Surface Coating of Metal Coil Residual Risk and Technology Review” (FRL No. 10003-81-OAR) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 13, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3735. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Renewable Fuel Standard Program; Standards for 2020, Biomass-Based Diesel Volumes for 2021, and Other Changes” (FRL No. 10003-79-OAR) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 13, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3736. 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 “Revenue Procedure 2020-5” (Rev. Proc. 2020-5) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 10, 2020; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-3737. A communication from the Acting Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Services, Office of General Counsel, Department of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Adjustment of Civil Monetary Penalties for Inflation” ((RIN1801-AA20) (34 CFR Parts 36 and 668)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 9, 2020; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-3738. A communication from the Senior Advisor, Office of the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of a vacancy in the position of Commissioner of Food and Drugs, Department of Health and Human Services, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 10, 2020; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-3739. A communication from the Director of Regulations and Policy Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Medical Device Submissions: Amending Premarket Regulations That Require Multiple Copies and Specify Paper Copies To Be Required in Electronic Format” (RIN0910-AH48) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 14, 2020; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-3740. A communication from the Director of Regulations and Policy Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Regulation Requiring an Approved New Drug Application for Drugs Sterilized by Irradiation” (RIN0910-AH47) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 13, 2020; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-3741. A communication from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled “2017 Annual Report of the National Institute of Justice”; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-3742. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Amendment of the Class E Airspace; Redding, CA” ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2019-0625)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 10, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3743. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Amendment of the Class E Airspace; Coudersport, PA; and Revocation of Class E Airspace; Galeton, PA” ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2019-0757)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 10, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3744. 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-2019-0603)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 10, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3745. 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-2019-0983)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 10, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3746. 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-2019-9072)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 10, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3747. 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-2019-0703)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 10, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3748. 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: Bombardier, Inc., Airplanes” ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2019-0256)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 10, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3749. 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; Viking Air Limited (Type Certificate Previously Held by Bombardier, Inc.; Canadair Limited) Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2019-0710)) received during adjournment of the Senate on January 10, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3750. 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-2019-0709)) received during adjournment of the Senate on January 10, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3751. 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; Bombardier, Inc., Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2019-0993)) received during adjournment of the Senate on January 10, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3752. 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; Embraer S.A. Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2019-0499)) received during adjournment of the Senate on January 10, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Ms. CORTEZ MASTO (for herself and Mr. CRAMER):

S. 3183. A bill to improve the Safe Routes to School Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. BRAUN (for himself and Ms. ERNST):

S. 3184. A bill to require an annual report of Federal employees and retirees with delinquent tax debt; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. ERNST (for herself, Mr. PETERS, and Mr. LANKFORD):

S. 3185. A bill to prohibit the payment of bonuses to contractors for unsatisfactory performance; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. GRAHAM (for himself and Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina):

S. 3186. A bill to amend title 40, United States Code, to modify the definition of Appalachian region; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. BOOZMAN (for himself and Mr. COTTON):

S. 3187. A bill to permit the Scipio A. Jones Post Office in Little Rock, Arkansas, to accept and display a portrait of Scipio A. Jones, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Ms. ROSEN (for herself, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. COONS, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. CASEY, Mr. BRAUN, and Mr. PETERS):

S. 3188. A bill to amend the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act to establish demonstration and pilot projects to facilitate education and training programs in the field of advanced manufacturing; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. WARNER (for himself, Mr. BURR, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. CORNYN, and Mr. BENNET):

S. 3189. A bill to use proceeds from spectrum auctions to support supply chain innovation and multilateral security; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. COONS, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. REED, Ms. ROSEN, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):

S. 3190. A bill to authorize dedicated domestic terrorism offices within the Department of Homeland Security, the Department of Justice, and the Federal Bureau of Investigation to analyze and monitor domestic terrorist activity and require the Federal Government to take steps to prevent domestic terrorism; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WICKER (for himself, Mr. GARDNER, Ms. BALDWIN, and Mr. PETERS):

S. 3191. A bill to increase the capacity of research and development programs of the Federal Government that focus on industries of the future, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Ms. CANTWELL (for herself and Mr. BLUNT):

S. 3192. A bill to establish an aerospace fellowship program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. PORTMAN (for himself, Mr. MANCHIN, Mrs. CAPITO, and Mrs. HYDE-SMITH):

S. 3193. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to list fentanyl-related substances as schedule I controlled substances, and for other purposes; read the first time.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. GRAHAM (for himself, Ms. MCSALLY, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. RUBIO, Ms. ERNST, Mr. CRUZ, and Mr. ROMNEY):

S. Res. 469. A resolution supporting the people of Iran as they engage in legitimate protests, and condemning the Iranian regime for its murderous response; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 169

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA) was added as a cosponsor of S. 169, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide an exemption from gross income for civil damages as recompense for trafficking in persons.

S. 259

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the names of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) were added as cosponsors of S. 259, a bill to impose criminal sanctions on certain persons involved in international doping fraud conspiracies, to provide restitution for victims of such conspiracies, and to require sharing of information with the United States Anti-Doping Agency to assist its fight against doping, and for other purposes.

S. 277

At the request of Ms. HIRONO, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) was added as a cosponsor of S. 277, a bill to posthumously award a Congressional Gold Medal to Fred Korematsu, in recognition of his dedication to justice and equality.

S. 342

At the request of Mr. YOUNG, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 342, a bill to reauthorize title VI of the Higher Education Act of 1965 in order to improve and encourage innovation in international education, and for other purposes.

S. 348

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 348, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the distribution of additional residency positions, and for other purposes.

S. 400

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the names of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. JOHNSON) and the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) were added as cosponsors of S. 400, a bill to gather information about the illicit production of illicit fentanyl in foreign countries and to withhold bilateral assistance from countries that do not have emergency scheduling procedures for new illicit drugs, cannot prosecute criminals for the manufacture or distribution of controlled substance analogues, or do not require the registration of tabletting machine and encapsulating machines.

S. 578

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the names of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) and the Senator from Utah (Mr. ROMNEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 578, a bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the five-month waiting period for disability insurance benefits under such title for individuals with amyotrophic lateral sclerosis.

S. 701

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 701, a bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to reauthorize the Chesapeake Bay Program, and for other purposes.

S. 892

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the names of the Senator from Maryland

(Mr. VAN HOLLEN) and the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER) were added as cosponsors of S. 892, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the women in the United States who joined the workforce during World War II, providing the aircraft, vehicles, weaponry, ammunition, and other materials to win the war, that were referred to as ‘Rosie the Riveter’, in recognition of their contributions to the United States and the inspiration they have provided to ensuing generations.

S. 947

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 947, a bill to amend the Radiation Exposure Compensation Act to improve compensation for workers involved in uranium mining, and for other purposes.

S. 1053

At the request of Mr. COONS, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1053, a bill to establish a universal personal savings program, and for other purposes.

S. 1074

At the request of Mr. SCHATZ, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1074, a bill to reinstate Federal Pell Grant eligibility for individuals incarcerated in Federal and State penal institutions, and for other purposes.

S. 1168

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1168, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to ensure campus access at public institutions of higher education for religious groups.

S. 1374

At the request of Ms. MCSALLY, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1374, a bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the waiting periods for disability insurance benefits and Medicare coverage for individuals with metastatic breast cancer, and for other purposes.

S. 2233

At the request of Mr. SCHATZ, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2233, a bill to nullify the effect of the recent executive order that requires Federal agencies to share citizenship data.

S. 2379

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2379, a bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to clarify the authority of State Medicaid fraud and abuse control units to investigate and prosecute cases of Medicaid patient abuse and neglect in any setting, and for other purposes.

S. 2570

At the request of Ms. SINEMA, the names of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BRAUN), the Senator from Massa-

chusetts (Ms. WARREN) and the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY) 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. 2679

At the request of Ms. DUCKWORTH, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2679, a bill to facilitate the automatic acquisition of citizenship for lawful permanent resident children of military and Federal Government personnel residing abroad, and for other purposes.

S. 2803

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the names of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) and the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) were added as cosponsors of S. 2803, a bill to provide Federal housing assistance on behalf of youths who are aging out of foster care, and for other purposes.

S. 2815

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. HAWLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2815, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the National Purple Heart Honor Mission.

S. 2941

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2941, a bill to require the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to establish a consumer recycling education and outreach grant program, and for other purposes.

S. 2948

At the request of Mr. TILLIS, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2948, a bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to carry out a pilot program for work therapy using service dog training.

S. 2980

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2980, a bill to require the promulgation of certain standards for perfluoroalkyl and polyfluoroalkyl substances under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, and for other purposes.

S. 2989

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2989, a bill to amend title XI of the Social Security Act to clarify the mailing requirement relating to social security account statements.

S. 2991

At the request of Mr. SULLIVAN, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2991, a bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to conduct an independent review of the deaths of certain veterans by suicide, and for other purposes.

S. 3133

At the request of Mr. BRAUN, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3133, a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to establish a time-limited conditional approval pathway, subject to specific obligations, for certain drugs, and for other purposes.

S. 3153

At the request of Mr. COTTON, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3153, a bill to prohibit the sharing of United States intelligence with countries that permit the operation of Huawei fifth generation telecommunications technology within their borders.

S.J. RES. 63

At the request of Mr. KAINES, the names of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) and the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) were added as cosponsors of S.J. Res. 63, a joint resolution to direct the removal of United States Armed Forces from hostilities against the Islamic Republic of Iran that have not been authorized by Congress.

S.J. RES. 68

At the request of Mr. KAINES, the names of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS), the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH), the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKLEY), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. JONES), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) and the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) were added as cosponsors of S.J. Res. 68, a joint resolution to direct the removal of United States Armed Forces from hostilities against the Islamic Republic of Iran that have not been authorized by Congress.

S. RES. 466

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 466, a resolution honoring the members of the Armed Forces and the intelligence community of the United States who carried out the mission that killed Qasem Soleimani, and for other purposes.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. COONS, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. REED, Ms. ROSEN, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):

S. 3190. A bill to authorize dedicated domestic terrorism offices within the Department of Homeland Security, the Department of Justice, and the Federal Bureau of Investigation to analyze and monitor domestic terrorist activity and require the Federal Government to take steps to prevent domestic terrorism; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 3190

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 “Domestic Terrorism Prevention Act of 2020”.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) Recent reports have demonstrated that White supremacists and other far-right-wing extremists are the most significant domestic terrorism threat facing the United States, including—

(A) a February 22, 2019, New York Times op-ed, by a Trump Administration United States Department of Justice official, who wrote that “white supremacy and far-right extremism are among the greatest domestic-security threats facing the United States. Regrettably, over the past 25 years, law enforcement, at both the Federal and State levels, has been slow to respond. . . . Killings committed by individuals and groups associated with far-right extremist groups have risen significantly.”;

(B) an April 2017 Government Accountability Office report on the significant, lethal threat posed by domestic violent extremists, which—

(i) explained that “[s]ince September 12, 2001, the number of fatalities caused by domestic violent extremists has ranged from 1 to 49 in a given year.”; and

(ii) noted that “[F]atalities resulting from attacks by far right wing violent extremists have exceeded those caused by radical Islamist violent extremists in 10 of the 15 years, and were the same in 3 of the years since September 12, 2001. Of the 85 violent extremist incidents that resulted in death since September 12, 2001, far right wing violent extremist groups were responsible for 62 (73 percent) while radical Islamist violent extremists were responsible for 23 (27 percent).”; and

(C) an unclassified May 2017 joint intelligence bulletin from the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Department of Homeland Security, which found that “white supremacist extremism poses [a] persistent threat of lethal violence,” and that White supremacists “were responsible for 49 homicides in 26 attacks from 2000 to 2016. . . . more than any other domestic extremist movement”.

(2) Recent domestic terrorist attacks include—

(A) the August 5, 2012, mass shooting at a Sikh gurdwara in Oak Creek, Wisconsin, in which a White supremacist shot and killed 6 members of the gurdwara;

(B) the April 13, 2014, mass shooting at a Jewish community center and a Jewish assisted living facility in Overland Park, Kansas, in which a neo-Nazi shot and killed 3 civilians, including a 14-year-old teenager;

(C) the June 8, 2014, ambush in Las Vegas, Nevada, in which 2 supporters of the far-right-wing “patriot” movement shot and killed 2 police officers and a civilian;

(D) the June 17, 2015, mass shooting at the Emanuel AME Church in Charleston, South Carolina, in which a White supremacist shot and killed 9 members of the church;

(E) the November 27, 2015, mass shooting at a Planned Parenthood clinic in Colorado Springs, Colorado, in which an anti-abortion extremist shot and killed a police officer and 2 civilians;

(F) the March 20, 2017, murder of an African-American man in New York City, allegedly committed by a White supremacist who

reportedly traveled to New York “for the purpose of killing black men”;

(G) the May 26, 2017, attack in Portland, Oregon, in which a White supremacist allegedly murdered 2 men and injured a third after the men defended 2 young women whom the individual had targeted with anti-Muslim hate speech;

(H) the August 12, 2017, attacks in Charlottesville, Virginia, in which—

(i) a White supremacist killed one and injured nineteen after driving his car through a crowd of individuals protesting a neo-Nazi rally, and of which former Attorney General Jeff Sessions said, “It does meet the definition of domestic terrorism in our statute.”; and

(ii) a group of 6 men linked to militia or White supremacist groups assaulted an African-American man who had been protesting the neo-Nazi rally in a downtown parking garage;

(I) the July 2018 murder of an African-American woman from Kansas City, Missouri, allegedly committed by a White supremacist who reportedly bragged about being a member of the Ku Klux Klan;

(J) the October 24, 2018, shooting in Jeffersontown, Kentucky, in which a White man allegedly murdered 2 African Americans at a grocery store after first attempting to enter a church with a predominantly African-American congregation during a service;

(K) the October 27, 2018, mass shooting at the Tree of Life Synagogue in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, in which a White nationalist allegedly shot and killed 11 members of the congregation;

(L) the April 27, 2019, shooting at the Chabad of Poway synagogue in California, in which a man yelling anti-Semitic slurs allegedly killed a member of the congregation and wounded 3 others;

(M) the August 3, 2019, mass shooting at a Walmart in El Paso, Texas, in which a White supremacist with anti-immigrant views killed 22 people and injured 26 others;

(N) the December 10, 2019, shooting at a Kosher supermarket in Jersey City, New Jersey, in which 2 men with anti-Semitic views killed 3 people in the store and a law enforcement officer in an earlier encounter; and

(O) the December 28, 2019, machete attack at a Hanukkah celebration in Monsey, New York, in which a man who had expressed anti-Semitic views stabbed 5 individuals.

(3) In November 2019, the Federal Bureau of Investigation released its annual hate crime incident report, which found that in 2018, violent hate crimes reached a 16-year high. Though the overall number of hate crimes decreased slightly after three consecutive years of increases, the report found a 4-percent increase in aggravated assaults, a 15-percent increase in simple assaults, and a 13-percent increase in intimidation. There was also a nearly 6-percent increase in hate crimes directed at LGBTQ individuals and a 14-percent increase in hate crimes directed at Hispanic and Latino individuals. Nearly 60 percent of the religion-based hate crimes reported targeted American Jews and Jewish institutions. The previous year’s report found that in 2017, hate crimes increased by approximately 17 percent, including a 23-percent increase in religion-based hate crimes, an 18-percent increase in race-based crimes, and a 5-percent increase in crimes directed against LGBTQ individuals. The report analyzing 2016 data found that hate crimes increased by almost 5 percent that year, including a 19-percent rise in hate crimes against American Muslims. Similarly, the report analyzing 2015 data found that hate crimes increased by 6 percent that year. Much of the 2015 increase came from a 66-percent rise in attacks on American Muslims and a 9-percent rise in attacks on American

Jews. In all 4 reports, race-based crimes were most numerous, and those crimes most often targeted African Americans.

(4) On March 15, 2019, a White nationalist was arrested and charged with murder after allegedly killing 50 Muslim worshippers and injuring more than 40 in a massacre at the Al Noor Mosque and Linwood Mosque in Christchurch, New Zealand. The alleged shooter posted a hate-filled, xenophobic manifesto that detailed his White nationalist ideology before the massacre. Prime Minister Jacinda Ardern labeled the massacre a terrorist attack.

(5) In January 2017, a right-wing extremist who had expressed anti-Muslim views was charged with murder for allegedly killing 6 people and injuring 19 in a shooting rampage at a mosque in Quebec City, Canada. It was the first-ever mass shooting at a mosque in North America, and Prime Minister Trudeau labeled it a terrorist attack.

(6) On February 15, 2019, Federal authorities arrested U.S. Coast Guard Lieutenant Christopher Paul Hasson, who was allegedly planning to kill a number of prominent journalists, professors, judges, and “leftists in general”. In court filings, prosecutors described Lieutenant Hasson as a “domestic terrorist” who in an email “identified himself as a White Nationalist for over 30 years and advocated for ‘focused violence’ in order to establish a white homeland.”.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act—

(1) the term “Director” means the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation;

(2) the term “domestic terrorism” has the meaning given the term in section 2331 of title 18, United States Code, except that it does not include acts perpetrated by individuals associated with or inspired by—

(A) a foreign person or organization designated as a foreign terrorist organization under section 219 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1189);

(B) an individual or organization designated under Executive Order 13224 (50 U.S.C. 1701 note); or

(C) a state sponsor of terrorism as determined by the Secretary of State under section 6(j) of the Export Administration Act of 1979 (50 U.S.C. 4605), section 40 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2780), or section 620A of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2371);

(3) the term “Domestic Terrorism Executive Committee” means the committee within the Department of Justice tasked with assessing and sharing information about ongoing domestic terrorism threats;

(4) the term “hate crime incident” means an act described in section 241, 245, 247, or 249 of title 18, United States Code, or in section 901 of the Civil Rights Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3631);

(5) the term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Homeland Security; and

(6) the term “uniformed services” has the meaning given the term in section 101(a) of title 10, United States Code.

SEC. 4. OFFICES TO COMBAT DOMESTIC TERRORISM.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF OFFICES TO MONITOR, ANALYZE, INVESTIGATE, AND PROSECUTE DOMESTIC TERRORISM.—

(1) DOMESTIC TERRORISM UNIT.—There is authorized a Domestic Terrorism Unit in the Office of Intelligence and Analysis of the Department of Homeland Security, which shall be responsible for monitoring and analyzing domestic terrorism activity.

(2) DOMESTIC TERRORISM OFFICE.—There is authorized a Domestic Terrorism Office in the Counterterrorism Section of the National Security Division of the Department of Justice—

(A) which shall be responsible for investigating and prosecuting incidents of domestic terrorism; and

(B) which shall be headed by the Domestic Terrorism Counsel.

(3) DOMESTIC TERRORISM SECTION OF THE FBI.—There is authorized a Domestic Terrorism Section within the Counterterrorism Division of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, which shall be responsible for investigating domestic terrorism activity.

(4) STAFFING.—The Secretary, the Attorney General, and the Director shall each ensure that each office authorized under this section in their respective agencies shall—

(A) have adequate number of employees to perform the required duties;

(B) have not less than 1 employee dedicated to ensuring compliance with civil rights and civil liberties laws and regulations; and

(C) require that all employees undergo annual anti-bias training.

(5) SUNSET.—The offices authorized under this subsection shall terminate on the date that is 10 years after the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) JOINT REPORT ON DOMESTIC TERRORISM.—

(1) BIANNUAL REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, and each 180 days thereafter for the 10-year period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security, the Attorney General, and the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation shall submit a joint report authored by the domestic terrorism offices authorized under paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of subsection (a) to—

(A) the Committee on the Judiciary, the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on the Judiciary, the Committee on Homeland Security, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives.

(2) CONTENTS.—Each report submitted under paragraph (1) shall include—

(A) an assessment of the domestic terrorism threat posed by White supremacists and neo-Nazis, including White supremacist and neo-Nazi infiltration of Federal, State, and local law enforcement agencies and the uniformed services; and

(B)(i) in the first report, an analysis of incidents or attempted incidents of domestic terrorism that have occurred in the United States since April 19, 1995, including any White-supremacist-related incidents or attempted incidents; and

(ii) in each subsequent report, an analysis of incidents or attempted incidents of domestic terrorism that occurred in the United States during the preceding 180-day period, including any White-supremacist-related incidents or attempted incidents; and

(C) a quantitative analysis of domestic terrorism for the preceding 180-day period, including—

(i) the number of—

(I) domestic terrorism related assessments initiated by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, including the number of assessments from each classification and subcategory, with a specific classification or subcategory for those related to White supremacism;

(II) domestic terrorism-related preliminary investigations initiated by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, including the number of preliminary investigations from each classification and subcategory, with a specific classification or subcategory for those related to White supremacism, and how many preliminary investigations resulted from assessments;

(III) domestic terrorism-related full investigations initiated by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, including the number of full investigations from each classification and subcategory, with a specific classification or subcategory for those related to White supremacism, and how many full investigations resulted from preliminary investigations and assessments;

(IV) domestic terrorism-related incidents, including the number of incidents from each classification and subcategory, with a specific classification or subcategory for those related to White supremacism, the number of deaths and injuries resulting from each incident, and a detailed explanation of each incident;

(V) Federal domestic terrorism-related arrests, including the number of arrests from each classification and subcategory, with a specific classification or subcategory for those related to White supremacism, and a detailed explanation of each arrest;

(VI) Federal domestic terrorism-related indictments, including the number of indictments from each classification and subcategory, with a specific classification or subcategory for those related to White supremacism, and a detailed explanation of each indictment;

(VII) Federal domestic terrorism-related prosecutions, including the number of incidents from each classification and subcategory, with a specific classification or subcategory for those related to White supremacism, and a detailed explanation of each prosecution;

(VIII) Federal domestic terrorism-related convictions, including the number of convictions from each classification and subcategory, with a specific classification or subcategory for those related to White supremacism, and a detailed explanation of each conviction; and

(IX) Federal domestic terrorism-related weapons recoveries, including the number of each type of weapon and the number of weapons from each classification and subcategory, with a specific classification or subcategory for those related to White supremacism; and

(ii) an explanation of each individual case that progressed through more than 1 of the stages described under clause (i), including the specific classification or subcategory for each case.

(3) HATE CRIMES.—In compiling a joint report under this subsection, the domestic terrorism offices authorized under paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of subsection (a) shall, in consultation with the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice and the Civil Rights Unit of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, review each hate crime incident reported during the preceding 180-day period to determine whether the incident also constitutes a domestic terrorism-related incident.

(4) CLASSIFICATION AND PUBLIC RELEASE.—Each report submitted under paragraph (1) shall be—

(A) unclassified, to the greatest extent possible, with a classified annex only if necessary; and

(B) in the case of the unclassified portion of the report, posted on the public websites of the Department of Homeland Security, the Department of Justice, and the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

(c) DOMESTIC TERRORISM EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.—There is authorized a Domestic Terrorism Executive Committee, which shall—

(1) meet on a regular basis, and not less regularly than 4 times each year, to coordinate with United States Attorneys and other key public safety officials across the country to promote information sharing and ensure

an effective, responsive, and organized joint effort to combat domestic terrorism; and

(2) be co-chaired by—

(A) the Domestic Terrorism Counsel authorized under subsection (a)(2)(B);

(B) a United States Attorney or Assistant United States Attorney;

(C) a member of the National Security Division of the Department of Justice; and

(D) a member of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

(d) FOCUS ON GREATEST THREATS.—The domestic terrorism offices authorized under paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of subsection (a) shall focus their limited resources on the most significant domestic terrorism threats, as determined by the number of domestic terrorism-related incidents from each category and subclassification in the joint report for the preceding 180-day period required under subsection (b).

SEC. 5. TRAINING TO COMBAT DOMESTIC TERRORISM.

(a) REQUIRED TRAINING AND RESOURCES.—The Secretary, the Attorney General, and the Director shall review the anti-terrorism training and resource programs of their respective agencies that are provided to Federal, State, local, and Tribal law enforcement agencies, including the State and Local Anti-Terrorism Program that is funded by the Bureau of Justice Assistance of the Department of Justice, and ensure that such programs include training and resources to assist State, local, and Tribal law enforcement agencies in understanding, detecting, deterring, and investigating acts of domestic terrorism and White supremacist and neo-Nazi infiltration of law enforcement and corrections agencies. The domestic-terrorism training shall focus on the most significant domestic terrorism threats, as determined by the quantitative analysis in the joint report required under section 4(b).

(b) REQUIREMENT.—Any individual who provides domestic terrorism training required under this section shall have—

(1) expertise in domestic terrorism; and

(2) relevant academic, law enforcement, or other community-based experience in matters related to domestic terrorism.

(c) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act and twice each year thereafter, the Secretary, the Attorney General, and the Director shall each submit a biannual report to the committees of Congress described in section 4(b)(1) on the domestic terrorism training implemented by their respective agencies under this section, which shall include copies of all training materials used and the names and qualifications of the individuals who provide the training.

(2) CLASSIFICATION AND PUBLIC RELEASE.—Each report submitted under paragraph (1) shall be—

(A) unclassified, to the greatest extent possible, with a classified annex only if necessary; and

(B) in the case of the unclassified portion of each report, posted on the public website of the Department of Homeland Security, the Department of Justice, and the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

SEC. 6. INTERAGENCY TASK FORCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General, the Director, the Secretary, and the Secretary of Defense shall establish an interagency task force to analyze and combat White supremacist and neo-Nazi infiltration of the uniformed services and Federal law enforcement agencies.

(b) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the interagency task force is established

under subsection (a), the Attorney General, the Director, the Secretary, and the Secretary of Defense shall submit a joint report on the findings of the task force, and the response of the Attorney General, the Director, the Secretary, and the Secretary of Defense to such findings, to—

(A) the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate;

(B) the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate;

(C) the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate;

(D) the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate;

(E) the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives;

(F) the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives;

(G) the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives; and

(H) the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives.

(2) CLASSIFICATION AND PUBLIC RELEASE.—The report submitted under paragraph (1) shall be—

(A) submitted in unclassified form, to the greatest extent possible, with a classified annex only if necessary; and

(B) in the case of the unclassified portion of the report, posted on the public website of the Department of Defense, the Department of Homeland Security, the Department of Justice, and the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

SEC. 7. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE SUPPORT FOR HATE CRIME INCIDENTS WITH A NEXUS TO DOMESTIC TERRORISM.

(a) COMMUNITY RELATIONS SERVICE.—The Community Relations Service of the Department of Justice, authorized under section 1001(a) of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000g), shall offer the support of the Service to communities where the Department of Justice has brought charges in a hate crime incident that has a nexus to domestic terrorism.

(b) FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION.—Section 249 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(e) FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION.—The Attorney General, acting through the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, shall assign a special agent or hate crimes liaison to each field office of the Federal Bureau of Investigation to investigate hate crimes incidents with a nexus to domestic terrorism (as such term is defined in section 3 of the Domestic Terrorism Prevention Act of 2020).”.

SEC. 8. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Justice, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Department of Homeland Security, and the Department of Defense such sums as may be necessary to carry out this Act.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 469—SUPPORTING THE PEOPLE OF IRAN AS THEY ENGAGE IN LEGITIMATE PROTESTS, AND CONDEMNING THE IRANIAN REGIME FOR ITS MURDEROUS RESPONSE

Mr. GRAHAM (for himself, Ms. MCSALLY, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. RUBIO, Ms. ERNST, Mr. CRUZ, and Mr. ROMNEY) submitted the following resolution, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 469

Whereas Iran began experiencing severe political unrest following the increase of fuel prices in November 2019;

Whereas reports state that the November 2019 protests were the deadliest period of political unrest since the Islamic Revolution occurred in 1979, resulting in the deaths of hundreds of Iranian citizens;

Whereas, spurred by the shooting down of a Ukrainian airliner by the Iranian military and the Government of Iran's subsequent denial, thousands of Iranian protesters, undeterred by water cannons, tear gas, and the reported use of live ammunition, continue their legitimate protest against a corrupt regime, hoping that their efforts will result in a brighter future for all Iranians, not just the elite;

Whereas, on January 10, 2020, during a press briefing at the White House concerning new tough sanctions on Iran, Secretary Pompeo stated, “These sanctions targets include the Secretary of the Supreme National Council and the Commander of the Basij Forces; that's the regime's brute squad, which has, in the last few months, killed approximately 1,500 Iranians who were simply demanding freedom.”;

Whereas, on January 11, 2020, Iran's only Olympic medalist, Kimia Alizadeh, announced her defection from Iran, stating that she was “one of the millions of oppressed women in Iran” and that she had defected due to “hypocrisy, lies, injustice, and flattery” of the Iranian regime;

Whereas, on January 11, 2020, Secretary Pompeo tweeted, “The voice of the Iranian people is clear. They are fed up with the regime's lies, corruption, ineptitude, and brutality of the IRGC under @khamenei_ir's kleptocracy. We stand with the Iranian people who deserve a better future”;

Whereas, on January 12, 2020, in a tweet directed towards Iranian leaders, President Trump stated, “Thousands have already been killed or imprisoned by you, and the World is watching. More importantly, the USA is watching”;

Whereas the United States Government supports the rights of all people to peaceably assemble and allow for substantive discourse, and it is deeply troubling that a government would ignore the concerns of its citizens as the Government of Iran has continually done; and

Whereas, now more than ever, it is imperative that all nations support the people of Iran as they protest a government that for far too long has ignored the needs of its citizens: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) stands with the people of Iran, hopeful for change, as they protest their corrupt and oppressive government;

(2) condemns the lethal crackdown by the Iranian regime on the peaceful protesters;

(3) calls on all peaceful and law abiding nations to support the legitimate protests by the Iranian people; and

(4) demands that the Iranian leadership be held accountable for their murderous actions against their own citizens who want nothing less than to be represented by a fair and just government.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 1279. Mr. CRUZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution S.J. Res. 63, to direct the removal of United States Armed Forces from hostilities against the Islamic Republic of Iran that have not been authorized by Congress; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

SA 1280. Mr. CRUZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution S.J. Res. 63, supra; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

SA 1281. Mr. CRUZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution S.J. Res. 63, supra; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

SA 1282. Mr. McCONNELL (for Mr. ROMNEY) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2547, to state the policy of the United States with respect to the expansion of cooperation with allies and partners in the Indo-Pacific region and Europe regarding the People's Republic of China.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 1279. Mr. CRUZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution S.J. Res. 63, to direct the removal of United States Armed Forces from hostilities against the Islamic Republic of Iran that have not been authorized by Congress; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations; as follows:

In section 1, insert after paragraph (4) the following:

(5) On January 2, 2020, United States personnel killed terrorist leader Qasem Soleimani during the course of a targeted strike against terrorists engaged in planning attacks against United States persons and personnel.

SA 1280. Mr. CRUZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution S.J. Res. 63, to direct the removal of United States Armed Forces from hostilities against the Islamic Republic of Iran that have not been authorized by Congress; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations; as follows:

In section 1, insert after paragraph (4) the following:

(5) Members of the United States Armed Forces and intelligence community, and all those involved in the planning of the January 2, 2020, strike, including President Trump, should be commended for their efforts in a successful mission.

SA 1281. Mr. CRUZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution S.J. Res. 63, to direct the removal of United States Armed Forces from hostilities against the Islamic Republic of Iran that have not been authorized by Congress; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations; as follows:

On page 5, line 18, insert “or to restrict missions related to force protection of United States aircraft, ships, or personnel” after “attack”.

SA 1282. Mr. McCONNELL (for Mr. ROMNEY) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2547, to state the policy of the United States with respect to the expansion of cooperation with allies and partners in the Indo-Pacific region and Europe regarding the People's Republic of China; as follows:

In section 2, strike paragraph (5) and insert the following:

(5) A critical objective of the defense strategy of the United States is to set the military of the People's Republic of China on a

path toward transparency and nonaggression.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I have 2 requests for committees to meet during today's session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today's session of the Senate:

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

The Committee on Environment and Public Works is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, January 14, 2020, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, January 14, 2020, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a closed roundtable.

MEASURE READ THE FIRST TIME—S. 3193

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam 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 title of the bill for the first time.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 3193) to amend the Controlled Substances Act to list fentanyl-related substances as schedule I controlled substances, and for other purposes.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I now ask unanimous consent 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.

RECOGNIZING THE 75TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE WARSAW UPRISING

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 339, S. Res. 375.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 375) recognizing the 75th anniversary of the Warsaw Uprising.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations without amendment, and with an amendment to the preamble as follows:

Whereas, October 2, 2019, marks the 75th anniversary of the tragic conclusion to the War-

saw Uprising, a landmark event during World War II, in which brave citizens of Poland revolted against the German Nazi occupation of the city of Warsaw in the face of daunting and seemingly insurmountable odds;

Whereas the Warsaw Uprising, which was part of a nationwide resistance against the German Nazi occupation of Poland and lasted for 63 days, was started by the Polish Home Army, the underground resistance effort that included many young and brave individuals;

Whereas the Warsaw Uprising occurred just over a year after the Warsaw Ghetto Uprising in April 1943, which was the single largest act of Jewish resistance against forces of Nazi Germany;

Whereas, after the Warsaw Ghetto Uprising, the remaining Jewish Poles from Warsaw were sent to the Treblinka extermination camp, the Majdanek labor camp, or other forced-labor camps;

Whereas, beginning August 1, 1944, the Polish Home Army fought against the German Nazi occupation of Warsaw, using mostly homemade weapons and far outnumbered by the overwhelming German Nazi force, at a cost of approximately 200,000 citizens of Poland killed, wounded, or missing;

Whereas Adolf Hitler ordered the annihilation of the city of Warsaw and the extermination of its citizens as punishment for the uprising, decimating 80 percent of Warsaw with no regard for the lives of the citizens of Warsaw or for the rich heritage of historic architecture in Warsaw;

Whereas a Soviet-led army halted its march toward the city of Berlin at the banks of the Vistula River on the specific orders of Stalin to allow the German Nazis to decimate the Poles;

Whereas, throughout the Warsaw Uprising, many people fled the city of Warsaw, remained in hiding, or were wounded or killed, and the surviving population of Warsaw, which once totaled more than 1,300,000 people, was then sent to prisoner of war camps and endured harsh conditions;

Whereas, after World War II, thousands of Polish refugees fled from Poland due to persecution and came to the United States for safety, security, and new opportunities;

Whereas the deep, rich history and traditions of immigrants from Poland who settled in the United States, particularly in the States of Ohio, New York, Pennsylvania, Michigan, Illinois, and Wisconsin, have undeniably shaped the social fabric and foundation of the United States;

Whereas, in the 20th century, Cleveland, Ohio; Buffalo, New York; Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania; Milwaukee, Wisconsin; Detroit, Michigan; and Chicago, Illinois; served as the major epicenters for immigrants and workers from Poland whose remarkable contributions to industry led to the incorporation of new towns and the subsequent growth of those towns;

Whereas the heroic actions of the Polish underground resistance during World War II and the brave citizenry of Poland provide a valuable lesson in perseverance and patriotism;

Whereas the legacy of the Warsaw Uprising serves as one of the most poignant reminders of the human cost of the Allied war effort during World War II to defeat Adolf Hitler and the German Nazis; and

Whereas the bravery demonstrated by the citizens of Poland during the Warsaw Uprising continues to inspire people throughout the world who are subjected to tyranny and oppression and who join the fight for freedom, democracy, and the pursuit of liberty: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes the 75th anniversary of the Warsaw Uprising;

(2) commends the bravery, heroism, and patriotism of the individuals who fought as part of the Polish Home Army in order to liberate Poland from German Nazi occupation; and

(3) honors the memory of the soldiers and civilians whose lives were lost during the fighting, and the individuals who suffered in concentration camps and death camps during World War II and the Holocaust.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to; the committee-reported amendment to the preamble be agreed to; the preamble, as amended, be agreed to; and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 375) was agreed to.

The committee-reported amendment to the preamble was agreed to.

The preamble, as amended, was agreed to.

RECOGNIZING THE IMPORTANCE OF SUSTAINED UNITED STATES LEADERSHIP TO ACCELERATING GLOBAL PROGRESS AGAINST MATERNAL AND CHILD MALNUTRITION AND SUPPORTING THE COMMITMENT OF THE UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT TO GLOBAL NUTRITION THROUGH THE MULTI-SECTORAL NUTRITION STRATEGY

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 379, S. Res. 260.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 260) recognizing the importance of sustained United States leadership to accelerating global progress against maternal and child malnutrition and supporting the commitment of the United States Agency for International Development to global nutrition through the Multi-Sectoral Nutrition Strategy.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

Whereas of all children under 5 worldwide—

(1) 149,000,000, or 21.9 percent, are stunted or chronically undernourished;

(2) an estimated 7.3 percent, or nearly 49,000,000, experience life-threatening acute malnutrition (also known as “wasting”); and

(3) more than 40,000,000 are overweight;

Whereas, in countries highly affected by undernutrition, stunting affects 1 in every 3 children;

Whereas malnutrition directly or indirectly causes 45 percent of all deaths of children under 5 years of age, a total of 2,600,000 deaths annually;

Whereas undernourished adolescent girls often suffer impaired cognitive ability and productivity, and the future children of those girls are at increased risk for low birth weight and death;

Whereas iron deficiency anemia, associated with undernutrition, contributes to 1 in 5 maternal deaths, or 20 percent of maternal mortality;

Whereas poor maternal nutrition contributes to poor fetal development and low birth weight,

and an estimated 60 to 80 percent of neonatal deaths occur in low-birth-weight babies;

Whereas a large body of evidence supports the benefits of improved breastfeeding practices on the short-term and long-term health and development of children and their mothers;

Whereas a growing body of evidence indicates that reducing maternal and child malnutrition, especially in the critical 1,000-day period between the beginning of pregnancy and the second birthday of the child, is imperative to—

(1) ending preventable child and maternal deaths;

(2) improving IQ, and physical, brain and cognitive development; and

(3) strengthening the immune systems of children;

Whereas combatting malnutrition is an economic issue, as well as a global health issue, that is central to reducing poverty and putting communities on a path toward greater self-reliance and economic growth;

Whereas research indicates that—

(1) adults who were well nourished as children earn up to 46 percent more than adults who were malnourished as children;

(2) countries with a very high burden of early malnutrition have lower economic growth rates resulting from lost income and productivity; and

(3) the cost of child malnutrition is substantial, with estimated losses in Gross Domestic Product of 3 to 16 percent and potential impacts to the global economy as high as \$3,500,000,000 per year;

Whereas leading economists and Nobel Laureates have identified improving child nutrition as the most cost-effective way to improve global health outcomes and enhance development;

Whereas the Multi-Sectoral Nutrition Strategy of the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) recognizes that it is in the national interest of the United States to help developing countries reduce malnutrition by addressing the direct and underlying causes of malnutrition;

Whereas the linkage between humanitarian assistance and development programming under the USAID Multi-Sectoral Nutrition Strategy helps build resilience to shocks and stresses in vulnerable communities, promotes greater self-reliance, and is essential to reducing long-term reliance upon other forms of United States foreign assistance;

Whereas, in addition to providing bilateral support, the United States plays a leading role in supporting the goals of Scaling Up Nutrition, a global movement of 60 countries to prioritize nutrition through effective policy and dedicated national resources, particularly during the 1,000-day window of opportunity between the beginning of pregnancy and the second birthday of the child; and

Whereas, despite the significant progress in reducing undernutrition since 1990, global progress has been too slow—

(1) to ensure that undernutrition no longer inhibits a child's ability to attain a full and prosperous future; and

(2) for the global community to reach the global nutrition targets set for 2025: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved,

That the Senate—

(1) recognizes that—

(A) malnutrition is a universal issue that no country can afford to overlook;

(B) food security and good nutrition in early childhood saves lives and lays the foundation for healthy physical and cognitive growth and development; and

(C) the potential life-long health and economic benefits of early childhood nutrition influence the future of individual children and families, as well as entire communities and countries;

(2) acknowledges that effective programs to reduce malnutrition are not only lifesaving, but

also critical to the success of United States foreign assistance programs to improve global health, end preventable child and maternal death, achieve an AIDS-free generation, reach starving children during an emergency, strengthen food security, and accelerate inclusive economic growth;

(3) affirms that it is in the national interest of the United States to help developing countries build their own capacity to reduce malnutrition, address the direct and indirect causes of malnutrition, and meet the nutritional needs of women and children;

(4) recognizes the effectiveness of the Multi-Sectoral Nutrition Strategy of USAID, the U.S. Government Global Nutrition Coordination Plan, and the U.S. Government Global Food Security Strategy to address the direct and indirect causes of malnutrition and reach, by 2025, the global nutrition targets agreed to at the World Health Assembly in 2012;

(5) supports the goals and principles of the Scaling Up Nutrition movement to end global malnutrition through—

(A) greater collaboration between governments, civil society, international organizations, donors, the private sector, and researchers on multi-sectoral approaches;

(B) cost-effective and inclusive approaches; and

(C) improved transparency and accountability for results;

(6) recognizes the significant progress made in the fight against global malnutrition;

(7) recommends accelerating improvements to the systems affecting the health and nutritional status of women and children through innovative, scaled-up approaches;

(8) applauds the efforts of USAID to integrate effective nutrition programming across relevant development sectors; and

(9) calls for additional transformative efforts across relevant sectors at USAID to accelerate progress toward ending maternal and child malnutrition, including through—

(A) country development cooperation strategies that align with national nutrition plans; and

(B) improved and clear methods to track nutrition funding and outcomes across all global nutrition programs of the United States Government, especially those relating to—

(i) global health;

(ii) food security;

(iii) agricultural development;

(iv) basic education;

(v) food assistance; and

(vi) water, sanitation, and hygiene (also known as "WASH").

Mr. McCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the committee-reported substitute amendment to the resolution be agreed to; that the resolution, as amended, be agreed to; that the committee-reported amendment to the preamble be agreed to; that the preamble, as amended, be agreed to; that the committee-reported title amendment be agreed to; and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The committee-reported amendment, in the nature of a substitute, was agreed to.

The resolution (S. Res. 260), as amended, was agreed to.

The committee-reported amendment to the preamble was agreed to.

The preamble, as amended, was agreed to.

The committee-reported title amendment was agreed to as follows:

Amend the title so as to read: "A resolution recognizing the importance of sustained United States leadership to accelerating global progress against maternal and child malnutrition and supporting the commitment of the United States Agency for International Development to reducing global malnutrition through the Multi-Sectoral Nutrition Strategy".

INDO-PACIFIC COOPERATION ACT OF 2019

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 363, S. 2547.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2547) to state the policy of the United States with respect to the expansion of cooperation with allies and partners in the Indo-Pacific region and Europe regarding the People's Republic of China.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Indo-Pacific Cooperation Act of 2019".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Congress supports the finding on the People's Republic of China articulated in the 2018 National Defense Strategy and the 2017 National Security Strategy.

(2) The Asia Reassurance Initiative Act of 2018 (Public Law 115-409) established the policy of the United States "to develop and commit to a long-term strategic vision and a comprehensive, multifaceted, and principled United States policy for the Indo-Pacific region" so as to advance United States national security, economic, human rights, and other regional interests, and for such purposes, Congress has authorized appropriate funding.

(3) The People's Republic of China is leveraging military modernization, influence operations, and predatory economics to coerce neighboring countries to reorder the Indo-Pacific region to the advantage of the People's Republic of China.

(4) As the People's Republic of China continues its economic and military ascendancy, asserting power through a whole of government long-term strategy, the People's Republic of China will continue to pursue a military modernization program that seeks Indo-Pacific regional hegemony in the near-term and displacement of the United States to achieve global pre-eminence in the future.

(5) The most far-reaching objective of the defense strategy of the United States is to set the military relationship between the United States and the People's Republic of China on a path toward transparency and nonaggression.

(6) The People's Republic of China uses economic inducements and penalties, influence operations, and implied military threats to persuade other countries to heed the political and security agenda of the People's Republic of China.

(7) United States allies and partners are critical to effective competition with the People's Republic of China.

SEC. 3. STATEMENT OF POLICY.

It is the policy of the United States—

(1) to expand military, diplomatic, and economic alliances and partnerships in the Indo-

Pacific region and with Europe and like-minded countries around the globe that are critical to effective competition with the People's Republic of China;

(2) to develop, in collaboration with such allies and partners, a unified approach to addressing and deterring significant diplomatic, economic, and military challenges posed by the People's Republic of China; and

(3) to promote, in partnership with like-minded countries around the globe, the values of democracy and human rights.

Mr. McCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the Romney amendment at the desk be considered and agreed to; that the committee-reported substitute amendment, as amended, 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. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 1282) was agreed to as follows:

(Purpose: To modify a finding relating to the defense strategy of the United States)

In section 2, strike paragraph (5) and insert the following:

(5) A critical objective of the defense strategy of the United States is to set the military of the People's Republic of China on a path toward transparency and nonaggression.

The committee-reported amendment, in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

The bill (S. 2547), as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 2547

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 “Indo-Pacific Cooperation Act of 2019”.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Congress supports the finding on the People's Republic of China articulated in the 2018 National Defense Strategy and the 2017 National Security Strategy.

(2) The Asia Reassurance Initiative Act of 2018 (Public Law 115-409) established the policy of the United States “to develop and commit to a long-term strategic vision and a comprehensive, multifaceted, and principled United States policy for the Indo-Pacific region” so as to advance United States national security, economic, human rights, and other regional interests, and for such purposes, Congress has authorized appropriate funding.

(3) The People's Republic of China is leveraging military modernization, influence operations, and predatory economics to coerce neighboring countries to reorder the Indo-Pacific region to the advantage of the People's Republic of China.

(4) As the People's Republic of China continues its economic and military ascendance, asserting power through a whole of government long-term strategy, the People's Republic of China will continue to pursue a military modernization program that seeks Indo-Pacific regional hegemony in the near-term and displacement of the United States to achieve global preeminence in the future.

(5) A critical objective of the defense strategy of the United States is to set the military of the People's Republic of China on a path toward transparency and nonaggression.

(6) The People's Republic of China uses economic inducements and penalties, influence operations, and implied military threats to persuade other countries to heed the political and security agenda of the People's Republic of China.

(7) United States allies and partners are critical to effective competition with the People's Republic of China.

SEC. 3. STATEMENT OF POLICY.

It is the policy of the United States—

(1) to expand military, diplomatic, and economic alliances and partnerships in the Indo-Pacific region and with Europe and like-minded countries around the globe that are critical to effective competition with the People's Republic of China;

(2) to develop, in collaboration with such allies and partners, a unified approach to ad-

dressing and deterring significant diplomatic, economic, and military challenges posed by the People's Republic of China; and

(3) to promote, in partnership with like-minded countries around the globe, the values of democracy and human rights.

**ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY,
JANUARY 15, 2020**

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m., Wednesday, January 15; 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 that the Senate then proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

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

**ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M.
TOMORROW**

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 6:50 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, January 15, 2020, at 10 a.m.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate January 14, 2020:

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

PETER GAYNOR, OF RHODE ISLAND, TO BE ADMINISTRATOR OF THE FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY, DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

IOWAN OF THE WEEK—CHRISTIAN VANDEHAAR

HON. CYNTHIA AXNE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 14, 2020

Mrs. AXNE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to ask the House of Representatives to join me in recognizing Iowa's Bondurant-Farrar High School's art teacher Christian Vandehaar for his hard work in his community and his continued contributions to his students' success.

Mr. Vandehaar is a true public servant. He has been teaching 9th through 12th grade art classes at Bondurant-Farrar High School for nine years. Mr. Vandehaar received his Bachelor of Fine Art degree from Iowa State University and his master's from Drake University. He decided to become an art teacher because he enjoys helping others and seeing them reach their full potential.

With help from Mr. Vandehaar's passion for the arts, Bondurant-Farrar High School has been recognized as one of Iowa's top three All-State Art Schools, with his school earning the number one overall spot in 2018. Students from Mr. Vandehaar's art classes have had success at state and national competitions, including the Congressional Art Competition. Under Mr. Vandehaar, art students from Bondurant-Farrar High School have been selected for the Congressional Art Competition for five of the past six years. 12 of his students have even earned All-State honors within the last four years. The accolades continue with three Gold and Silver medals in the National Scholastic Competition, two Grant Wood Legacy Prize Awards, and a National Scholastic American Vision Medal.

Outside of the classroom, Mr. Vandehaar and his students have worked with the Bondurant Community Foundation to create a 100-foot mural along an area bike path. However, Mr. Vandehaar's proudest accomplishment is his Art Canned Food Drive, which challenges classes to donate the most canned items for their Combat Hunger week. Through his initiative, students have donated over 15,000 items in the last seven years.

It is an honor to commemorate Mr. Vandehaar's outstanding achievements in his school and his community. I have great respect and admiration for our educators and am particularly thankful for the strong foundation they are giving our kids. As the mother of two boys, I know that a quality education is crucial to success. Mr. Vandehaar is not only helping his students succeed in the arts, but teaching them actively engage with their community.

I applaud Mr. Vandehaar for his hard work and dedication, and I congratulate him and his students for their success.

RECOGNIZING SOUTH MIAMI MAYOR PHILIP STODDARD'S TEN YEARS OF SERVICE

HON. DONNA E. SHALALA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 14, 2020

Ms. SHALALA. Madam Speaker, I rise in honor of Philip Stoddard, mayor of South Miami. First elected in 2010, he has gained a reputation as one of the most environmentally conscious mayors in the United States.

Ten years ago, Mayor Stoddard implemented term limits for city officials, preventing himself from serving more than five two-year terms. Now, as he nears the end of his final term, Mayor Stoddard can look back on his time in office with pride. He fundamentally changed the standards of public policy in the city of South Miami.

A biology professor at Florida International University, Mayor Stoddard made environmental science and conservation a priority for the city. He signed laws requiring the installation of solar panels on new homes and banning pesticide spraying in the city. Last year, he led South Miami to commit to a goal of 100 percent renewable energy citywide by 2040.

Mayor Stoddard's expertise in environmental public policy extended beyond South Miami. In 2015, he helped the Obama administration develop policy to address sea level rise.

Mayor Stoddard is an inspiration for all of us who hope to help South Florida become greener and more resilient to climate change. I'm grateful for his decade of service and wish him all the best in his future endeavors.

APPROVING REQUEST OF SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS FOR WAIVER UNDER SECTION 1703E(f) OF TITLE 38, UNITED STATES CODE

SPEECH OF

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 13, 2020

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, as a senior Member of Congress, I rise in support of H.J. Res. 80, which requires the approval of the request of the Secretary of Veterans' Affairs for a waiver under section 1703E(f) of 38 U.S.C., which provides for the Veterans' Community Care Program.

As a strong proponent of veteran care, I support this resolution because our veterans deserve to receive the maximum quality of hospital care, medical services and extended care services.

This resolution will improve the quality of dental care granted to our veterans by allowing them a more diverse group of dental providers to choose from, at affordable rates.

There are a total of 9.1 million enrollees in the Veterans' Affairs Health Care system.

This resolution gives veterans the opportunity to use Veterans' Affairs administrative support to search for non-VA, pro bono or discounted dental services.

Over 580,000 Veterans with comprehensive dental care benefits were provided dental care in Fiscal Year 2019.

Veterans identified as Class I, those with a service-connected compensable dental disability or condition, are eligible for any dental care needed.

The U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs has created a new community care program that allows veterans more choice in health care providers.

These revolutionary modifications will extend services to over 28,000 veterans within the 18th Congressional District.

The Michael E. DeBakey VA Medical Center in Houston provides a full range of health care services that include trauma recovery, mental health, and substance dependence programs to veterans.

Waiving section 1703E(f) of 38 U.S.C., United States allows the Veterans Community Care Program to keep the methods that are used for veteran medical services as up to date as possible and to ensure that veterans have access to dental care when needed.

I ask my colleagues from both sides of the aisle to vote in support of H.J. Res. 80.

CONGRATULATING THE PEOPLE OF TAIWAN FOR HOLDING SUCCESSFUL ELECTIONS AND COMMENDING PRESIDENT TSAI ING-WEN ON HER REELECTION

HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 14, 2020

Mr. HASTINGS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the people of Taiwan for holding successful elections on January 11, 2020 and commend President Tsai Ing-wen on her re-election. Free and fair elections are a core tenet of democratic societies and it is encouraging to see the people of Taiwan continue to enthusiastically embrace their civic duty, especially in the face of significant election meddling on the part of the People's Republic of China.

The United States and Taiwan have long enjoyed a close friendship, with strong bonds forged through our economic, trade, and security ties. It is critical that the United States never loses sight of the importance Taiwan will play in our efforts to assure a prosperous and peaceful rise for all our friends and allies in the region.

Taiwan's dedication to democracy, freedom, and the rule of law make it not only a great partner for the United States, but a beacon of hope for all countries striving to protect and further democratic ideals.

Madam Speaker, I again congratulate our friends in Taiwan and President Tsai Ing-wen on this momentous occasion.

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

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

SCOTT JONES' QUEST OF ALL 419 NATIONAL PARKS

HON. RAÚL M. GRIJALVA

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 14, 2020

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Scott Jones, who last summer completed a quest to see all 419 units of our National Park System, an impressive feat. Apparently, this wasn't enough for Mr. Jones though, who added all the National Monuments and National Conservation Areas managed by the U.S. Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management just for good measure. On August 26, 2019, Mr. Jones became the first person to visit all 478 of the federal protected lands he calls our nation's Treasured Places.

The list includes some of our most iconic and inspiring landscapes (such as Grand Canyon and Yellowstone), and places that serve to interpret some of our most important historical lessons (Gettysburg and the Lincoln Memorial). Mr. Jones' travels took him to both the best of America, and to places that help us remember the turbulent and even unsavory history that is part of our shared national experience. Mr. Jones is quick to admit that each trip was an education and his experiences at many sites were rich opportunities to understand more about himself and about the United States.

For instance, Mr. Jones spoke to local reporters about his moving experience at Topeka's Brown V. Board of Education National Historic Site in Topeka, Kansas, which chronicles the fight to end school segregation. He recalled walking down a hallway lined as video of people yelling racial epithets played around him—mimicking the experience of Linda Brown on her walk to school.

From Topeka to 477 other sites, the Treasured Places quest took almost 15 years and involved a lot of travel. Mr. Jones started out just like anyone would, visiting places close to his home in Phoenix, Arizona, but he had to venture a bit further than most, with trips to interior Alaska, the Northern woods, and even the War in the Pacific National Historical Park in Guam, his farthest trip at over 6,500 miles.

Mr. Jones' quest was not just a personal whim, he used it as an opportunity to inspire others. Through his blog and social media, he invited anyone interested to follow his adventures. Each of his quests are designed to encourage others to "just get out more" at whatever ability and with whatever time each of us has, whether for just a day trip or an epic adventure. His three slogans: explore eagerly, travel cheaply, and adventure often.

Many of his trips provide examples of how achievable and inexpensive it is to visit some of our nation's exceptional public lands. He completed this quest while working full-time for conservation nonprofits and made a point of not counting any visits that were made for his job toward completion of the total goal.

But for Mr. Jones, adventuring is a constant goal and his thirst for adventures is far from slaked. In 2016, to celebrate the 100th anniversary of the National Park Service, he took an epic trip to visit 100 parks in 100 days. He examined every "World Largest Ball of Twine"—all three of them—while making his way to every state in the U.S. In the future, he

plans to climb to the highest point in every county in Arizona and he plans to visit 50 different countries by the time he turns 50.

A proud graduate of Arizona State University, Mr. Jones is a fanatic supporter of ASU Sun Devil football. Ever the explorer, even this interest has become another quest—Mr. Jones has been to 8 of the 12 football stadiums of the PAC-12.

Now that his personal Treasured Places quest is complete, Mr. Jones continues to encourage others to undertake their own quests to visit these places with the help of his website, treasuredplaces.us.

Mr. Jones is an exemplary person, who transformed a personal interest in parks and special places into a quest that he has shared as an inspiring invitation. His efforts truly do encourage all of us to make the time and effort to "get out there more" and enjoy our country's many treasured places.

COMMENDING AND CONGRATULATING JOYCE IRENE MARTRATT ON THE OCCASION OF HER RETIREMENT

HON. MICHAEL F.Q. SAN NICOLAS

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 14, 2020

Mr. SAN NICOLAS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Joyce Irene Martratt on her retirement.

Born on August 28, 1939, Joyce is a World War II survivor of the Japanese occupation. After the war, she grew to be fearless and had a thirst for knowledge, immersing herself into every learning opportunity she could.

Joyce started her career as an educator, teaching a first-grade special needs class at the old Barrigada Elementary School. She also taught 3rd and 6th grade levels. Years later, she obtained a temporary job at the Andersen Air Force Base at the Civilian Personnel Office as a clerk typist, and with her hard work and authenticity, she persistently thrived. Joyce gained a great deal of experience over the years as a civilian employee and worked within the SAC's 3960th Civil Engineering Squadron Material Control Section, Programs and Planning, Operations and Maintenance, and eventually moved to the 3960th Civil Engineering Squadron's Commander's office, to name a few. In 1974, both needing a secretary, the Commander, and Vice Commander determined to integrate the position and personally requested for Joyce to accept the offer.

On July 18, 2005, she took her final transfer to the 36th Wing Commander, which is where the "Ask Joyce" column was developed. The column was placed in the Andersen Air Force Base paper, "Pacific Edge" and served as an informative outlet to learn about Guam's culture and society. Due to its immense popularity, the people of Guam still remember the details of her column to this day.

Joyce served alongside notable leaders, and amongst the most skilled airmen and civil servants who recognized her as a distinguished woman of character who cared deeply for our island. I thank Joyce for her many years of service and wish her the best in a much-deserved retirement.

RECOGNIZING THE 35TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE SOUTHERN ILLINOIS HEALTHCARE FOUNDATION

HON. JOHN SHIMKUS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 14, 2020

Mr. SHIMKUS. Madam Speaker, I rise to recognize Southern Illinois Healthcare Foundation on its thirty-fifth anniversary.

Southern Illinois Healthcare Foundation, or simply SIHF as it is known in the area, had its start in 1984 when a group of community leaders recognized the need to attract physicians to the Metro-East of the St. Louis Metropolitan area. SIHF opened its first site in Centreville on January 7, 1985 with a physician, a nurse, and a director. Today, SIHF serves 1,100-plus patients each day with open arms and a dedication to providing compassionate, comprehensive and efficient care.

Community collaboration has been the key to SIHF's success. SIHF has fostered a dynamic approach to caring that includes shared staff, coordinated services and a joint approach to community problems. To that end, SIHF has partnered in collaborative efforts with dozens of community, civic, governmental, and various health care groups throughout the region. The single focus of these linkages has been to improve access, expand coverage, and provide the most efficient and effective care possible. The effectiveness of these initiatives has had a profound effect on the area.

Madam Speaker, it is with great pleasure I stand to recognize Southern Illinois Healthcare Foundation. SIHF has embraced its role of being a leading provider of health care for thirty-five years, and in that capacity has benefited thousands, a record of service I am pleased to acknowledge today. And with its single-minded focus on providing the very best health care to the area, I can confidently predict many more years of success for Southern Illinois Healthcare Foundation.

CYBERSECURITY AND FINANCIAL SYSTEM RESILIENCE ACT OF 2019

SPEECH OF

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 13, 2020

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, as a senior member of the Homeland Security Committee and its Subcommittee on Cybersecurity, Infrastructure Protection, and Innovation, I rise in strong support of H.R. 4458, the "Cybersecurity and Financial System Resilience Act of 2019."

The bill before us requires the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System to submit a report to Congress, explaining the measures taken to strengthen cybersecurity functions within the Federal Reserve System.

In recent years, cybercrimes across the world have become increasingly commonplace and a serious threat to the American people.

In a 2018 Gallup Poll, 71 percent of Americans say they frequently or occasionally worry about being victims to a cybercrime whereas less than 30 percent of Americans worried about being victims in a violent crime.

With cybercrimes like the WannaCry ransomware attack of 2017, which remains one of the worst ransomware attacks in history with over 150 countries affected and over 4 billion dollars pilfered by cyber thieves, people, businesses, and governments across the globe are at risk.

In the United States, the financial services industry suffers from the highest average annual costs due to cybercrimes like data breaches, ransomware, phishing, and identity theft.

Over the last 10 years, the Government Accountability Office has found that the number of cyber attacks that target federal agencies has increased from 5,500 to over 77,000 per year.

Madam Speaker, this legislation will help prevent a potential cyber threat to the global financial system.

Requiring increased reporting and information sharing for the Federal Reserve will strengthen current protocols and create new policies to address threats like the destruction of information without official authorization, malware attacks, and the denial of service activities.

This bill will also lay the foundation for further cybersecurity efforts among departments and agencies of the Federal Government, foreign central banks, and other partners.

I ask all members from both sides of the aisle to join me in voting to pass H.R. 4458.

HONORING STEVE MARTINEZ OF EAGLE IDAHO

HON. RUSS FULCHER

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 14, 2020

Mr. FULCHER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor a fellow Idahoan who reassured, restored, and comforted the community of builders in Idaho during a difficult time. Sadly, today, I also honor the life and passing of Frankie Hickman, who ran the Idaho Builders Contractors Association for 27 years. Frankie was the Executive Officer of the Idaho Building Contractors Association and a lifeline for the community in Idaho. During her final months and after her passing, Steve Martinez, stepped in to fill the long-time role of Frankie. When all were grieving the loss of her presence at the IBCA, Steve helped to pick up the pieces, reassure staff, and maintain a continued legacy for IBCA. He also helped Frankie in the most difficult months of her life, because in the end, IBCA was her life. Frankie, unable to fulfill her role, entrusted Steve with the arduous task of continuing the hard work at the IBCA. Steve has a passion and heart for the building industry. It shows in his love for the people, customers, and partners at IBCA. He follows in his father's footsteps and serves as National Builders representative for Idaho, representing Idaho at the National Association of Home Builders. Steve displays the qualities we all strive to be, and I am honored to showcase his work for a brief but permanent moment in the House of Representatives.

IN RECOGNITION OF MS. KATIE MAZZOLA

HON. ROBERT J. WITTMAN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 14, 2020

Mr. WITTMAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Katie Mazzola and her service to Virginia's First District.

Katie earned her Bachelor of Arts in Political Science with a concentration in National Security from Virginia Tech in Blacksburg, VA. While at Tech, Katie served in the Corps of Cadets where she quickly climbed the ranks, culminating in Executive Officer who was in charge of over 200 cadets. Katie also served as a Division Leader for the Coast Guard Auxiliary University Programs, commanding 22 units nationwide. Following a knee injury, Katie's plans to commission into the Coast Guard were changed. Ever the servant leader, she knew she wanted to continue to serve our great nation.

Katie began her service in my office as an intern in the summer and winter of 2016 before becoming my Staff Assistant in May 2017. During her years serving Virginia's First District, Katie has been on the front line of my office in many roles, including hiring and training our D.C. interns, coordinating tours, assisting my staff and me, managing our constituent services database, responding to over 36,000 pieces of constituent mail, and assisting with my proactive constituent outreach. Katie has also been responsible for a legislative portfolio including health, labor, education, workforce development, family values, women's issues, and religious issues. Katie has been my lead staffer on the Congressional Public Health Caucus of which I am a Co-Chair. Additionally, Katie successfully created my CTE Task Force, shedding light on the importance of CTE and STEM programs as a way to cultivate the skillsets needed for students to succeed in today's workforce. In addition to her official duties, Katie has never missed an opportunity to update my office on the most recent Virginia Tech game—Go Hokies.

Since her first day in my office, Katie has always upheld the values of honor, respect, and devotion to duty in service to the people of the First District. Her commitment to servant leadership, constituent services, and integrity are without equal. I have no doubt that Katie will continue to excel as she begins this new chapter—her best and brightest years are still ahead.

Madam Speaker, I ask you to join me in recognizing Katie Mazzola for her dedicated service to Virginia's First District. May God bless Katie as she continues her career in public service.

HONORING MR. CHARLES SCHUCK

HON. JOHN H. RUTHERFORD

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 14, 2020

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Madam Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to Mr. Charles Schuck and celebrate his 100th birthday, which occurred this past August. From the time he graduated high school, he has served our country dutifully in

many roles including as a Sergeant in the Marine Corps during World War II, the Chief of the Flight Standards Division during the Vietnam War, and, most recently, a volunteer at his local elementary school. Mr. Schuck embodies the American spirit, and I am honored to tell his story here today.

Mr. Schuck was born on August 5, 1919, in New York City and is the son of a German immigrant. Growing up he always had a passion for aeronautics and mechanics, this led him to become an aircraft mechanic upon his graduation from Stewart Tech. He then worked for an airline where he taught Army mechanics aviation skills. Following this, he joined the Marines and received the rank of Sergeant out of boot camp. He was stationed in El Toro, a Marine Air Station in California.

After the war, he joined the Civil Aeronautics Administration where he quickly moved up the ranks from Maintenance Inspector to Chief of the General Aviation Maintenance Branch. In 1962, he was selected to attend the War College at Maxwell Air Force Base and in 1964 was stationed in Hawaii as Chief of the Flight Standards Division. Here, his experience and expertise proved invaluable during the Vietnam War. He has also held high positions in the Federal Aviation Administration and was instrumental in setting standards in the Pacific Theater. He received both an Outstanding Performance Rating and a Special Achievement Award from the FAA for his service. He then transitioned to the Experimental Aircraft Association where he advised policymakers on aeronautics and aviation issues for 21 years until his retirement at the age of 81.

Today, he lives a healthy and happy life and continues to teach about patriotism and aeronautics. As a volunteer at his local elementary school, he engages with children about our flag, how airplanes and helicopters fly, and his love for our country. He is very much appreciated by the students, parents, and faculty alike.

Madam Speaker, it has been a privilege to share the story of Mr. Charles Schuck and recognize his exemplary achievements. On behalf of a grateful nation, I thank him and wish him all the best as he reflects on a century full of memories.

CELEBRATING THE RETIREMENT OF FEDEX CUSTOM CRITICAL CEO, VIRGINIA ADDICOTT

HON. ANTHONY GONZALEZ

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 14, 2020

Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the career of one of my district's most committed leaders, Virginia Addicott. Since beginning her career at FedEx Custom Critical in Green, Ohio in 1986, she has served as vice president of operations and chief executive officer.

Under her leadership, Ms. Addicott has helped establish FedEx Custom Critical as one of Northeast Ohio's best workplaces. Her efforts have helped the company receive the Northcoast 99 award an impressive eighteen times. Recognized not just for her leadership locally, but also across the country, she was a recipient of the 2019 Moves Power Women

Award. Ms. Addicott's emphasis on workplace culture and a teamwork environment serves as a model for every American business.

In addition to her successful business career, Ms. Addicott has been a committed leader in the Northeast Ohio community. She is involved in several philanthropic organizations, serving on the board of Akron Children's Hospital, the Greater Akron Chamber, and the non-profit organization, For Inspiration and Recognition of Science and Technology. She is also a trustee at her alma mater, Kent State University.

Without a doubt, Ms. Addicott's investment in our community has made a positive impact on the livelihood of thousands of Ohioans. On behalf of Ohio's Sixteenth Congressional District, I offer my sincerest appreciation to Ms. Addicott for her service and wish her all the best on her retirement.

PRESIDENT GEORGE H.W. BUSH AND FIRST SPOUSE BARBARA BUSH COIN ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 13, 2020

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, as a senior member of Congress, and an admirer and friend of the Bush Family, I rise in support of S. 457, "President George H.W. Bush and First Spouse Barbara Bush Coin Act," to require that \$1 coins issued during 2020 honor President George H.W. Bush and bullion coins issued during 2020 are in honor of Barbara Bush.

President Bush and First Lady Barbara were friends of mine, and I have always respected and admired their service to this country.

President Bush was a heroic naval aviator, a member of congress, Director of Central Intelligence Agency, Vice President of the United States, and the 41st President of the United States, and First Lady Barbara Bush was a leading force in our country who worked to improve literacy and strengthen American families by her prime example as a mother to five children and wife to the 41st U.S. President, and mother of sons who were elected Governor and one of whom was elected the 43rd President of the United States.

President George H.W. Bush moved himself and his young family to Texas in 1948 and Texans are very grateful to the Bushes for all the work they did to improve and strengthen Texas and the nation during their lives.

The minting of a \$1 coin and a bullion coin to honor these two great Americans will ensure that the memory of the 41st President of the United States, George H.W. Bush, and First Lady Barbara Bush, will live on and be celebrated for their hard work and devotion to the Constitution and our country.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BRAD SHERMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 14, 2020

Mr. SHERMAN. Madam Speaker, I was unavoidably absent from the Chamber on Mon-

day, January 13, 2020 for the first vote of the series. Had I been present, I would have voted "Yea" on Roll Call No 14.

HONORING DR. EARL LENNARD

HON. CHARLIE CRIST

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 14, 2020

Mr. CRIST. Madam Speaker, I rise today to ask the House of Representatives to join me in commemorating the memory of Dr. Earl Lennard for his upstanding service as the Superintendent for Hillsborough County Schools and Hillsborough Supervisor of Elections.

Dr. Lennard was born on March 22, 1942 in Tampa, Florida where he grew up with nine brothers and sisters. He was a part of the first graduating class of the University of South Florida, earning his bachelor's degree in education in 1963. Dr. Lennard began his teaching career at Ruskin Elementary School, a temporary position that evolved into a profession and lifelong passion. In 1996, Dr. Lennard was named Superintendent of Hillsborough County Schools, where he established magnet schools and the school choice program, allowing for students to attend schools that fit their needs best. Additionally, he oversaw the openings of countless schools throughout the district to accommodate for the rapid population growth in my home of Tampa Bay.

In 2009, I had the honor as Florida's Governor to appoint Dr. Lennard to serve as Hillsborough Supervisor of Elections. Dr. Lennard's civic involvement and commitment to the Tampa Bay community made my choice clear. As Supervisor of Elections, Dr. Lennard worked tirelessly to ensure every citizen had equal access to the ballot box.

Outside of his professional life, Dr. Lennard worked to benefit his community by serving as a Sunday school teacher at Riverview United Methodist Church, participating in the Brandon Community Foundation, and helping establish the Sandy & George Simmons Family Boys & Girls Club in Riverview. Though he is no longer with us, the impact of Dr. Lennard, both in Hillsborough and throughout Tampa Bay, will be felt for years to come through his dedication to improving academic opportunities for students throughout Tampa Bay.

Madam Speaker, please join me once again to commemorate Dr. Earl Lennard for his service and dedication to his community. His leadership and character distinguish him as a true public servant.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 2020 CALIFORNIA DISTINGUISHED SCHOOLS FROM CALIFORNIA'S 39TH DISTRICT

HON. GILBERT RAY CISNEROS, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 14, 2020

Mr. CISNEROS. Madam Speaker, it is with great pride that I rise today to honor and congratulate ten elementary schools in California's 39th District for their selection as 2020 California Distinguished Schools. The California

Distinguished Schools Program is a component of the California School Recognition Program and serves to recognize schools that demonstrate outstanding education programs and practices. Schools awarded with this distinction hold the Distinguished School title for two years. This year, eligible elementary schools in the State of California were identified through a multiple measures accountability system that examines performance and progress on state indicators specified on the California School Dashboard. Schools were identified and selected within two distinct categories: Closing the Achievement Gap and Exceptional Student Performance.

Elementary schools in California's 39th District awarded this distinction include: Acacia Elementary School (Fullerton School District), Blandford Elementary School (Rowland Unified School District), Buena Terra Elementary School (Centralia Elementary School District), Charles G. Emery Elementary (Buena Park Elementary School District), Golden Elementary School (Placentia-Yorba Linda Unified School District), Hidden Trails Elementary School (Chino Valley Unified School District), Killian Elementary School (Rowland Unified School District), Laguna Road Elementary School (Fullerton School District), Laurel Elementary Magnet School of Innovation and Career Exploration (Brea-Olinda Unified School District), Mesa Robles School (Hacienda La Puente Unified School District), Robert C. Fisler School (Fullerton School District), Wedgeworth Elementary School (Hacienda La Puente Unified School District), and Ybarra Academy of Arts and Technology (Rowland Unified School District).

As California Distinguished Schools, these institutions set the standard for an immersive educational climate bound by a student-driven learning philosophy. Exceptional student achievement in each school is a testament to the efforts made by educators to realign pedagogical practices to allow for student empowerment and engagement. This relies on a comprehensive platform that supplements the breadth of academic rigor with collaboration and social support. Through programs ranging from dual immersion to positive behavior intervention, these schools reconcile differences in theory and praxis to close achievement gaps and instill traits vital to academic success. What results is a seamless integration between teacher guidance and student participation. It is this attunement to the holistic well-being of each student that sets Distinguished Schools apart.

As a strong believer in education and its life-changing advantages, there is nothing more pleasing than knowing that the community I serve is paving a brighter road for the academic future of California's youth. I am proud of the tireless efforts made by parents, teachers, administrators, and staff to advance a scholastic agenda that rewards integrated educational experiences. Madam Speaker, I ask that you and my honorable colleagues join me in congratulating these ten California Distinguished Schools for this tremendous achievement in the world of education. I am wholeheartedly assured in their ability to guide and leave a lasting impact on the students of California's 39th District.

PASSING OF COURTNEY EVERTS
MYKYTYN**HON. ROBERT C. "BOBBY" SCOTT**
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES*Tuesday, January 14, 2020*

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I rise today to share a word about the untimely passing of Courtney Everts Mykytyn.

In 1954, the United States Supreme Court unanimously struck down lawful school segregation in the landmark case of *Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka*. In a unanimous decision, the Court stated, “where the state has undertaken to provide it, [education] is a right which must be made available to all on equal terms.” Chief Justice Earl Warren went on to state that “in the field of public education, the doctrine of ‘separate but equal’ has no place.”

Courtney founded Integrated Schools in Los Angeles, California in 2015 to start a grassroots movement for school integration. Integrated Schools’ mission states: “America’s schools are more segregated than before the Civil Rights Movement. . . . Through national organizing to promote local action, we support, educate, develop and mobilize families to “live their values,” disrupt segregation, and leverage their choices for the well-being and futures for their own children, for all children, and for our democracy.”

As champion for educational equity, Courtney recognized that school integration is one of the most powerful tools to ensure that all children have an equal opportunity to reach their full potential. She understood that the work of integrating our schools can be uncomfortable and complicated, and worked to educate parents and build community coalitions. Unlike many school integration efforts that place burden solely on families of color, Courtney’s mission was also to challenge white families to integrate schools. Courtney was always intentional in her efforts as she boldly stated: “We’re [white people] the ones who kind of made it all [school integration] fail. Really fixing it has to be on us.”

Courtney educated white families about how true school integration requires both an understanding of systemic racism in America and the careful work of relationship-building free of self-interested agendas and without employing a white saviorism mentality. When I think of

Courtney’s leadership on this important issue, I am reminded of the Court’s 1971 opinion in *Swann v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg Board of Education* led by Chief Justice Earl Warren. He stated, “. . . [A]ll things are not equal in a system that has been deliberately constructed and maintained to enforce racial segregation. The remedy for such segregation may be administratively awkward, inconvenient, and even bizarre in some situations, and may impose burdens on some; but all awkwardness and inconvenience cannot be avoided . . .”

Courtney understood the consequences of segregation for children and our democracy. She often spoke about how segregation undermines our core American ideals of fairness and equality and worked tirelessly to help fulfill the promise of *Brown*. Courtney emphasized that integrating schools was not about sacrifice, but instead about a commitment to strengthening our democracy and building a better society. I hope advocates and families continue her legacy and commitment of fighting for school integration. Further, I challenge this body to honor Courtney’s legacy in the months and years to come by taking the necessary actions to support and advance school integration.

Madam Speaker, the sadness of the passing of Courtney Everts Mykytyn is offset by her transformative work on school integration. Her death is a great loss to the school integration movement and our country. She will be greatly missed. I send my deepest sympathies to her loved ones, including her husband, Roman Mykytyn, her two children, Stefan and Lulu, and the Integrated Schools community.

HOMELESS ASSISTANCE ACT OF
2019

SPEECH OF

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 13, 2020

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, as a senior member of congress, I rise in support of H.R. 4302, the “Homeless Assistance Act,” which amends the United States Housing Act of 1937 by adding in a new subsection that creates a method for information of homeless individuals to be disclosed promptly from PHAs to local government and nonprofit organizations.

This subsection, subsection ‘C’, would authorize Public Housing Agencies (PHAs) to disclose relevant client information to local government entities and nonprofits in order to facilitate housing and services for individuals and families experiencing homelessness.

PHAs can play an important role in a local strategy to end homelessness, however PHAs are limited by the Federal Privacy Act.

PHAs can receive information on incoming homeless clients, but they must obtain written consent from each client before disclosing information about its client’s housing assistance with local government entities and nonprofits, which can serve as an unnecessary barrier.

One of the challenges to serving people who are experiencing homelessness is coordinating between various local entities that are working together to provide the necessary housing and services that cater to the unique needs of each individual and family.

The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development’s ‘2019 Point-in-Time Homeless Count & Survey’ collected data showing that as of April of 2019 there are 3,938 sheltered and unsheltered residents of Houston experiencing homelessness.

The most recent data from the city of Houston had revealed nearly 69,000 individuals had signed up for their waitlist to receive housing assistance.

The Houston Housing Authority (HHA) provides services to more than 60,000 low-income Houstonians, including over 17,000 families housed through the Housing Choice Voucher Program and another 5,500 living in 25 public housing and tax credit developments around the city.

The Homeless Assistance Act assures that the collection, maintenance, use, and dissemination of information about clients can be disclosed not for public consumption, but to other home and health services programs for the benefit of the client.

The implementation of subsection ‘C’ would allow PHAs to disclose relevant client data with local government entities and nonprofits for the limited purpose of facilitating the expedited identification, assessment, and linkage of individuals experiencing homelessness to housing and supportive services.

I urge all Members to join me in voting for H.R. 4302.

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S167–S200

Measures Introduced: Eleven bills and one resolution were introduced, as follows: S. 3183–3193, and S. Res. 469. **Page S193**

Measures Passed:

75th Anniversary of the Warsaw Uprising: Senate agreed to S. Res. 375, recognizing the 75th anniversary of the Warsaw Uprising. **Page S198**

Multi-Sectoral Nutrition Strategy: Senate agreed to S. Res. 260, recognizing the importance of sustained United States leadership to accelerating global progress against maternal and child malnutrition and supporting the commitment of the United States Agency for International Development to reducing global malnutrition through the Multi-Sectoral Nutrition Strategy, after agreeing to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, and the amendment to the title. **Pages S198–S199**

Indo-Pacific Cooperation Act: Senate passed S. 2547, to state the policy of the United States with respect to the expansion of cooperation with allies and partners in the Indo-Pacific region and Europe regarding the People's Republic of China, after agreeing to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, and the following amendment proposed thereto: **Pages S199–S200**

McConnell (for Romney) Amendment No. 1282, to modify a finding relating to the defense strategy of the United States. **Page S200**

Nomination Confirmed: Senate confirmed the following nomination:

By 81 yeas to 8 nays (Vote No. EX. 12), Peter Gaynor, of Rhode Island, to be Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security. **Pages S169–S176, S200**

Messages from the House: **Page S191**

Measures Referred: **Page S191**

Measures Read the First Time: **Page S191**

Executive Communications: **Pages S191–S193**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S193–S194**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions:

Pages S194–S197

Additional Statements:

Page S190

Amendments Submitted:

Pages S197–S198

Authorities for Committees to Meet:

Page S198

Record Votes: One record vote was taken today. (Total—12) **Page S176**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 6:50 p.m., until 10 a.m. on Wednesday, January 15, 2020. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today's Record on page S200.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on the Budget: Committee ordered favorably reported H.R. 5430, to implement the Agreement between the United States of America, the United Mexican States, and Canada attached as an Annex to the Protocol Replacing the North American Free Trade Agreement.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Environment and Public Works: Committee ordered favorably reported H.R. 5430, to implement the Agreement between the United States of America, the United Mexican States, and Canada attached as an Annex to the Protocol Replacing the North American Free Trade Agreement.

BUSINESS MEETING

Select Committee on Intelligence: Committee met in closed session to consider pending intelligence matters.

INTELLIGENCE

Select Committee on Intelligence: Committee held closed hearings on intelligence matters, receiving testimony from officials of the intelligence community.

Committee recessed subject to the call.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 10 public bills, H.R. 5596–5605; and 6 resolutions, H. Res 792–797, were introduced.

Page H238

Additional Cosponsors:

Pages H239–40

Reports Filed: There were no reports filed today.

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein she appointed Representative Cuellar to act as Speaker pro tempore for today.

Page H211

Recess: The House recessed at 10:23 a.m. and reconvened at 12 noon.

Page H214

Whole Number of the House: The Speaker announced to the House that, in light of the resignation of the gentleman from California, Mr. Hunter, the whole number of the House is 430.

Page H214

Protecting Older Workers Against Discrimination Act and Providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Department of Education relating to “Borrower Defense Institutional Accountability”—Rule for Consideration: The House agreed to H. Res. 790, providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1230) to amend the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967 and other laws to clarify appropriate standards for Federal employment discrimination and retaliation claims, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 76) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Department of Education relating to “Borrower Defense Institutional Accountability”, by a yea-and-nay vote of 216 yeas to 200 nays, Roll No. 17, after the previous question was ordered by a yea-and-nay vote of 226 yeas to 191 nays, Roll No. 16.

Pages H216–33

Committee Election: The House agreed to H. Res. 793, electing a certain Member to a certain standing committee of the House of Representatives.

Page H223

Board of the Federal Judicial Center Foundation—Appointment: The Chair announced the Speaker’s appointment of the following individuals on the part of the House to the Board of the Federal Judicial Center Foundation for a term of 5 years: Ms. Elizabeth J. Cabraser of Sebastopol, California, and Mr. Peter A. Kraus of Dallas, Texas.

Page H223

Senate Message: Message received from the Senate by the Clerk and subsequently presented to the House today appears on page H216.

Quorum Calls—Votes: Two yea-and-nay votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H222 and H223. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 4:13 p.m.

Committee Meetings

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Education and Labor: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 2694, the “Pregnant Workers Fairness Act”; and H.R. 5191, the “Runaway and Homeless Youth and Trafficking Prevention Act of 2019”. H.R. 2694 and H.R. 5191 were ordered reported, as amended.

A PUBLIC HEALTH EMERGENCY: STATE EFFORTS TO CURB THE OPIOID CRISIS

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations held a hearing entitled “A Public Health Emergency: State Efforts to Curb the Opioid Crisis”. Testimony was heard from Nicole Alexander-Scott, M.D., Director, Rhode Island Department of Health; Monica Bharel, M.D., Commissioner, Massachusetts Department of Public Health; Kody Kinsley, Deputy Secretary, Behavioral Health and Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities, North Carolina Department of Health and Human Services; Christina Mullins, Commissioner, Bureau for Behavioral Health, West Virginia Department of Health and Human Resources; and Jennifer Smith, Secretary, Department of Drug and Alcohol Programs, Pennsylvania.

PROMOTING AMERICAN INNOVATION AND JOBS: LEGISLATION TO PHASE DOWN HYDROFLUOROCARBONS

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Environment and Climate Change held a hearing entitled “Promoting American Innovation and Jobs: Legislation to Phase Down Hydrofluorocarbons”. Testimony was heard from Cynthia Newberg, Director, Stratospheric Protection Division, Office of Atmospheric Programs, Office of Air and Radiation, Environmental Protection Agency; and public witnesses.

ON THE BRINK OF HOMELESSNESS: HOW THE AFFORDABLE HOUSING CRISIS AND THE GENTRIFICATION OF AMERICA IS LEAVING FAMILIES VULNERABLE

Committee on Financial Services: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “On the Brink of Homelessness: How the Affordable Housing Crisis and the Gentrification of America Is Leaving Families Vulnerable”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

THE COMMUNITY REINVESTMENT ACT: REVIEWING WHO WINS AND WHO LOSES WITH COMPTROLLER OTTING’S PROPOSAL

Committee on Financial Services: Subcommittee on Consumer Protection and Financial Institutions held a hearing entitled “The Community Reinvestment Act: Reviewing Who Wins and Who Loses with Comptroller Otting’s Proposal”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

FROM SANCTIONS TO THE SOLEIMANI STRIKE TO ESCALATION: EVALUATING THE ADMINISTRATION’S IRAN POLICY

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “From Sanctions to the Soleimani Strike to Escalation: Evaluating the Administration’s Iran Policy”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

ASSESSING THE ADEQUACY OF DHS EFFORTS TO PREVENT CHILD DEATHS IN CUSTODY

Committee on Homeland Security: Subcommittee on Border Security, Facilitation, and Operations held a hearing entitled “Assessing the Adequacy of DHS Efforts to Prevent Child Deaths in Custody”. Testimony was heard from Brian Hastings, Chief, Law Enforcement Operations, U.S. Border Patrol, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Department of Homeland Security; and Alex Eastman, M.D., Senior Medical Officer—Operations, Countering Weapons of Mass Destruction Office, Department of Homeland Security.

SEVENTEEN YEARS LATER: WHY IS MORALE AT DHS STILL LOW?

Committee on Homeland Security: Subcommittee on Oversight, Management, and Accountability held a hearing entitled “Seventeen Years Later: Why is Morale at DHS Still Low?”. Testimony was heard from Angela Bailey, Chief Human Capital Officer, Department of Homeland Security; Chris Currie, Director, Homeland Security and Justice Team, Government Accountability Office; and a public witness.

LEGISLATIVE MEASURES

Committee on Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Water, Oceans, and Wildlife held a hearing on H.R. 1834, the “Defending Our National Marine Sanctuaries from Damaging Chemicals Act of 2019”; H.R. 2236, the “Forage Fish Conservation Act”; H.R. 4679, the “Climate-Ready Fisheries Act of 2019”; H.R. 4723, the “Fish Act of 2019”; H.R. 5126, the “Direct Enhancement of Snapper Conservation and the Economy through Novel Devices Act of 2019”; and H.R. 5548, the “Fishery Failures: Urgently Needed Disaster Declarations Act”. Testimony was heard from Representatives Rooney of Florida, Dingell, and Huffman; Rear Admiral Timothy Gallaudet, U.S. Navy (Ret.), Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Oceans and Atmosphere, Deputy NOAA Administrator, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration; and public witnesses.

THE PATH TO A CARBON-FREE MARITIME INDUSTRY: INVESTMENTS AND INNOVATION

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Subcommittee on Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation held a hearing entitled “The Path to a Carbon-Free Maritime Industry: Investments and Innovation”. Testimony was heard from Joshua Berger, Governor’s Maritime Sector Lead, Washington Department of Commerce; and public witnesses.

MAKING HUD–VASH WORK FOR ALL VETERAN COMMUNITIES

Committee on Veterans’ Affairs: Subcommittee on Economic Opportunity held a hearing entitled “Making HUD–VASH Work for all Veteran Communities”. Testimony was heard from Keith Harris, National Director of Clinical Operations, Veterans Affairs Homeless Program Office, Department of Veterans Affairs; Hunter Kurtz, Assistant Secretary of Public and Indian Housing, Department of Housing and Urban Development; and public witnesses.

ARTICLE ONE: RESTORING CAPACITY AND EQUIPPING CONGRESS TO BETTER SERVE THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

Select Committee on the Modernization of Congress: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “Article One: Restoring Capacity and Equipping Congress to Better Serve the American People”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

**COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR WEDNESDAY,
JANUARY 15, 2020**

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Appropriations: business meeting to markup H.R. 5430, to implement the Agreement between the United States of America, the United Mexican States, and Canada attached as an Annex to the Protocol Replacing the North American Free Trade Agreement, 10:15 a.m., SD-106.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: business meeting to consider H.R. 5430, to implement the Agreement between the United States of America, the United Mexican States, and Canada attached as an Annex to the Protocol Replacing the North American Free Trade Agreement; to be immediately followed by a hearing to examine industries of the future, 10 a.m., SH-216.

Committee on Environment and Public Works: to hold hearings to examine an update on implementation of the Nuclear Energy Innovation and Modernization Act, 10 a.m., SD-406.

Committee on Foreign Relations: business meeting to consider H.R. 5430, to implement the Agreement between the United States of America, the United Mexican States, and Canada attached as an Annex to the Protocol Replacing the North American Free Trade Agreement, the nominations of Todd C. Chapman, of Texas, to be Ambassador to the Federative Republic of Brazil, John Hennessey-Niland, of Illinois, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Palau, Dorothy Shea, of North Carolina, to be Ambassador to the Lebanese Republic, and Donald Wright, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the United Republic of Tanzania, all of the Department of State, and other pending calendar business, 9:30 a.m., S-116, Capitol.

Full Committee, to receive a closed briefing on United States-Iran policy and authorities for the use of force, 10 a.m., SVC-217.

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: business meeting to consider H.R. 5430, to implement the Agreement between the United States of America, the United Mexican States, and Canada attached as an Annex to the Protocol Replacing the North American Free Trade Agreement, 10 a.m., SD-430.

House

Committee on Armed Services: Full Committee, hearing entitled “DOD’s Role in Competing with China”, 10 a.m., 2118 Rayburn.

Committee on the Budget: Full Committee, hearing entitled “Why Federal Investments Matter: Stability from Congress to State Capitals”, 10 a.m., 210 Cannon.

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Health, hearing entitled “Cannabis Policies for the New Decade”, 10 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Communications and Technology, hearing entitled “Lifting Voices: Legislation to Promote Media Marketplace Diversity”, 10:30 a.m., 2322 Rayburn.

Committee on Financial Services: Subcommittee on National Security, International Development, and Monetary Policy, hearing entitled “A Persistent and Evolving Threat: An Examination of the Financing of Domestic Terrorism and Extremism”, 10 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Investor Protection, Entrepreneurship, and Capital Markets, hearing entitled “Overseeing the Standard Setters: An Examination of the Financial Accounting Standards Board and the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board”, 2 p.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Full Committee, hearing entitled “U.S. Lessons Learned in Afghanistan”, 10 a.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on the Western Hemisphere, Civilian Security, and Trade, hearing entitled “Strengthening Security and the Rule of Law in Mexico”, 2 p.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Committee on Homeland Security: Full Committee, hearing entitled “U.S.-Iran Tensions: Implications for Homeland Security”, 10 a.m., 310 Cannon.

Subcommittee on Intelligence and Counterterrorism, hearing entitled “Confronting the Rise in Anti-Semitic Domestic Terrorism”, 2 p.m., 310 Cannon.

Committee on Natural Resources: Full Committee, markup on H.R. 306, the “Kettle Creek Battlefield Study Act”; H.R. 496, the “Sinkhole Mapping Act of 2019”; H.R. 895, the “Tribal School Federal Insurance Parity Act”; H.R. 1702, the “Free Veterans from Fees Act”; H.R. 2640, the “Buffalo Tract Protection Act”; H.R. 3068, the “Offshore Wind Jobs and Opportunity Act”; H.R. 3160, the “Blackwater Trading Post Land Transfer Act”; H.R. 3465, the “Fallen Journalists Memorial Act of 2019”; H.R. 4248, the “Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act Amendments of 2019”; and H.R. 5552, the “Migratory Bird Protection Act of 2020”, 10 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

Committee on Oversight and Reform: Full Committee, hearing entitled “Facial Recognition Technology (Part III): Ensuring Commercial Transparency and Accuracy”, 10 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology: Full Committee, hearing entitled “An Update on the Climate Crisis: From Science to Solutions”, 10 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Energy, hearing entitled “The Department of Energy’s Office of Science: Exploring the Next Frontiers in Energy Research and Scientific Discovery”, 2 p.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Committee on Small Business: Full Committee, hearing entitled “Enhancing Patent Diversity for America’s Innovators”, 11:30 a.m., 2360 Rayburn.

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Subcommittee on Aviation, hearing entitled “Oversight of Working Conditions for Airline Ground Workers”, 10 a.m., 2167 Rayburn

Next Meeting of the SENATE

10 a.m., Wednesday, January 15

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

10 a.m., Wednesday, January 15

Senate Chamber

Program for Wednesday: Senate will be in a period of morning business.

House Chamber

Program for Wednesday: Consideration of H.R. 1230—Protecting Older Workers Against Discrimination Act.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue**HOUSE**

Axne, Cynthia, Iowa, E33
Cisneros, Gilbert Ray, Jr., Calif., E36
Crist, Charlie, Fla., E36
Fulcher, Russ, Idaho, E35

Gonzalez, Anthony, Ohio, E35
Grijalva, Raúl M., Ariz., E34
Hastings, Alcee L., Fla., E33
Jackson Lee, Sheila, Tex., E33, E34, E36, E37
Rutherford, John H., Fla., E35
San Nicolas, Michael F.Q., Guam, E34

Scott, Robert C. “Bobby”, Va., E37
Shalala, Donna E., Fla., E33
Sherman, Brad, Calif., E36
Shimkus, John, Ill., E34
Wittman, Robert J., Va., E35

**Congressional Record**

printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶ Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through the U.S. Government Publishing Office, at www.govinfo.gov, free of charge to the user. The information is updated online each day the *Congressional Record* is published. For more information, contact the GPO Customer Contact Center, U.S. Government Publishing Office. Phone 202-512-1800, or 866-512-1800 (toll-free). E-Mail, contactcenter@gpo.gov. ¶ To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 979050, St. Louis, MO 63197-9000, or phone orders to 866-512-1800 (toll-free), 202-512-1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202-512-2104. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶ Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶ With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Publishing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.