CORRECTION

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 166 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JANUARY 28, 2020 No. 18

Senate

The Senate met at 1:03 p.m. and was called to order by the Chief Justice of the United States.

TRIAL OF DONALD J. TRUMP, PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The CHIEF JUSTICE. The Senate will convene as a Court of Impeachment.

The Chaplain will lead us in prayer.

PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

O God, You are our rock of safety. Protect us in an unsafe world. Guard us from those who smile but plan evil in their hearts. Use our Senators to bring peace and unity to our world. May they permit Godliness to make them bold as lions. Give them a clearer vision of your desires for our Nation. Remind them that they borrow their heartbeats from You each day. Provide them with such humility, hope, and courage that they will do Your will.

Lord, grant that this impeachment trial will make our Nation stronger, wiser, and better.

We pray in Your strong Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Chief Justice 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 JOURNAL

The CHIEF JUSTICE. Please be seated. If there is no objection, the Journal of proceedings of the trial is approved to date.

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Sergeant at Arms will make the proclamation.

The Sergeant at Arms, Michael C. Stenger, made proclamation as follows:

Hear ye! Hear ye! Hear ye! All persons are commanded to keep silence, on pain of imprisonment, while the Senate of the United States is sitting for the trial of the articles of impeachment exhibited by the House of Representatives against Donald John Trump, President of the United States.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. The majority leader is recognized.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. Chief Justice, we expect several hours of session today, with probably one quick break in the middle.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. Thank you. Pursuant to the provisions of S. Res 483, the counsel for the President have 15 hours and 33 minutes remaining to make the presentation of their case, though it will not be possible to use the remainder of that time before the end of the day.

The Senate will now hear you.

Mr. Counsel CIPOLLONE. Mr. Chief Justice, Members of the Senate, just to give you a very quick, brief overview of today, we do not intend to use much of that time today. Our goal is to be finished by dinnertime and well before. We will have three presentations. First will be Pat Philbin, Deputy White House counsel. Then, Jay Sekulow will give a presentation. We will take a break, if that is OK with you, Mr. Leader. And then, after that, I will finish with a presentation. That is our goal for the day. With that, I will turn it over to Pat Philbin.

Mr. Counsel PHILBIN. Mr. Chief Justice, Members of the Senate, Majority Leader MCCONNELL, Minority Leader SCHUMER, I would like to start today by making a couple of observations related to the abuse of power charge in the first Article of Impeachment. I wouldn't presume to elaborate on Professor Dershowitz' presentation from yesterday evening, which I thought was complete and compelling, but I wanted to add a couple of very specific points in support of the exposition of the Constitution and the impeachment clause that he set out.

It begins from a focus on the point in the debate about the impeachment clause at the Constitutional Convention where maladministration was offered by George Mason as a grounds for impeachment, and James Madison responded that that was a bad idea, and he said: ''So vague a term will be equivalent to a tenure during the pleasure of the Senate.'' That evinced the deep-seated concern that Madison had, and it is part of the whole design of our Constitution for ways that can lead to exercises of arbitrary power.

The Constitution was designed to put limits and checks on all forms of government power. Obviously, one of the great mechanisms for that is the separation of powers—the structural separation of powers in our Constitution. But it also comes from defining and limiting powers and responsibilities and a concern that vague terms, vague standards are themselves an opportunity for the expansion of power and the exercise of arbitrary power. We see that throughout the Constitution and in the impeachment clause as well. This is why, as Gouverneur Morris argued in discussing the impeachment clause, that only few offenses—he said few offenses—ought to be impeachable, and the cases ought to be enumerated and defined.

Many terms had been included in earlier drafts, when it was narrowed down to treason and bribery, and there was a suggestion to include maladministration, which had been a ground for impeachment in English practice. The Framers rejected it because it was too vague; it was too expansive. It would allow for arbitrary exercises of power.

We see throughout the Constitution, in terms that relate and fit in with the impeachment clause, the same concern. One is in the definition of ''treason.'' The Framers were very concerned that the English practice of having a vague concept of treason that was malleable and could be changed even after the fact to define new concepts of treason was dangerous. It was one of the things that they wanted to reject from the English system. So

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

they defined in the Constitution very specifically what constituted treason and how it had to be proved, and then that term was incorporated into the impeachment clause.

Similarly, in the rejection of maladministration, which had been an impeachable offense in England, the Framers rejected that because it was vague. A vague standard, something that is too changeable, that can be redefined, that can be malleable after the fact, allows for the arbitrary exercise of power, and that would be dangerous to give that power to the legislature as a power to impeach the executive.

Similarly—and it relates again to the impeachment clause—one of the greatest dangers from having changeable standards that existed in the English system was bills of attainder. Under a bill of attainder, the Parliament could pass a specific law saying that a specific person had done something unlawful—they were being attainted—even though it wasn't unlawful before that.

The Framers rejected that entire concept. In article I, section 9, they eliminated both bills of attainder and all ex post facto laws for criminal penalties at the Federal level, and they also included a provision to prohibit States from using bills of attainder.

In the English system, there was a relationship, to some extent, between impeachment and bills of attainder because both were tools of the Parliament to get at officials in the government. You could impeach them for an established offense or you could pass a bill of attainder.

It was because the definition of ''impeachment'' was being narrowed that George Mason at the debates suggested—he pointed out—that in the English system there is a bill of attainder. It has been a great, useful tool for the government, but we are eliminating that, and now we are getting a narrow definition of ''impeachment,'' and we ought to expand it to include ''maladministration.'' Madison said no, and the Framers agreed: We have to have enumerated and defined offenses—not a vague concept, not something that can be blurry and interpreted after the fact and that could be used, essentially, to make policy differences or other differences like that the subject of impeachment.

All of the steps that the Framers took in the way they approached the impeachment clause were in terms of narrowing, restricting, constraining, and enumerating offenses and not a vague and malleable approach, as they had been in the English system.

I think the minority views of Republican Members of the House Judiciary Committee at the time of the Nixon impeachment inquiry summed this up and reflected it well because they explained—and I am quoting from the minority views in the report:

> The whole tenor of the Framers' discussions, the whole purpose of their many careful departures from English impeachment practice, was in the direction of limits and of standards. An impeachment power exercised without extrinsic and objective standards would be tantamount to the use of bills of attainder and ex post facto laws, which are expressly forbidden by the Constitution and are contrary to the American spirit of justice.

What we see in the House managers' charges and their definition of abuse of power is exactly antithetical to the Framers' approach because their very premise for their abuse of power charge is that it is entirely based on subjective motive—not objective standards, not predefined offenses, but the President can do something that is perfectly lawful, perfectly within his authority. But if the real reason, as Professor Dershowitz pointed out—that is the language from their report—the reason in the President's mind is something that they ferret out and decide is wrong, that becomes impeachable, and that is not a standard at all. It ends up being infinitely malleable.

It is something that I think—a telling factor that reflects how malleable it is and how dangerous it is in the House Judiciary's report because after they define their concept of abuse of power and they say that it involves your exercising government power for personal interest and not the national interest and it depends on your subjective motives, they realize that is infinitely malleable.

There is not really a clear standard there, and it is violating a fundamental premise of the American system of justice that you have to have notice of what is wrong. You have to have notice of an offense. This is something Professor Dershowitz pointed out last night. There has to be a defined offense in advance. The way they try to resolve this is to say: Well, in addition to our definition, high crimes and misdemeanors involve conduct that is recognizably wrong to a reasonable person. And that is their kind of add-on to deal with the fact that they have an unconstitutionally vague standard.

They don't have a standard that really defines a specific offense. They don't have a standard that really defines, in coherent terms that are going to be identifiable, what the offenses are, so they just add on. It has to be recognizably wrong.

They say they are doing this to resolve a tension, they call it, within the Constitution because they point out—and this is quoting from the report—''The structure of the Constitution, including its prohibition on bills of attainder and the ex post facto clause, implies that peaceable offenses should not come as a surprise.''

That is exactly what Professor Dershowitz pointed out. And everything about the terms of the Constitution, speaking of an offense and a conviction, that crime should be tried by jury except impeachments. They all talk about impeachment in those criminal offense terms.

But the tension here isn't within the Constitution; it is between the House managers' definition, which lacks any coherent definition of an offense that would catch people by surprise and the Constitution. That is the tension that they are trying to resolve between their malleable standards that actually states no clear offense and the Constitution and the principles of justice embodied in the Constitution that requires some clear offense.

I wanted to point that out in relation to the standards for impeachable offenses because it is another piece of the constitutional puzzle that fits in with the exposition that Professor Dershowitz set out. And it also shows an inherent flaw in the House managers' theory of abuse of power, regardless of whether or not one accepts the view that an impeachable offense has to be a defined crime. There is still the flaw in their definition of abuse of power; that it is so malleable, based on purely subjective standards, that it does not provide any recognizable notice of an offense. It is so malleable that it, in effect, recreates the offense of maladministration that the Framers expressly rejected, as Professor Dershowitz explained.

The second point that I wanted to make is, how do we tell, under the House managers' standard, what the illicit motive is; when is there illicit motive? How are we supposed to get the proof of what is inside the President's head because, of course, motive is inherently difficult to prove when you are talking about, as they conceded they are talking about, perfectly lawful actions, on their face, within the constitutional authority of the President? They want to make it impeachable if it is just the wrong idea inside the President's head. And they explain in the House Judiciary Committee report that the way we will tell if the President had the wrong motive is we will compare what he did to what staffers in the executive branch said he ought to do. They say that the President ''disregarded United States foreign policy towards Ukraine'' and that he ignored ''official'' policy that he had been briefed on and that ''he ignored, defied, and confounded every . . . agency within the Executive Branch.''

That is not a constitutionally coherent statement. The President cannot defy agencies within the executive branch. Article II, section 1 of the Constitution vests all of the Executive power in a President of the United States. He alone is an entire branch of government. He sets policy for the executive branch. He is given vast power. And, of course, within limits set by laws passed by Congress and within limits set by spending priorities—spending laws passed by Congress—he, within those constraints, sets the policies of the government. And in areas of foreign affairs, military affairs, national security—which is what we are dealing with in this case—in foreign affairs and head of state communications, he has vast powers.

As Professor Dershowitz explained, for over two centuries, the President

has been regarded as the sole organ of the Nation in foreign affairs. So the idea that we are going to find out when the President has a wrong subjective motive by comparing what he did to the recommendations of some interagency consensus among staffers is fundamentally anti-constitutional. It inverts the constitutional structure, and it is also fundamentally anti-democratic because our system is rather unique in the amount of power that it gives to the President.

The Executive here has much more power than in a parliamentary system, but part of the reason that the President can have that power is if he is directly democratically accountable to the people. There is an election every 4 years to ensure that the President stays democratically accountable to the people. Those staffers in these supposed interagencies who have their meetings and make recommendations to the President are not accountable to the people. There is no democratic legitimacy or accountability to their decisions or recommendations. And that is why the President, as head of the executive branch, has the authority to actually set policies and make determinations, regardless of what his staffers may recommend. They are there to provide information and recommendations, not to set policy.

The idea that we are going to start impeaching Presidents by deciding that they have illicit motives if we can show they disagree with some interagency consensus is fundamentally contrary to the Constitution and fundamentally anti-democratic. Those were the two observations I wanted to add to supplement specific points on Professor Dershowitz' comments from last night.

I want to shift gears and respond to a couple of points that the House managers have brought up that are really completely extraneous to this proceeding. They involve matters that are not charged in the Articles of Impeachment. They do not relate directly to the President and his actions, but they are accusations that were brought up somewhat recklessly, in any event, and we can't close without some response to them. The first has to do with the idea that somehow the White House and White House lawyers were involved in some sort of coverup related to the transcript of the July 25 call because it was stored on a highly classified system.

Let me start with that. The House managers made this accusation of something nefarious going on. Let's see what the witnesses actually had to say. LTC Alexander Vindman—remember Lieutenant Colonel Vindman is the person who was listening in on the call and who raised a concern. He was the only person who went and raised a concern with NSC lawyers that he thought there was something improper, something wrong with the call. Even though he later conceded under cross-examination it was really a policy concern, but he thought there was something wrong.

And he had to say: ''I do not think there was malicious intent or anything of that nature . . . to cover anything up.''

He is the one who went and talked to the lawyers. He is the one whose complaint spurred the idea that, wait, there might be something that is really sensitive here. Let's make sure this is not going to leak. He thought there was nothing covering it up.

His boss, Senior Director Tim Morrison, had similar testimony.

(Text of Videotape presentation:)

Mr. CASTOR. So to your knowledge, there was no malicious intent in moving the transcript to the compartmented server?

Mr. MORRISON. Correct.

Mr. Counsel PHILBIN. The idea that there was some sort of coverup is further destroyed by the simple fact that everyone who as part of their job needed access to that transcript, still had access to it, including Lieutenant Colonel Vindman. The person who raised the complaint still had access to the transcript the entire time.

This is the way Mr. Morrison's testimony explained that.

(Text of Videotape presentation:)

Mr. CASTOR. And even on the code word server, you had access to it?

Lieutenant Colonel VINDMAN. Yes.

Mr. CASTOR. So at no point in time in your official duties were you denied access to this information, is that correct?

Lieutenant Colonel VINDMAN. Correct.

Mr. CASTOR. And to your knowledge, anybody on NSC staff that needed access to their official duties always was able to access it, correct, people that had a need to know and a need to access it?

Mr. MORRISON. Once it was moved to the departmental system? Yes.

Mr. CASTOR. OK.

Mr. Counsel PHILBIN. Now, Mr. Morrison testified that he recommended restricting access to the transcript, not because he was concerned there was anything improper or illegal, but he was concerned about a potential leak and, as he put it, how that ''would play out in Washington's polarized environment'' and would ''affect bipartisan support our Ukrainian partners are currently experiencing in Congress.''

He was right to be concerned, potentially, about leaks because the Trump administration has faced national security leaks at an alarming rate. Lieutenant Colonel Vindman, himself, said concerns about leaks seemed justified, and it was not unusual that something would be put in a more restricted circulation.

Now, what else is in the record evidence? Mr. Morrison explained his understanding of how the transcript ended up on that server.

(Text of Videotape presentation:)

Mr. MORRISON. I spoke with the NSC executive secretariat staff, asked them why, and they did their research and they informed me that it had been moved to the higher classification system at the direction of John Eisenberg, whom I then asked why. I mean, if that was the judgment he made, that's not necessarily mine to question, but I didn't understand it. And he essentially told me: I gave no such direction. He did his own inquiry, and he represented back to me that it was his understanding that it was kind of an administrative error, that when he also gave direction to restrict access, the executive secretariat staff also understood that as an apprehension that there was something in the content of the Memcon that could not exist on the lower classification system.

Mr. CASTOR. To the best of your knowledge, there was no malicious intent in moving the transcript to the compartmented server?

Mr. MORRISON. Correct.

Mr. Counsel PHILBIN. Everyone who knew something about it and who testified agreed there was no malicious intent. The call was still available to everyone who needed it as part of their job, and it certainly wasn't covered up or deep-sixed in some way. The President declassified it and made it public. So why we are even here talking about these accusations about a coverup, when it is a transcript that was preserved and made public, is somewhat absurd.

The other point I would like to turn to—another accusation from the House managers—is that the whistleblower complaint was not forwarded to Congress. They have said that lawyers at the Department of Justice, this time, they accused OLC, the Office of Legal Counsel, of providing a bogus opinion for why the Director of National Intelligence did not have to advance the whistleblower's complaint to Congress.

Manager JEFFRIES said that OLC opined ''without any reasonable basis that the Acting DNI did not have to turn over the complaint to Congress.''

The way he portrayed this—now, there is a statute that says if the inspector general of the intelligence community finds a matter of urgent concern, it must be forwarded to Congress. And Manager JEFFRIES portrayed this as if the only thing to decide was were these claims urgent. He said: ''What can be more urgent than a sitting President trying to cheat in an American election by soliciting foreign interference?''

Except that is not the only question. The statute doesn't just say, if it is urgent, you have to forward it. It talks about ''urgent concern'' as a defined term. If the House managers want to come and cast accusations that the political and career officials at the Office of Legal Counsel, which we all know is a very respected office of the Department of Justice, provides opinions for the executive branch on what governing law is, they should come backed up with analysis.

So let's look at what the law actually says, and I think we have the slide of that.

''Urgent concern is defined as a serious or flagrant problem, abuse, violation of law relating to the funding, administration, or operation of an intelligence activity within the responsibility and authority of the Director of National Intelligence involving classified information.''

So the Office of Legal Counsel was consulted by the General Counsel at

the DNI's office, and they looked at this definition, and they did an analysis. They determined that the alleged misconduct was not an urgent concern within the meaning of the statute because they were not just talking about ''Do we think it is urgent?'' ''Do we think it is important?'' No. They were analyzing the law, and they looked at the terms of the statute.

''The alleged misconduct is not an urgent concern within the meaning of the statute because it does not concern the funding, administration, or operation of an intelligence activity under the authority of the DNI.''

Remember, what we are talking about here is a head-of-state communication between the President of the United States and another head of state. This isn't some CIA operation overseas. This isn't the NSA's doing something. This isn't any intelligence activity going on within the intelligence community under the supervision of the DNI. It is the head of the executive branch, in the exercising of his constitutional authority, engaging in foreign relations with a foreign head of state.

So, in reaching that conclusion, the Office of Legal Counsel looked at the statute, case law, and the legislative history. It concluded that this phrase ''urgent concern'' included matters relating to an intelligence activity subject to the DNI's supervision, but it did not include allegations of wrongdoing arising outside of any intelligence activity or outside the intelligence community itself.

That makes sense. This statute was meant to provide for an ability of the inspector general's of the intelligence community, in overseeing the activities of the intelligence community, to receive reports about what was going on at intelligence agencies, those who were members of the intelligence community, and if there were fraud, waste, abuse—something unlawful—in those activities. It was not meant to create an inspector general of the Presidency, an inspector general of the Oval Office, to purport to determine whether the President, in exercising his constitutional authorities, had done something that should be reported.

This law is narrow, and it does not cover every alleged violation of law, the OSC explained, or other abuse that comes to the attention of a member of the intelligence community. Just because you are in the intelligence community and happen to see something else doesn't make this law apply. The law does not make the inspector general for the intelligence community responsible for investigating and reporting on allegations that do not involve intelligence activities or the intelligence community.

Nonetheless, the President, of course, released the July 25 call transcript, and it was also not the end of the matter that the whistleblower complaint and the ICIG's letter were not sent directly to Congress. As the OLC explained, if the alleged complaint does not involve an urgent concern but if there is anything else there that you want to have checked out, the appropriate action is to refer the matter to the Department of Justice, and that is what the DNI's office did.

They sent the ICIG's letter, with the complaint, to the Department of Justice, and the Department of Justice looked at it. This was all made public some time ago. The Department of Justice examined the exact allegations of the whistleblower's and the exact framing and concern raised by the inspector general, which had to do with the potential of, perhaps, a campaign finance law violation. The DOJ looked at it—looked at the statutes, analyzed it—and determined there was no violation, and it closed the matter. It announced that months ago.

When something gets sent over to the Department of Justice to examine, you can't call that a coverup. Everything here was done correctly. The lawyers analyzed the law. The complaint was sent to the appropriate person for review. It was not within the statute that it required transmission to Congress. Everything was handled entirely properly.

Again, actually extraneous to the matters before you, there is nothing about these two points in the Articles of Impeachment, but it merits a response when reckless allegations are made against those at the White House and at the Department of Justice.

With that, Mr. Chief Justice, I yield my time to Mr. Sekulow.

Mr. Counsel SEKULOW. Thank you, Mr. Chief Justice, Majority Leader MCCONNELL, Democratic Leader SCHUMER, House managers, Members of the Senate.

What we are involved in here, as we conclude, is perhaps the most solemn of duties under our constitutional framework—the trial of the leader of the free world and the duly elected President of the United States. It is not a game of leaks and unsourced manuscripts. That is politics, unfortunately, and Hamilton put impeachment in the hands of this body—the Senate—precisely and specifically to be above that fray. This is the greatest deliberative body on Earth.

In our presentation so far, you have now heard from legal scholars from a variety of schools of thought, from a variety of political backgrounds, but they do have a common theme with a dire warning—danger, danger, danger. To lower the bar of impeachment based on these Articles of Impeachment would impact the functioning of our constitutional Republic and the framework of that Constitution for generations.

I asked you to put yourselves—in quoting Mr. SCHIFF's statement that his father made—in the shoes of someone else, and I said I would like you to put yourselves in the shoes of the President. I think it is important, as we conclude today, that we are reminded of that fact.

The President of the United States, before he was the President, was under an investigation. It was called Crossfire Hurricane. It was an investigation, led by the FBI, the Federal Bureau of Investigation. James Comey eventually told the President a little bit about the investigation and referenced the Steele dossier. James Comey, the then-Director of the FBI, said it was salacious and unverified—so salacious and unverified that they used it as a basis to obtain FISA warrants. Members—managers here, managers at this table right here—said that any discussions on the abuse from the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act, utilized to get the FISA warrants from the court, were conspiracy theories.

At the very beginning, I asked you to put yourselves in the shoes of not just this President but of any President who would have been under this type of attack. FISA warrants were issued on people affiliated with his campaign—American citizens affiliated with the people of his campaign, citizens of the United States being surveilled pursuant to an order that has now been acknowledged by the very court that issued the order that it was based on a fraudulent presentation.

In fact, evidence specifically changed—changed by the very FBI lawyer who was in charge of this, changed to such an extent that the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court—as I said earlier, and I will not repeat it again—issued two orders, saying that when this agent—this lawyer—made these misrepresentations to the National Security Division, they also made a misrepresentation to a Federal court—the Federal court—the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court. This is a court where there are no defense witnesses and is a court where there is no cross-examination. It is a court based on trust. That trust was violated.

Then the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, James Comey, decides he will leak a memo of a conversation he had with the President of the United States. He is leaking the memo for a purpose, he said—to obtain the appointment of a special counsel. Lo and behold, a special counsel is appointed. It just so happens that that FBI agent—lawyer—who committed the fraud on the FISA Court, became a lawyer for the Mueller investigation, only to be removed because of political animus and bias found by the inspector general.

Then we have a special counsel investigation. Lisa Page, Agent Strzok—I am not going to go into the details. You know them. They are not in controversy. They are uncontroverted. The facts are clear. But does it bother your sense of justice even a little bit—even a little bit—that Bob Mueller allowed the evidence on the phones of those agents to be wiped clean while there was an investigation going on by the inspector general?

Now, if you did it, or if you did it, Manager SCHIFF, or if you did it, Manager JEFFRIES, or if I did that—destroyed evidence—if anyone in this Chamber did this, we would be in serious trouble. Their serious trouble is their getting fired. Bob Mueller's explanation for it is, I don't know what happened. I don't know what happened. I can't recall conversations.

You can't view this case in a vacuum. You are being asked—and I say this with the utmost respect—to remove a duly elected President of the United States. We have referenced the law school exams, and I love that. I thought there was great analysis yesterday. I appreciate all of that, but I want to focus today on my section, on what you are being asked to do. You are being asked to remove a duly elected President of the United States, and you are being asked to do it in an election year—in an election year.

There are some of you in this Chamber right now who would rather be someplace else, and that is why we will be brief. I understand. You would rather be someplace else. Why would you rather be someplace else? Because you are running for President, for the nomination of your party. I get it, but this is a serious, deliberative situation. You are being asked to remove a duly elected President of the United States. That is what the Articles of Impeachment call for—removal.

So we had a special counsel, and we got the report. Just for a moment, putting yourselves in the shoes of this President—or of any President who would be under this situation—you are No. 4 at the Department of Justice. His wife is working for the firm that is doing the opposition research on him and is communicating with the foreign former spy, Christopher Steele, who put together the dossier. It is being handled by Christopher Steele, through Nellie Ohr, to her husband—then, the fourth ranking member at the Department of Justice, Bruce Ohr. All of this is going on, and he doesn't want to tell everybody—and he has testified to this—what he is doing because he is afraid he might have to stop.

Might have to stop?

How did this happen? This is the Federal Bureau of Investigation. And then we ask why the President is concerned about advice he is being given?

Put yourself in his shoes. Put yourself in his shoes.

We have given you—and our approach has been to give—an overview, and to be very specific, to remove a duly elected President, which is what you are being asked to do, for essentially policy disagreements—you heard a lot about policy, although the one that I still—it still troubles me, this idea that the President—it was said by several of the managers—is only doing these things for himself.

Understanding what is going on in the world today, as we are here—they raised it, by the way. I am not trying to be disrespectful. They raised it: This President is only doing things for himself while the leaders of opposing parties, by the way, at the highest level, to obtain peace in the Middle East—to say you are only doing that for yourself? I think the irony is that those statements were made while all of that was going on and other acts that this body has passed, some of them bipartisan, to help the American people.

Policy differences—those policy differences cannot be used to destroy the separation of powers. House managers spoke for—I know we have had disagreements on the time. It was 21 hours or 23 hours. They spoke during their time—a lot of time—most of it attacking the President, policy decisions. They didn't like what they heard. They didn't like there was a pause on foreign aid.

I have laid out before that there were pauses on all kinds of foreign aid. He is not the first President to do it.

But the one thing I am still trying to understand from the managers' perspective—and maybe it is not fair to ask the managers because you are not the leader of the House. But remember the whole idea that this was a dire national security threat, a danger to our Nation, and we had to get this over here right away. It had to be done before Christmas. It was so important; it was so significant; the country was in such jeopardy; the jeopardy was so serious that it had to be done immediately.

Let's hold on to the Articles of Impeachment for a month to see if the House could force the Senate to adopt rules that they wanted, which is not the way the Constitution is set up.

But it was such a dire emergency, it was so critical for our Nation's national interests, that we could hold them for 33 days. Danger, danger, danger. That is politics.

As I said, you are being called upon to remove the duly elected President of the United States. That is what these Articles of Impeachment call for.

They never really answered the question of why they thought there was such a national emergency. Maybe they will during questions; I don't know. If there was such a national emergency, they never did explain why it was that they waited. They certainly didn't wait to have the proceedings, as my colleagues have laid out; I mean, those proceedings moved in record time. I suspect that we have been here more than the House actually considered the actual Articles of Impeachment.

Is that the way the Constitution is supposed to work? Is that the design of the Constitution?

And then their question, of course, came up yesterday on the whole situation with Burisma and the Bidens and that whole issue, and my colleague went through that a great deal, and I am not going to do that.

But do we have a—we used to call this, in free speech cases, like a free speech zone. You could have your free speech activities over here; you can't have them over there. Do you we have like a Biden-free zone? Was that was this was? You mention someone or you are concerned about a company, and it is now off limits? You can impeach the President of the United States for asking a question? I think we significantly showed the question.

I am not going to go through a detail-by-detail analysis of the facts, but there are some that we just have to go through.

You heard a lot of new facts yesterday in our presentation. On Saturday, what we were pointing to was a very quick overview, and then yesterday we spent the day—and we appreciate everybody's patience on that—going through the facts: They showed you this, but they didn't show you that.

The facts are important, though, because facts have legal ramifications; legal ramifications impact the decisions you make. So I don't take facts lightly, and I certainly don't take the constitutional mandate lightly, and we can't.

The facts we demonstrated yesterday and briefly on Saturday demonstrate that there was, in fact, a proper governmental interest in the questions that the President asked and the issues that the President raised on that phone call.

A phone call—now, let's—again, put your feet in the shoes of the President. Put yourself in the President's position. Do you think he thought, when he was on the call, it was him and President Zelensky he was talking to, and that was it? Or as I heard one commentator say it was—people listening in on the call—the President and 3,000 of his closest friends.

Let's be realistic. The President of the United States knew, when he was on that call, there were a lot of people listening from our side and from their side. So he knew what he was saying. He said it. We released a transcript of it.

The facts on the call that have been kind of the focus of all of this really focused on foreign policy initiatives both in Ukraine and around the globe. They talked about other countries. The President has been very concerned about other countries carrying some of the financial load here, not just the United States. That is a legitimate position for a President to take. If you disagree with it, you have the right to do that, but he is the President. As my colleague Deputy White House Counsel Philbin just said, that is the executive branch prerogative. That is their constitutional, appropriate role.

So the call is well documented. There were lots of people on the call. The person that would be on the other end of the quid pro quo, if it existed, would have been President Zelensky. But President Zelensky—and we already laid out the other officials from Ukraine—has repeatedly said there was no pressure. It was a good call. They didn't even know there was a pause in

the aid. All of that is well documented. I am not going to go through each and every one of those facts. We did that over the last several days.

President Zelensky's senior adviser, Andriy Yermak, was asked if he ever felt there was a connection between military aid and the request for investigations, and he was adamant that ''We never had that feeling'' and ''We did not have the feeling that this aid was connected to any one specific issue.'' This is coming from the people who were receiving the aid.

So we talk about this whole quid pro quo, and that was a big issue. That is how this—actually, before it became an impeachment proceeding, there was—as the proceedings were beginning in the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence under Chairman SCHIFF's role, there were all these discussions: Is it a quid pro quo? Was it extortion? Was it bribery? What was it?

And we are clear in our position that there was no quid pro quo. But then yesterday, my cocounsel, Professor Alan Dershowitz, explained last night that these articles must be rejected—he was talking about from a constitutional framework—even if it was a quid pro quo, which we have clearly established there was not.

And this is what he said, and I am going to quote it verbatim:

> The claim that foreign policy decisions can be deemed abuses of power based on subjective opinions about mixed or sole motives that the President was interested only in helping himself demonstrate the dangers of employing the vague, subjective, and politically malleable phrase ''abuse of power'' as a constitutionally permissible criteria for the removal of a President.

He went on to say:

> Now, it follows from this that if a President—any President—were to have done what ''The Times'' reported about the content of John Bolton's manuscript, that would not constitute an impeachable offense.

I am quoting exactly from Professor Dershowitz. He said:

> Let me repeat it. Nothing in the Bolton revelations, even if true—

Even if true.

> would rise to the level of abuse of power or an impeachable offense. That is clear from history. That is clear from the language of the Constitution. You cannot turn conduct that is not impeachable into impeachable conduct simply by using words like ''quid pro quo'' and ''personal benefit.''
>
> It is inconceivable that the Framers would have intended so politically loaded and promiscuously deployed a term as ''abuse of power'' to be weaponized—

Again, Professor Dershowitz.

> as a tool of impeachment. It is precisely the kind of vague, open-ended, and subjective term Framers feared and rejected.

Now, to be specific: You cannot impeach a President on an unsourced allegation. But what Professor Dershowitz was saying is that even if everything in there is true, it constitutionally doesn't rise to that level.

But I want to be clear on this because there is a lot of speculation out there with regard to what John Bolton has said, which referenced a number of individuals. We will start with the President. Here is what the President said in response to that New York Times piece:

> I NEVER told John Bolton that the aid to Ukraine was tied to investigations into Democrats, including the Bidens. In fact, he never complained about this at the time of his very public termination. If John Bolton said this, it was only to sell a book.

The Department of Justice.

> While the Department of Justice has not reviewed Mr. Bolton's manuscript, the New York Times' account of his conversation grossly mischaracterizes what Attorney General Barr and Bolton discussed.
>
> There was no discussion of ''personal favors'' or ''undue influence'' on investigations, nor did Attorney General Barr state that the President's conversations with foreign leaders were improper.

The Vice President's chief of staff issued a statement:

> In every conversation with the President and the Vice President, in preparation for our trip to Poland—

Remember, that was the trip that was being planned for the meeting with President Zelensky.

> the President consistently expressed his frustration that the United States was bearing the lion's share of responsibility for aid to Ukraine and that European nations weren't doing their part.
>
> The President also expressed concerns about corruption in Ukraine, and at no time did I hear him tie Ukraine aid to investigations into the Biden family or Burisma.

That was the response responding to an unpublished manuscript that maybe some reporters have an idea of maybe what it says. I mean, that is what the evidence—if you want to call that evidence. I don't know what you call that. I would call it inadmissible, but that is what it is.

To argue that the President is not acting in our national interest and is violating his oath of office, which the managers have put forward, is wrong based on the facts and the way the Constitution is designed.

When you look at the fullness of the record of their witnesses—their witnesses—the witnesses' statements, the transcripts—there is one thing that emerged: There is no violation of law. There is no violation of the Constitution. There is a disagreement on policy decisions.

Most of those who spoke at your hearings did not like the President's policy. That is why we have elections. That is where policy differentials and differences are discussed. But to have a removal of a duly elected President based on policy differences is not what the Framers intended.

If you lower the bar that way, danger, danger, danger, because the next President or the one after that—he or she would be held to that same standard. I hope not. I pray that is not what happens, not just for the sake of my client but for the Constitution. Professor Dershowitz gave a list of Presidents, from Washington to where we are today, who, under the standard that they are proposing, could be subject to abuse of power or obstruction of Congress.

We know that this is not about a President pausing aid to Ukraine. It is really not about the law. It is about a lot of attempts on policy disagreements that are not being debated here. My goodness, how much time—how much time has been spent in the House of Representatives hoping? They were hoping that the Mueller probe would result in—I mean, I am not going to play all the—I was thinking about it, playing all the clips from all the commentators the day after Bob Mueller testified. Bob Mueller was unable to answer, under his examination, basic and fundamental questions. He had to correct himself, actually. He had to correct himself before the Senate for something that he said before the House. So that is what the President has been living with.

And we are today arguing about what? A phone call to Ukraine or Ukraine aid being held or a question about corruption or a question about corruption that happened to involve a high-profile public figure? Is that what this is? Is that where we are?

Then what do we find out? The aid was released. It was released in an orderly fashion. The reform President, President Zelensky, wins, but there was a question on whether his party would take the Parliament. It did. They worked late into the evening with the desire to put forward reforms. So everybody was waiting, including—and you heard the testimony from, I will say, their witnesses—you heard the testimony—everybody was concerned about Ukraine. Everybody was concerned about whether these reforms could actually take place. Everybody was concerned about it. So you hold back.

It didn't affect anything that was going on in the field. We heard Mr. CROW worrying about the soldiers. I understand that, I appreciate that, but none of that aid was affecting what was going on in the battlefield right then or for the next 4 months because it was future aid. Are we having an impeachment proceeding because aid came out 3 weeks before the end of the fiscal year, for a 6-minute phone call? You boil it down, that is what this is.

It is interesting to me that everybody said: Well, the aid was finally released September 11 only because of the committee and the whistleblower we have never seen. Mr. Philbin dealt with that in great detail. I am not going to go over that again. But, you know, the new high court, the anti-corruption court, wasn't established and did not sit until September 5, 2019. So while the President of Ukraine was trying to get reforms put in place, the court that was going to decide corruption issues was not set until September 5.

I want you to think about this for a moment too. They needed a high court of corruption for corruption. Think

about that for a moment. Now, it is good that they recognized it, but remember when I said the other day that you don't wave a magic wand and now Ukraine doesn't have a corruption problem? The high court of corruption, which they have to have because it is not just past corruption—they are concerned about ongoing corruption issues.

You could put all of your witnesses back under oath in the next hearings you will have when this is all over, and you are going to be back in the House and you are going to be doing this again, putting them all back under oath, and ask them, Mr. SCHIFF, is there a problem with corruption in Ukraine? If they get up there and say: No. Everything is great now, hallelujah—but I suspect they are going to say: We are working really hard on it. But this idea that it has just vanished and now we are back into ''everything is fine'' is absurd.

Mr. Morrison testified that while the developments were taking place, the Vice President also met with President Zelensky in Warsaw. That was the meeting of September 1—the one, by the way, where the Vice President's Office said in response to this New York Times article that nobody told him about aid being held or linked to investigations.

Are you going to stop—are you going to allow proceedings on impeachment to go from a New York Times report about someone that says what they hear is in a manuscript? Is that where we are? I don't think so. I hope not.

What did Morrison say? You heard firsthand that the new Ukraine administration was taking concrete steps to address corruption. That is good. He advised the President that the relationship with Zelensky is one that could be trusted. Good.

President Zelensky also agreed with Vice President PENCE—this is interesting—that the Europeans should be doing more and related to Vice President PENCE conversations he had been having with European leaders about getting them to do more.

In sum, the President raised two issues he was concerned with to get them addressed.

Now I have already gone over—again, this is just the closing moments here of our portion of this proceeding. Aid was withheld or paused, put on a pause button not just for Ukraine but for Afghanistan, South Korea, El Salvador, Guatemala, Lebanon, and Pakistan. I am sure I am leaving countries out. But do you think the American people are concerned if the President says: You know, before we give a country, I don't know, $550 million—some countries, only $400 million—we would like to know what they are doing with it. You are supposed to be the guardians of the trust here. It is the taxpayers' money we are spending.

There was a lot of testimony from Dr. Fiona Hill, John Bolton's deputy. Here is what she said about aid that was being held. This was her testimony: There was a freeze put on all kinds of aid and assistance because it was in the process at the time of an awful lot of reviews of foreign assistance.

Oh, you mean there was a policy within the administration to review foreign assistance and how we are doing it because we spend a lot of money?

By the way, I am not complaining about the money. I don't think anybody doesn't want to help. But we do need to know what is going on, and those are valid and important questions.

Manager CROW told you that the President's Ukraine policy was not strong against Russia, but Ambassador Yovanovitch stated the exact opposite. She said in her deposition that our country's Ukraine policy under President Trump actually—her words—''got stronger'' than it was under President Obama.

So, again, policy disagreements. Disagreements on approach. Have elections. That is what we do in our Republic.

For 3 long days, House managers presented their case by selectively showing parts of testimony. Good lawyers show parts of testimony. You don't have to show the whole thing. But other good lawyers show the rest of the testimony. And that is what we sought to do to give you a fuller view of what we saw as the glaring omissions by my colleagues, the House managers.

The legal issues here are the constitutional ones, and I have been I think pretty clear over the last week, starting when we had the motions arguments, in my concern about the constitutional obligations that we are operating under. I have been critical of Manager NADLER's ''executive privilege and other nonsense.''

I want you to look at it this way. Take out executive privilege; First Amendment free speech and other nonsense; the free exercise of religion and other nonsense; the right to due process and other nonsense; the right of equal protection under the law and other nonsense. You can't start doing that. You would not do that. No administration has done that, in fact, since the first administration, George Washington. They wanted information. He thought it was privileged. He said it was executive privilege.

Let's not start calling constitutional rights ''other nonsense'' and lumping them together. This is from the House of Representatives that actually believes the attorney/client privilege doesn't apply, which should scare every lawyer in Washington, DC, but more scary for their clients. They say that in writing, in letters. They don't hide it.

I would ask them—I am not going to; it is not my privilege to do that—do you really believe that? Do you really believe that the attorney/client privilege does not apply in a congressional hearing? Do you really believe that? Because if that is what is believed or implied, then there is no attorney/client privilege—or is that the attorney/client privilege and other nonsense? Danger, danger, danger.

We believe that article I fails constitutionally. The President has constitutional authority to engage in and conduct foreign policy and foreign affairs. It is our position legally—the President at all times acted with perfect legal authority, inquired of matters in our national interest, and, having received assurances of those matters, continued his policy that his administration put forward of what really is unprecedented support for Ukraine, including the delivery of a military aid package that was denied to the Ukrainians by the prior administration.

Some of the managers right here, my colleagues at the other table, voted in favor of those—wanted Javelin antitank missiles for Ukraine. Some of the Members here did not, didn't want to do that, voted against that. I am glad we gave it to them. I am glad we allowed them to purchase Javelins.

I never served in the military. I have tremendous, tremendous respect for the men and women who protect our freedom. I have tremendous respect for what they are doing and continue to do.

This President actually allowed the Javelins to go. Some of you liked that idea; some of you did not. Policy difference. Were you going to impeach President Obama because he did not give them lethal aid? No. Nor should you. You should not do that. It is a policy difference. Policy differences do not rise to the level of constitutionally mandated or constitutional applications for removal from office. It is policy differences.

By the way, it is not just on lethal weapons; President Obama, as I said, withheld aid. He had the right to do that. You have allowed him to do that.

Oh, but we don't like that this President did it, so the rules change. So this President's rules are different than—he has a different set of standards he has to apply than what you allowed the previous administrations to apply. And you know what—or the future administrations to apply. That is the problem with these articles.

We have laid out, I believe, a compelling case on what the Constitution requires. When they were in the House of Representatives putting this together, did they go through a constitutionally mandated accommodation process to see if there was a way to come up with something? No, they did not. Did they run to court? No. And the one time it was about to happen, they ran the other way.

Separation of powers means something. It is not separation of powers and other nonsense. If we have reached now, at this very moment in the history of our Republic, a bar of impeachment because you don't like the President's policies or you don't like the

way he undertook those policies—because we heard a lot about policy. If partisan impeachment is now the rule of the day, which these Members and Members of this Senate said should never be the rule of the day—my goodness, they said it—some of them—5 months ago, but then we had the national emergency, a phone call. It is an emergency, except we will just wait.

But if partisan impeachment based on policy disagreements, which is what this is, and personal presumptions or newspaper reports and allegations in an unsourced—maybe this is in somebody's book who is no longer at the White House—if that becomes the new norm, future Presidents, Democrats and Republicans, will be paralyzed the moment they are elected, before they can even take the oath of office. The bar for impeachment cannot be set this low.

Majority Leader MCCONNELL, Democratic Leader SCHUMER, House managers, Members of the Senate—danger, danger, danger. These articles must be rejected. The Constitution requires it. Justice demands it.

We would ask the majority leader for a short recess, if we can, about 15 minutes.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. The majority leader is recognized.

RECESS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. Chief Justice, we will be in recess for 15 minutes.

There being no objection, at 2:18 p.m., the Senate, sitting as a Court of Impeachment, recessed until 2:44 p.m.; whereupon the Senate reassembled when called to order by the CHIEF JUSTICE.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. The Senate will come to order. Please be seated.

Mr. Cipollone.

Mr. Counsel CIPOLLONE. I thank Mr. Chief Justice and Members of the Senate.

Well, I had kind of a lengthy presentation prepared, but I think you have heard a lot from our side, and I think we have made our case.

I just want to leave you with a couple of points. First of all, I thank the majority leader and thank Democratic Leader SCHUMER and all of you for the privilege of speaking on the floor of the Senate and for your time and attention. We really appreciate it.

We made three basic points. One, all you need in this case is the Constitution and your common sense. If you just look at the Articles of Impeachment, the Articles of Impeachment fall far short of any constitutional standard, and they are dangerous. If you look to the words from the past that I think are instructive, as I said last night, they are instructive because they were right then and they are right now, and I will leave you with some of those words.

(Text of Videotape presentation:)

Mr. NADLER. There must never be a narrowly voted impeachment or an impeachment supported by one of our major political parties and opposed by the other. Such an impeachment will lack legitimacy, will produce divisiveness and bitterness in our politics for years to come, and will call into question the very legitimacy of our political institutions.

Ms. LOFGREN. This is unfair to the American people. By these actions you would undo the free election that expressed the will of the American people in 1996. In so doing, you will damage the faith the American people have in this institution and in the American democracy. You will set the dangerous precedent that the certainty of Presidential terms, which has so benefited our wonderful America, will be replaced by the partisan use of impeachment. Future Presidents will face election, then litigation, then impeachment. The power of the President will diminish in the face of the Congress, a phenomena much feared by the Founding Fathers.

Mr. MARKEY. This is a constitutional amendment that we are debating, not an impeachment resolution. The Republicans are crossing out the impeachment standard of high crimes and misdemeanors, and they are inserting the words ''any crime or misdemeanor.'' We are permitting a constitutional coup d'etat which will haunt this body and our country forever.

Mr. MENENDEZ. I warn my colleagues that you will reap the bitter harvest of the unfair partisan seeds you sow today. The constitutional provision for impeachment is a way to protect our government and our citizens, not another weapon in the political arsenal.

Mr. SCHUMER. I suspect history will show that we have lowered the bar on impeachment so much we have broken the seal on this extreme penalty so cavalierly that it will be used as a routine tool to fight political battles. My fear is that when a Republican wins the White House Democrats will demand payback.

Mr. Counsel CIPOLLONE. You were right, but I am sorry to say you were also prophetic, and I think I couldn't say it better myself, so I will not. You know what the right answer is in your heart. You know what the right answer is for our country. You know what the right answer is for the American people.

What they are asking you to do is to throw out a successful President on the eve of an election with no basis and in violation of the Constitution. It would dangerously change our country and weaken—weaken—forever all of our democratic institutions. You all know that is not in the interest of the American people. Why not trust the American people with this decision? Why tear up their ballots? Why tear up every ballot across this country? You can't do that. You know you can't do that.

So I ask you to defend our Constitution, to defend fundamental fairness, to defend basic due process rights, but most importantly—most importantly—to respect and defend the sacred right of every American to vote and to choose their President. The election is only months away. The American people are entitled to choose their President.

Overturning the last election and massively interfering with the upcoming one would cause serious and lasting damage to the people of the United States and to our great country. The Senate cannot allow this to happen. It is time for this to end, here and now. So we urge the Senate to reject these Articles of Impeachment for all of the reasons we have given you. You know them all. I don't need to repeat them.

They have repeatedly said, over and over again, a quote from Benjamin Franklin: ''It is a republic, if you can keep it.'' And every time I heard it, I said to myself: It is a republic, if they let us keep it.

I have every confidence—every confidence—in your wisdom. You will do the only thing you can do, what you must do, what the Constitution compels you to do: Reject these Articles of Impeachment for our country and for the American people.

It will show that you put the Constitution above partisanship. It will show that we can come together on both sides of the aisle and end the era of impeachment for good. You know it should end. You know it should end. It will allow you all to spend all of your energy and all of your enormous talent and all of your resources on doing what the American people sent you here to do: to work together, to work with the President, to solve their problems.

So this should end now, as quickly as possible. Thank you again for your attention. I look forward to answering your questions.

With that, that ends our presentation. Thank you very much.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. The majority leader is recognized.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. Chief Justice, I have reached an agreement with the Democratic leader on how to proceed during the question period. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the question period for Senators start when the Senate reconvenes on Wednesday; further, that the questions alternate between the majority and minority sides for up to 8 hours during that session of the Senate; and finally, that on Thursday, the Senate resume time for Senators' questions, alternating between sides for up to 8 hours during that session of the Senate.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. Chief Justice, we will complete the question period over the next 2 days. I remind Senators that their questions must be in writing and will be submitted to the Chief Justice. During the question period of the Clinton trial, Senators were thoughtful and brief with their questions, and the managers and counsel were succinct in their answers. I hope we can follow both of these examples during this time.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. During the impeachment trial of President Clinton, Chief Justice Rehnquist advised ''counsel on both sides that the Chair will operate on a rebuttable presumption that each question can be fully and fairly answered in 5 minutes or less.'' The transcript indicates that the statement was met with ''laughter.''

Nonetheless, managers and counsel generally limited their responses accordingly. I think the late Chief's time limit was a good one and would ask both sides to abide by it.

MORNING BUSINESS

NATIONAL SLAVERY AND HUMAN TRAFFICKING PREVENTION MONTH

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, today, I join my colleagues on an important resolution condemning human trafficking both at home and around the world.

Congress made human trafficking a federal crime 20 years ago with passage of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act. Since then, I have worked with my colleagues on several pieces of legislation to strengthen existing protections and continue putting victims first.

President Trump has also made addressing human trafficking one of his top priorities. He signed my bill, the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2017 into law, as well as other measures that I cosponsored, such as the Stop Enabling Sex Traffickers Act, the Abolish Human Trafficking Act and the Frederick Douglass Trafficking Victims Prevention and Reauthorization Act. He also proclaimed January as National Slavery and Human Trafficking Prevention Month.

IOWA CAUCUSES

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, this coming Monday, the first in the Nation Iowa caucuses kick off the Presidential nomination process. The Presidential preference part of the caucus is just one part, however. In truth, the Iowa caucuses are an example of grassroots democracy. Iowa voters for each political party gather in each of the 1681 precincts across my State. At these neighborhood meetings, voters discuss issues of local and national importance and elect party officers and convention delegates. The platform planks approved and the officers and delegates elected often have a longer lasting impact on the political parties than the Presidential preference votes.

Mr. President, in a week, all political focus will be set on my home State of Iowa for the first in the Nation precinct caucuses. Many pundits ask why Iowa should be awarded this much impact in the Presidential nomination process? Iowans take this job seriously. They study the candidates' backgrounds and positions on issues and they thoughtfully listen to the debates. In Iowa, Presidential candidates must explain and discuss their positions and answer tough questions directly to citizens instead of relying on advertising. Candidates who have done this successfully will be rewarded with momentum and excitement that could launch the rest of their candidacy.

SUPPORT FOR AMERICAN VICTIMS OF TERRORISM

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, this past December, H.R. 1865, the Further Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2020, was enacted into law as Public Law 116–94. I want to take a moment to offer some clarity regarding section 903 of division J of the Act, which is a modified version of the Promoting Security and Justice for Victims of Terrorism Act of 2019.

I commend the Republican and Democratic Senators who have dedicated their time to pursuing justice for American victims of terrorism. We all want these victims to have their day in court and to be appropriately compensated. It is also important that we do so in a manner that does not do more harm than good. That is the balance that was sought in section 903 on a bipartisan basis.

One component of section 903 is a provision that enables the Palestinian Authority and the Palestinian Liberation Organization, PA and PLO, to conduct certain activities in the United States ''exclusively for the purpose of conducting official business'' and activities ''ancillary'' to those listed in the provision without consenting to personal jurisdiction in civil cases. The provision was included because Senators of both parties understand that it is in our national interest to permit certain activities related to the official representation of the PA and PLO. Having been part of the negotiation that resulted in this language, I believe it is important that we have a clear understanding of the types of activities that are considered ''ancillary'' to the conduct of official business.

While the official business of any foreign mission necessarily includes meetings with Members of Congress and their staff, representatives of the executive branch, and other public officials, ancillary activities are those which may not be essential for the minimal functioning of the mission but which support the mission's primary operations. By way of example, I am confident that every Member of this body would, as I do, consider a public statement, the issuance of a press release, or a meeting or public appearance—while not essential—to be ancillary to his or her primary functions as a U.S. Senator and would reject any attempt to define such activities otherwise.

That is also why, with regard to the PA and PLO, while we may or may not agree with the statements of its representatives, the law contemplates that its representatives may meet with advocates regarding relevant issues, make public statements, and otherwise engage in public advocacy and civil society activities that are ancillary to the conduct of official business without consenting to personal jurisdiction. Such jurisdiction is provided for elsewhere in section 903.

The message in this bill is clear: Congress is committed to pursuing justice for American victims of terrorism while ensuring appropriate standards regarding the ability of foreign missions to conduct official business in the United States. This is a solution that protects U.S. national interests, and I thank the Senators on both sides of the aisle who have worked together to find a way forward on this measure.

THE PHILIPPINES

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President I want to take a few moments to discuss an issue that has garnered some attention in recent months, which is our relations with the Government of the Philippines, including President Duterte's counter-drug strategy and his government's treatment of those who have openly criticized that strategy.

It is important to first recount the long history of friendship and strategic cooperation between the United States and the Philippines. Family and cultural ties that extend back many generations bind us together, as do our shared goals in East Asia and the Pacific. Our Armed Forces regularly engage in joint exercises to enhance regional security. Despite our differences, relations between our two countries are strong and based on mutual respect.

We should also extend our deepest sympathies to those harmed by the recent eruption of the Taal volcano in Luzon. It has displaced tens of thousands of families and destroyed the livelihoods of many. The U.S. Agency for International Development and international organizations that receive U.S. funding like the World Food Programme are responding with humanitarian aid to those in need, which I and others in Congress strongly support.

One of the manifestations of our longstanding, close relations with the Philippines is the assistance we provide annually to promote a wide range of interests there, from humanitarian and economic assistance to military assistance, which in fiscal year 2019 totaled more than $150 million. However, as is the case for other recipients of U.S. assistance, those funds are not an entitlement and they are not a blank check. For example, in the Philippines they may not be used to support police counter-drug operations. We condemn the thousands of extrajudicial executions of suspected drug users and drug-traffickers by police and their collaborators. Such a strategy is not consistent with due process and the rule of law, nor an effective way to combat the trafficking and abuse of illegal drugs that every country, including the United States, is struggling with. We do support treatment programs for Filipinos suffering from drug addiction.

We also stand strongly in support of freedom of expression, whether in the Philippines or anywhere else, including in our own country, and that, as well as President Duterte's counter-drug strategy, is what underlies our current

disagreement with his government that is illustrated, most recently, by the passage without opposition of S. Res. 142, which condemns the imprisonment of Senator Leila De Lima and calls for her immediate release. It also calls on the Government of the Philippines to guarantee freedom of the press and to drop charges against Maria Ressa and the online news network Rappler.

As said by Senator DURBIN who, like I, cosponsored that resolution, ''[i]n the end, [De Lima's] freedom and the end of government harassment against journalists like Maria Ressa will be important tests of whether cherished democratic norms we share with our long-standing Filipino allies will be respected by President Duterte.''

The response of the Duterte government was regrettable, albeit not uncharacteristic. Like Senator DURBIN, I have become accustomed to being on the receiving end of baseless personal attacks by President Duterte's spokesman, as if those attacks might intimidate us or boost domestic support for his government. Rather than respond substantively to legitimate concerns about extrajudicial killings, impunity, and freedom of expression that I, Senator DURBIN, Senator MARKEY, our Democratic and Republican colleagues, the U.S. State Department, the United Nations, and respected human rights organizations have raised over the years, we are told that S. Res. 142 is based on ''bogus narratives . . . promoted by Duterte's usual antagonists.'' We are accused of being ''prejudiced'' and ''misguided,'' our support for Senator De Lima ''a direct and shameless affront to the Republic of the Philippines, which has long ceased to be a colony of the United States.'' Our actions are called ''brazen and intrusive to the dignity of an independent, democratic and sovereign state'' which would ''not be bullied by any foreign country or by its officials, especially by misinformed and gullible politicians who grandstand at our expense.'' Going a step further, the Duterte government inexplicably threatened to deny visas to Americans who seek to visit the Philippines and who have nothing to do with these concerns.

Such vitriolic hyperbole is barely deserving of a response, but suffice it to say that none of us remotely regards the Philippines as a colony of the United States, nor are our concerns about the treatment of Senator De Lima and Maria Ressa an intrusion of the Philippines' sovereignty, which we respect. S. Res. 142 is based on consistent reporting by the Trump administration's State Department, the United Nations, and other credible observers, including in the Philippines, who share the conviction that defending freedom of expression has nothing to do with sovereignty. To the contrary, it is everyone's responsibility, wherever it is denied. If there is any ''intrusion of dignity'' or ''shameless affront'' in this instance, it is the harassment, threats, false charges, and imprisonment of those who have dared to criticize the Duterte government's lawless counter-drug strategy.

None of us here, nor in the Philippines, has an interest in prolonging this dispute. To the contrary, we want to enhance our cooperation in a multitude of areas of common interest—from maritime security to human trafficking to climate change. What 100 U.S. Senators—Republicans and Democrats—have urged is succinctly spelled out in the resolution. Rather than deny visas to Americans, many of whom have family in the Philippines, and rather than resort to ad hominem attacks, there is, as Senator DURBIN has said, ''an easy and honorable way forward.'' As I have said for months, we are not aware of any credible evidence that Senator De Lima, who has been detained for nearly 3 years, is guilty of the crimes she has been accused of. If such evidence exists, it should be promptly produced in a public trial, and she should be provided the opportunity to refute it. Otherwise she should be released. As a former prosecutor, I know that is the minimum to which anyone accused of a crime is entitled.

And respected, courageous investigative journalists like Maria Ressa should be able to publish without fear of retaliation. There is no surer way to destroy the underpinnings of democracy than by using threats and unlawful arrest to silence the press.

IMPRISONMENT OF LOUJAIN AL-HATHLOUL

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I have spoken repeatedly about the unlawful imprisonment and abuse of human rights activists by the Saudi Government, which continue despite promises of reform by Crown Prince Mohammed bin Salman. In fact, the murder of Jamal Khashoggi, the botched coverup and sham investigation, and the ongoing, systematic repression of Saudi activists have only served to confirm what we already knew, which is that the Crown Prince is no reformer but, instead, a ruthless autocrat intimidated by non-violent dissent from his own people.

One such activist being unlawfully detained by the Saudi royal family—which for all intents and purposes is the government—is Loujain al-Hathloul, a prominent and outspoken women's rights defender known for her activism against the women's driving ban and the male guardianship system. In 2014, Ms. al-Hathloul, who had a driver's license from the United Arab Emirates, UAE, was detained for 73 days after attempting to drive into Saudi Arabia from the UAE.

She was arrested again in May 2018 along with several other women's rights activists, weeks before the Saudi Government lifted the ban on female drivers. She was detained and forcibly deported via private Saudi jet from the UAE and remains in a Saudi prison today. According to Ms. al-Hathloul's family and several human rights organizations, she has been tortured, sexually harassed, and threatened with rape and murder by Saudi officials.

For the first 10 months of her detention, Ms. al-Hathloul was held without charges or trial and for the first 3 months, without access to her family or lawyer. In her first trial session on March 13, 2019, she was charged with promoting women's rights; calling for an end to the male guardianship system; and contacting international organizations, foreign media, and other activists. It is hard to believe that in the year 2020, advocacy that has been protected under international law for nearly half a century is grounds for imprisonment and prosecution in Saudi Arabia, a country whose leaders enjoy the best of what oil revenues can buy while subjecting their critics to treatment reminiscent of the 1800s.

Imprisoned, tortured, and charged with multiple ''crimes,'' Ms. al-Hathloul's last court appearance was on April 3, 2019, more than 250 days ago. She remains in prison without any information regarding when her next court session will take place. The right of due process simply does not exist in Saudi Arabia.

This is typical of how Saudi Arabia treats those who dare to exercise their rights to free expression, association, and assembly. We should all be outraged, and in fact Republicans and Democrats in Congress as well as dozens of foreign governments have called for Ms. al-Hathloul's release and the release of others facing politically motivated charges in Saudi Arabia. Until there are consequences for these violations of human rights and misuse of the judicial process, nothing will change.

Fortunately, our hands are not tied. The United States can do more than simply call for Ms. al-Hathloul's release. Section 7031(c) of division G of the Further Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2020, which applies to all foreign countries, states that ''[o]fficials of foreign governments and their immediate family members about whom the Secretary of State has credible information have been involved, directly or indirectly, in . . . a gross violation of human rights shall be ineligible for entry into the United States.''

Secretary of State Pompeo unquestionably has such information. Ms. al-Hathloul's prolonged, arbitrary detention and abuse in custody are gross violations of human rights. Secretary Pompeo should apply section 7031(c) and immediately impose visa restrictions on all Saudi Government officials involved, directly or indirectly, in her detention and abuse. That is our law.

It is as ironic as it is unconscionable that the Crown Prince has been praised for ending the ban on a woman's ability to drive a car in Saudi Arabia, at the same time that his government is unjustly and cruelly imprisoning a courageous woman for advocating for that

very right. The Trump administration should apply the law as required in this case.

U.S. SENATE SELECT COMMITTEE ON ETHICS ANNUAL REPORT

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, for myself as chairman of the Select Committee on Ethics and for Senator CHRISTOPHER A. COONS, vice chairman of the committee, that the Annual Report for the Select Committee on Ethics for calendar year 2019 be printed in the RECORD. The Committee issues this report today, January 28, 2020, as required by the Honest Leadership and Open Government Act of 2007.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON ETHICS

116TH CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

JANUARY 28, 2020

The Honest Leadership and Open Government Act of 2007 (the Act) calls for the Select Committee on Ethics of the United States Senate to issue an annual report no later than January 31st of each year providing information in certain categories describing its activities for the preceding year. Reported below is the information describing the Committee's activities in 2019 in the categories set forth in the Act:

(1) The number of alleged violations of Senate rules received from any source, including the number raised by a Senator or staff of the Committee: 251. (In addition, 16 alleged violations from previous years were carried into 2019.)

(2) The number of alleged violations that were dismissed—

(A) For lack of subject matter jurisdiction or in which, even if the allegations in the complaint are true, no violation of Senate rules would exist: 135. (This figure includes 4 matters from the previous year carried into 2019.)

(B) Because they failed to provide sufficient facts as to any material violation of the Senate rules beyond mere allegation or assertion: 118. (This figure includes 5 matters from previous years carried into 2019.)

(3) The number of alleged violations for which the Committee staff conducted a preliminary inquiry: 16. (This figure includes 8 matters from previous years carried into 2019.)

(4) The number of alleged violations for which the Committee staff conducted a preliminary inquiry that resulted in an adjudicatory review: 0.

(5) The number of alleged violations for which the Committee staff conducted a preliminary inquiry and the Committee dismissed the matter for lack of substantial merit or because it was inadvertent, technical or otherwise of a de minimis nature: 11.

(6) The number of alleged violations for which the Committee staff conducted a preliminary inquiry and the Committee issued private or public letters of admonition: 0.

(7) The number of matters resulting in a disciplinary sanction: 0.

(8) Any other information deemed by the Committee to be appropriate to describe its activities in the previous year:

In 2019, the Committee staff conducted 36 Member and committee office campaign briefings (includes 6 remedial training sessions); 21 employee code of conduct training sessions; 11 public financial disclosure clinics, seminars, and webinars; 19 ethics seminars and customized briefings for Member DC offices, state offices, and Senate committees; 4 private sector ethics briefings; and 3 international briefings.

In 2019, the Committee staff handled approximately 10,998 inquiries (via telephone and email) for ethics advice and guidance.

In 2019, the Committee wrote approximately 784 ethics advisory letters and responses including, but not limited to, 581 travel and gifts matters (Senate Rule 35) and 133 conflict of interest matters (Senate Rule 37).

In 2019, the Committee received 3,586 public financial disclosure and periodic disclosure of financial transactions reports.

TRIAL OF PRESIDENT DONALD J. TRUMP

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. President, the impeachment trial of President Trump has devolved into a parade of last-minute red herrings meant to distract this body from the issue at hand. The near-hysteria over books, boredom, and beef jerky has provided a convenient vehicle for the House managers, who are trying their best to peddle outrage as evidence.

We learned nothing new from the House managers' presentations, but outside the Senate Chamber, they have been doing their best to convince us that we are one ''bombshell'' away from, at last, having all the elements needed for a speedy conviction. These efforts to keep unfounded allegations in the limelight have not gone unnoticed by those who should be commanding our attention: the American people.

Outside the beltway, Americans have grown weary of trials and talking points. They have heard enough, and they have had enough.

Taking that feedback into consideration, I thought it might be helpful to offer an update on what we could be focusing on instead of this farcical partisan grudge match.

Behind the scenes, we are limping along as best we can, but our focus is necessarily distracted from regular business. Before our time was monopolized by impeachment, the Senate was making wonderful progress on filling the Federal bench with well-qualified, constitutionalist judges.

When we weren't interviewing those nominees, members of the Judiciary Committee spent time hearing testimony on privacy, competition, and the crisis on our southern border.

Before impeachment, Senators serving on the Veterans' Affairs Committee were hard at work considering a comprehensive mental health bill that would strengthen veteran mental health and suicide prevention programs. My own IMPROVE Act is part of this effort. We were also working on the IT Reform Act, which would improve information technology projects at the VA, and the Network of Support Act, which would help VA officials guide veterans through the emotional upheaval of transitioning between Active Duty and civilian life. We were doing all of this in addition to our continued oversight of the VA MISSION Act, and check-ins on struggling clinics such as the one in Murfreesboro, TN, which just reduced bed space for veterans struggling with opiate addiction and thoughts of suicide.

This Thursday, we have an Armed Services Committee hearing on the U.S.' role in AFRICOM. When I visited with our troops in Djibouti and Somalia at the end of last year, I saw firsthand the importance of our advisory support on the African continent. Drawing down resources or personnel in AFRICOM would harm our position as we compete with Russia and China—but we won't have much time to discuss this potentially disastrous change. Every day, work grinds to a halt at 1:00 p.m., so that we can sit in our seats in the Senate Chamber and focus on the impeachment trial.

We could be paying attention to the full-blown health crisis plaguing our rural communities. Since 2010, 118 rural hospitals have shut their doors. Fourteen of those facilities were in my home State of Tennessee. Between these hospital closures, and high drug prices, there is enough work to be done in the health care sector alone to keep us busy through Christmas.

Mister President, if Tennessee is a good test group for the rest of the Nation—and it usually is—I can tell you that when asked to choose between discussing impeachment politics and real world problems, the American people are much more worried about trade, transportation, and manufacturing, and how evolving policy initiatives will affect prices at the grocery store.

I would encourage my colleagues to remember the cost of indulging these proceedings and to listen to their constituents back home and not the breathless coverage that dominates the 24 hour news cycle.

H. CON. RES. 83

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, H. Con. Res. 83 directs the President to terminate the use of U.S. Armed Forces to engage in hostilities against Iran, unless Congress has authorized the use of military force against Iran or such use is necessary to defend against an imminent armed attack. H. Con. Res. 83 was agreed to in the House of Representatives on January 9, 2020 and received in the Senate and referred to the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations on January 13, 2020.

The War Powers Resolution, PL 93–148, has special procedures underscoring the privileged nature of a concurrent resolution like H. Con. Res. 83. Section 1546(c) of the War Powers Resolution requires that once a privileged concurrent resolution such as H. Con. Res. 83 has been passed by the House, it must be referred to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and ''shall be reported out by such committee together with its recommendations within fifteen calendar days.'' Fifteen calendar

days from January 13 is today, January 28, 2020. Under the law, the concurrent resolution may be reported out with a favorable or unfavorable recommendation, or no recommendation at all, but it must be reported out.

Unfortunately, it appears that the Senate Foreign Relations Committee majority leadership has decided to allow the 15 calendar days to lapse without taking action on H. Con. Res. 83. This failure to act leaves a statutory obligation unfulfilled.

I understand that the chairman is basing this inaction primarily on the contention that a concurrent resolution under 50 U.S.C. 1544(c) may be privileged only if it uses the word ''remove'' or the phrase ''removal of United States Armed Forces engaged in hostilities,'' rather than ''terminate'' or ''terminate the use of United States Armed Forces to engage in hostilities'' as used in H. Con. Res. 83. The argument appears to be that the use of ''removed'' in 1544(c) of the War Powers Resolution eliminates the possibility of privilege if any other terminology is used, regardless of functional equivalency. This argument suggests that ''removal'' is a term of art required for privilege.

The approach is unjustifiably restrictive. Treating ''removal'' as a term of art required for privilege is inconsistent with the overarching purpose of the War Powers Resolution and without support in either the statutory framework or legislative history. It also undermines Senate and congressional prerogatives.

The purpose of the War Powers Resolution was for Congress to reconfirm and reassert its constitutional powers over ''undeclared'' wars. The availability of a privileged and binding resolution to force a President to stop using U.S. Armed Forces in hostilities is central to that purpose. Limiting such privilege to a single phrase or word is inconsistent with this reassertion of congressional powers and is neither a feature of the statute nor its legislative history.

The statutory framework of the War Powers Resolution does not support the assertion that ''removal'' or ''removal from hostilities'' are terms of art that are required for and exclusive to the availability of privilege. To the contrary, those terms are not defined in law; nor is there any reference in the statute to a military or other usage of those phrases to suggest that they are terms of art.

The absence of statutorily mandated language for privilege in the War Powers Resolution directly contrasts with many other statutes in which Congress expressly requires specific language for privilege to attach. For example, in contrast to the War Powers Resolution, section 130(f) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, PL 83–703, section 101 of the Arms Export Control Act, PL 90–629, and section 216(c) of the Countering America's Adversaries Through Sanctions Act, PL 115–44 all require specific text for privileged resolutions and provide that text in quotations in the statute. Clearly, as evidenced by laws enacted before and after the War Powers Resolution, Congress knows how to require the use of unique, statutorily mandated language for privilege to apply. The fact that it did not do so in the War Powers Resolution demonstrates that there was no intent to limit privilege to use of a single word or phrase.

Further, the legislative record of the War Powers Resolution does not support the assertion that there is an exclusive connection between the use of ''removal'' and the availability of privilege. To the contrary, the record indicates that ''remove'' and ''terminate'' were used synonymously. The record is replete with the interchangeable usage of synonymous terms consistent with a cessation of the use of U.S. forces in hostilities. For example, House Report 93–287 uses no less than seven terms in this regard, including ''conclude,'' ''disengage,'' ''remove,'' ''terminate,'' ''abandon such action,'' and ''stop.'' In fact, the conferees even used ''terminate'' to describe the privileged resolution envisioned in 1544(c), clearly demonstrating that these terms were considered to be functionally equivalent for purposes of War Powers. ''The House joint resolution provided that use of United States Armed Forces by the President without a declaration of war or specific statutory authorization could be terminated by Congress through the use of a concurrent resolution. The Senate amendment provided for such termination by a bill or joint resolution.'' H. Rept. 93–547, Conference Report to H.J. Res. 542. This legislative history, in tandem with a statutory construct that does not require a term of art, demonstrates that the insistence on such a term for privilege is misguided.

Finally, strictly limiting privilege to a resolution that uses ''remove'' is inconsistent with Senate and congressional perogatives. The purpose of the War Powers Resolution—reasserting the power of Congress over undeclared wars—can be vindicated only if the executive branch and its supporters in the Senate cannot use committee or floor procedure to bottle up a resolution consistent with both the purpose and construct of the War Powers Resolution. Reading into the statute a requirement for specific terminology where no such requirement exists unjustifiably restricts Senate action and limits the reassertion of congressional authority over War Powers.

For the reasons stated above, I urge the chairman to immediately take the necessary steps to ensure full compliance with the law.

REMEMBERING RETIRED ARMY COLONEL (DR.) ROBERT J.T. JOY

Mr. REED. Mr. President, today I pay tribute to a pioneer in the field of military medicine, retired Army COL Dr. Robert J.T. Joy. Colonel Joy was founding professor of military medicine and commandant of the School of Medicine at the Uniformed Services University, USU. Most recently, he served as professor emeritus of USU's Section of Military Medical History. He passed away last year at the age of 90.

Born in Rhode Island and raised between Narragansett, RI, and St. Petersburg, FL, he studied pre-med and pre-law at the University of Rhode Island, before attending Yale University Medical School on a Reserve medical officers training scholarship.

From there, his service to his country began. After assignments stateside, Dr. Joy volunteered to lead the Walter Reed Army Institute of Research, WRAIR, team to Vietnam, where he received his first—of four—Legion of Merit medals and his team received a Meritorious Unit Citation for their field research. After becoming Deputy Director and then Director of WRAIR, many thought he had found his dream job.

However, after a meeting with Dr. Jay Sanford, the first dean of USU, in 1976, Colonel Joy received a transfer to take the position of professor of military medicine and commandant of the School of Medicine at the newly created USU. While there, he was instrumental in the creation of the field of military medical history, and his teachings, lectures, and leadership were integral to the development of today's ''joint'' concept of military medicine.

Dr. Joy retired from Active Duty in 1981 and was awarded the Distinguished Service Medal for his Army career. He continued to teach as a civilian professor until 2005, and his legacy lives on through his students—the physicians and surgical teams that continue to provide world-class care for our wounded, ill, and injured service members.

I would like to close with a quote about Dr. Joy from retired Army BG Robert Doughty, professor and chair of history at the United States Military Academy at West Point: ''His contribution has influenced, and will continue to influence, students, historians, and soldiers for decades to come.''

I salute Dr. Joy and extend my condolences to his family.

TRIBUTE TO CARY JONES

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I want to take a few minutes today to honor Cary Jones, an Oregonian retiring after a long career in the Coast Guard and the Department of Veterans Affairs. The bottom line is Mr. Jones has embraced and embodied the essence of public service throughout his distinguished career.

He joined the Coast Guard in 1976 and was stationed in Honolulu, Seattle, and Coos Bay. He served for several years aboard the USCGC *Boutwell*, a high-endurance cutter used to intercept smuggling vessels.

Mr. Jones left the Coast Guard in 2001 as a senior chief yeoman, and he could have sailed off into an easy retirement. Instead, he went to work for the VA, where he would spend nearly two decades helping Oregon veterans. He served in a number of roles at the Portland VA Medical Center, but in every capacity he sought to do right by veterans. He worked with my Portland staff for years, and if you ever want to get one of them going, just ask how helpful Cary Jones was. They will tell you he worked on more than 10,000 congressional inquiries, each of which represented an attempt to help an Oregon veteran or military family.

Cary Jones is a shining example of what public service is supposed to be all about. He has always been one of the good guys, in it for the right reasons, and always laser-focused on lifting up people who need a little bit of help.

Mr. Jones' career reminds me of a quote by the famous naturalist John Burroughs: ''For anything worth having one must pay the price; and the price is always work, patience, love, self-sacrifice—no paper currency, no promises to pay, but the gold of real service.''

And so today I say thank you to Senior Chief Yeoman Cary Jones for his work, patience, love and self-sacrifice.

I say thank you for leading by example, for showing countless Oregonians that public service is a noble calling, and for paying the gold of real service.

I wish you the best as you embark on your well-deserved retirement.

TRIBUTE TO CARL ADRIAN

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize the career and service of Carl Adrian, who is retiring this month after more than 16 years as the president of the Tri-Cities Economic Development Council in my home State of Washington.

Carl has devoted his career to making the Tri-Cities an economic powerhouse, and throughout his time as the longest serving president of TRIDEC, Carl Adrian accomplished so many important things for the region. Thanks in part to his work, the Tri-Cities of today is very different from the Tri-Cities of 16 years ago.

Under Carl's leadership, more than 1,300 businesses set up shop in the Tri-Cities and more than 35,000 new jobs were created. These business leaders weren't drawn to the Tri-Cities just because of the weather or the excellent Washington wine; they came because Carl helped create new opportunities and supported significant investments for employers in the region.

I have been so pleased to partner with Carl and TRIDEC on so many endeavors over the years. When it comes to Hanford, Carl saw the site as history that should be celebrated and remembered. We worked together to establish the Manhattan Project Historical Park in Richland, which honors the more than 51,000 Hanford workers who helped drive our country's nuclear program and remembers those whose lands were taken when the facilities were built. The site is helping to educate new generations and bringing new visitors to the Tri-Cities. More than 10,000 people visit every year from all 50 States and more than 80 countries.

Carl also knows how important it is that we get Hanford cleaned up. He has been a stalwart advocate for the funding we need to clean up the site. And I share his strong belief that the Federal Government has a moral obligation to the Tri-Cities and our State to make sure the Hanford cleanup and its workers receive Federal funding they need.

Throughout his time at TRIDEC, Carl has worked on so many other projects of importance to the Tri-Cities. He has been one of the Pacific Northwest National Laboratory's strongest supporters, working tirelessly to make sure Congress and the Department of Energy recognize the importance of the lab to our region and country. As a result of his advocacy, the lab has experienced significant growth, particularly in energy innovation including grid security, battery storage and clean energy technologies.

I was also proud to work with Carl and TRIDEC to expand the Tri-City Regional Airport. His leadership enabled the airport to bring non-stop daily flights from San Francisco, Minneapolis, and Chicago to the region, along with many other destinations. These flights have helped grow the attractiveness of southeastern Washington and allowed many more people to see what the Tri-Cities have to offer.

For more than 16 years, Carl Adrian's leadership of the Tri-Cities Economic Development Council has made an impact throughout Southeastern Washington and our entire State. We are all grateful for his hard work and many contributions.

Congratulations on your retirement, Carl. I wish you and Rheta great success as you transition to the next chapter of your life.

TRIBUTE TO COLONEL ROBERT DESOUSA

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. President, today I rise to honor the service of COL Robert DeSousa upon his retirement from the Army on February 29, 2020. For over 26 years, Colonel DeSousa has served with distinction and dedication in the U.S. Army Reserve and the Pennsylvania National Guard. Many Pennsylvanians may know Colonel DeSousa in his civilian capacity as the widely respected State director for my offices in the Commonwealth.

A native of New Jersey but an adopted son of Pennsylvania, Colonel DeSousa holds a bachelor's degree from Bucknell University, a law degree from the Dickinson School of Law, and a master's degree from the U.S. Army War College. He began his military career as a judge advocate with the U.S. Army Reserve in 1993 and quickly established himself as an outstanding defense lawyer and soldier. Following the September 11 terror attacks, Colonel DeSousa aided in the mobilization of our troops and then deployed to Iraq in 2007. While deployed, he simultaneously held three distinct positions for the Pennsylvania National Guard, the U.S. Air Force, and the U.S. Army Reserve.

In 2008, Colonel DeSousa returned to serve in the 28th Infantry Division Headquarters of the Pennsylvania National Guard. The following year, he was tasked as the first ever regional defense counsel in what would become the Army's first fully integrated trial defense service for Reserve, Active Duty, and National Guard soldiers. As a result of Colonel DeSousa's leadership in this role, thousands of Army soldiers in nine different States gained greater access to legal defense services. He was subsequently appointed as the State judge advocate for the Pennsylvania National Guard's Joint Force Headquarters in 2013. In this position, from which he will retire this February, Colonel DeSousa advised the Pennsylvania National Guard's adjutant general and his command staff on legal and ethical matters while supervising nearly 50 judge advocates.

Colonel DeSousa has built an exemplary career on service and leadership. His selflessness and competency, undoubtedly aided by his positive can-do attitude and infectious smile, have earned him numerous honors in the U.S. Army Reserve and Pennsylvania National Guard. These honors include a Bronze Star Medal, Meritorious Service Medal, Army Commendation Medal, and over a dozen other commendations. His dedication to public service is evinced by his civilian career, too, having previously been a Federal law clerk, an assistant U.S. attorney, the chief counsel for Pennsylvania's Department of State, and the inspector general for the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

Thankfully, Colonel DeSousa's retirement is not the end of his service to Pennsylvanians. He will continue in his current role as State director for my Senate office, where he oversees the daily operations of my seven State-based offices. In this role, Colonel DeSousa is famous for his bits of wisdom he passes down. In particular, he reminds his colleagues often that ''an email sent or a phone call made does not mean mission accomplished.'' Colonel DeSousa meets this mission every day, as he can generally be found out on the road, crisscrossing our great Commonwealth to meet with constituents.

Colonel DeSousa, who is known to appreciate a good cigar, the occasional whiskey, and, unrelatedly, sporting dapper bow-ties, is a true friend to Pennsylvanians anywhere. I offer Colonel DeSousa my heartfelt congratulations on his military retirement and

am grateful for his counsel, his continued service to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and his friendship.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

150TH ANNIVERSARY OF MISSOURI UNIVERSITY OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

● Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, today I stand to recognize the 150th anniversary of Missouri University of Science and Technology. Part of the University of Missouri System, Missouri S&T was founded in 1870 in Rolla, MO, as one of the first technological institutions west of the Mississippi and continues to be one of the top technological research institutions in the nation.

Originally established as the University of Missouri School of Mines and Metallurgy, Missouri S&T has grown from its original mining focus to offer 99 degree programs, while maintaining its leadership in engineering and the sciences. In fact, Missouri S&T is consistently ranked as one of the top engineering schools in the nation.

Missouri S&T was chartered on February 24, 1870, and classes were first called to order on November 6, 1871. Since that time, more than 60,000 men and women have gone on to carry their status as ''miners'' into successful endeavors all over the world. Missouri S&T alumni consistently achieve some of the highest average starting salaries in the Midwest, and the university is ranked sixth in the Nation for annual return on investment.

The campus boasts a Center for Infrastructure Engineering Systems, a Materials Research Center, a Center for Biomedical Research, and several other centers generating world-class discoveries. Faculty, staff, and students produce research on everything from bioactive glass and bioactive ceramic scaffolds for regenerating bone to advancing treatments for traumatic brain injury. Partnerships with hospitals, the U.S. Army, and local businesses that are industry leaders have strengthened and grown already successful programs and put Missouri S&T at the forefront of solving difficult problems.

The commitment of Missouri University of Science and Technology to educate young men and women and push for solutions to some of our most difficult problems is to be commended. I extend my sincere thanks for everything the faculty, staff, and administrators have accomplished over the last 150 years. Congratulations to Chancellor Mohammad Dehghani and all Missouri S&T faculty, staff, students, and alumni on this important occasion.●

RECOGNIZING THE BONNEVILLE HOTEL

● Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, along with my colleagues Senator JAMES E. RISCH and Representative MIKE SIMPSON, I congratulate the city of Idaho Falls and Bonneville County on the preservation of the historic Hotel Bonneville.

The Bonneville County Heritage Association provided historical background about the area and the original naming and purpose of the hotel that has stood in Idaho Falls for nearly a century. The association notes this remarkable structure was named for Captain Bonneville, who led an expedition from 1832 to 1834 through the vast country between the Missouri and Columbia Rivers. Idaho later became part of the United States through the Oregon Treaty in 1846. Then, on March 4, 1863, President Abraham Lincoln signed a bill establishing the Idaho Territory, and Idaho became the 43rd State on July 3, 1890. Further, the Bonneville County Heritage Association explained that on February 7, 1911, Governor James Henry Hawley put an end to a fight for county division by signing a bill designating Bonneville County and naming Idaho Falls the county seat.

The Bonneville County Heritage Association found a May 1927 Times Register article providing an account of the historical significance of the Hotel Bonneville in Idaho Falls at the time of its construction that states the hotel ''is the result of the desire on the part of a number of the people of Idaho Falls, and community, to have the use of a strictly first class hotel, with adequate accommodations and quality of service which would enable Idaho Falls, as a community, to invite public gatherings and conventions and to be prepared to take care of them in a way and manner, which would reflect on the community.'' The name Hotel Bonneville was selected for the original hotel to honor the founder of this part of the country, and the hotel opened its doors for business on June 1, 1927.

The Bonneville Hotel has recently undergone extensive renovations transforming it into an affordable housing complex that includes retail space. We commend the visionaries and partners who came together to provide a new life for this local landmark. A plaque at the building notes the original Hotel Bonneville was built by 481 citizens. Through the leadership of Idaho Falls Mayor Rebecca Casper, the Idaho Falls City Council, the Idaho Falls Redevelopment Agency, and the hard work and vison of many Idahoans, the renewal of this landmark honors the founders of the county and those who worked to build and renovate the hotel and preserves this historic building for generations to come. Congratulations on this local transformation.●

TRIBUTE TO BRANDON ROBERTS AND STACIA FUZESY

● Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, this week I have the honor of recognizing Brandon Roberts and Stacia Fuzesy of Chouteau County for their hard work and entrepreneurial spirit.

Brandon and Stacia opened the Golden Triangle Brewing Co. in Fort Benton. Their craft beers showcase the rich history of Montana ag and the grain growers of the Golden Triangle. Working with local farmers, Brandon and Stacia are energizing the local economy and crafting beers that Montanans can call their own.

They have also worked with local historians to help create unique names for their craft beer that highlight Montana history such as Shepweizen and Bentonbier.

It is my honor to recognize Brandon and Stacia for opening up this thriving Montana small business that promotes our rich history and values. Small craft breweries like the Golden Triangle Brewing Co. are helping drive the economy across Big Sky Country. Keep on brewing.●

TRIBUTE TO ANNA, GRACE, AND JOY WILLIAMS

● Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, this week I have the honor of recognizing Anna, Grace, and Joy Williams of Daniels County, for their hard work in planning Hands Across Scobey, an event that raised money for Montana foster children.

These three Montana sisters took the initiative to give back to their community and organize an effort to help those most vulnerable in our society—foster children.

Their mother, Ruth Williams, a mother of five, including one foster child, was the motivation for the 'Hands Across Scobey' event.

It is my honor to recognize Anna, Grace, and Joy for their selflessness and willingness to serve others. Their charitable effort is exemplary of the Montana spirit.

I look forward to following the future accomplishments of these three young ladies.●

TRIBUTE TO PASTOR DOUGLAS P. JONES

● Mr. PETERS. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize Pastor Douglas P. Jones of Welcome Missionary Baptist Church of Pontiac, MI, as the congregation and the Pontiac community celebrate his 30th pastoral anniversary.

Pastor Jones moved from his native Cincinnati in 1989 to Pontiac, MI, to assume leadership of Welcome Missionary Baptist Church. Under his guidance, membership at Welcome Missionary Baptist Church grew from a few hundred to more than 4,000 worshippers. From the very beginning of his tenure at the church, Pastor Jones has worked tirelessly to implement a vision of unity and kindness, bringing worshippers together so that they may find strength in their community and, with that strength, work toward positive change throughout the Pontiac area.

His focus on ensuring that church members' needs are met can be seen in

the number and diversity of ministries established at Welcome. In support of his younger members, Pastor Jones created both the Young Men Making a Difference Ministry for preteen and teenage boys, as well as the Teen Esteem Ministry for preteen and teenage girls. Pastor Jones has endeavored to create resources for the most vulnerable members of the Welcome community such as the T.I.P.—Tots, Infants, and Preschoolers—ministry, which looks after the congregation's youngest members, the Exodus Dependency Program, which assists those contending with problems relating to substance abuse and HIV, and the Domestic Violence Ministry.

Pastor Jones has not limited his dedication to service to the members of Welcome Missionary Baptist Church but, rather, extended his unwavering faith and generosity to the broader Pontiac community. He has been fundamental in the positive growth seen throughout the city over the last 30 years. He has served on committees, boards, and partnerships in support of the community, including the Pontiac Youth Assistance, the NAACP North Oakland Medical Center, and the Woodward Dream Cruise, Inc., to name only a few. Seeing a lack of unity among those trying to create change, Pastor Jones founded the Greater Pontiac Community Coalition, a federation of over 190 Oakland County individuals, community groups, clergy, elected officials, and businesses that work together to encourage positive change on the individual, social, and institutional level through advocacy and community action. Pastor Jones has further been a driving force behind helping the students of Pontiac achieve their goals of pursuing higher education. Under his guidance the Pontiac Promise Zone Scholarship Program was created, which has given many Pontiac students the chance to obtain the financial aid necessary to pursue their dreams of higher education in the State of Michigan.

Since his arrival in 1989, Pastor Jones has been a source of strength and good will for all those in the Pontiac community. He is often called upon to act as a consensus builder among groups and people of different perspectives, preaching partnership and cooperation in order to inspire success and transformation. He has worked tirelessly in pursuit of what he thinks is best for the community and has done so while spreading a message of morality and kindness.

I have no doubt that the congregation at Welcome Missionary Baptist Church is proud to call Pastor Jones their leader and celebrate his many accomplishments over the last 30 years. I am grateful to Pastor Jones for his friendship and for his selflessness in serving the residents of Pontiac and surrounding area. I wish Pastor Jones, First Lady JoAnn, and their family continued happiness and success as they continue to work for the betterment of the community.●

TRIBUTE TO NATHANIEL JONES

● Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I rise to honor the memory of one of our country's great civil rights leaders and judges, the Honorable Nathaniel Jones, who passed away on January 26 at the age of 93.

Judge Jones was a native of Youngstown in my home State of Ohio, a veteran who served in the Air Force during World War II, and a tireless advocate for justice and equality. After his time in the military, he earned an undergraduate degree and a JD from Youngstown State University.

For much of the 1960s, Judge Jones was the assistant U.S. attorney for the Northern District of Ohio at the appointment of Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy. In 1969, he became the general counsel for the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, NAACP, where he argued numerous cases before the Supreme Court.

In 1979 he moved to the Cincinnati area upon being appointed as an appeals judge for the Sixth Circuit by President Carter, and he served admirably in that role for decades. With all of his experience, and his reputation for integrity and problem-solving, Judge Jones was an active member of the Cincinnati community and widely respected in legal circles. As an example, he was asked to deliver the inaugural Judge A. Leon Higginbotham Distinguished Memorial Lecture at Harvard Law School.

His work also included helping to end the apartheid regime in South Africa, working to promote a free and independent Namibia, participating in the U.S.-Egypt Judicial Exchange Program, and advocating for human rights within the Soviet Union. Among his many accomplishments, he received the Distinguished Service Citation from the National Conference for Community Justice and the State Department's Millennium International Volunteer Award. For all of his accomplishments, worked in the House of Representatives to write and pass legislation to rename the U.S. courthouse in Youngstown after Judge Jones—the courthouse stands only a few miles down the road from where he was raised as a child. It now bears the name of this proud son of Youngstown.

Back home in Cincinnati, Judge Jones was just as important a figure in the fight for a more equitable society, having taught law at the University of Cincinnati, among other schools. I was proud to work with him on launching the National Underground Railroad Museum, housed in my hometown of Cincinnati. It is there in large part because of the efforts of Judge Jones, who also served as a co-chair of the board of trustees for the museum. I was honored to work with him over the years to further its mission. Just last fall, the University of Cincinnati College of Law renamed its Center for Race, Gender, and Social Justice in his honor.

Judge Jones was a model public servant, working to better his community and his fellow man. I will remember him as a friend who brought people together to support racial healing, equality and to improve the community. His legacy of justice and equality before the law should inspire all of us to continue to seek positive change.

Today, my thoughts are with his family—his sister, Allie Jean, his daughters Stephanie and Pamela, his sons Rick, William, and Marc, and the many others whose lives he touched.●

REMEMBERING CARMELLA WOOD

● Ms. ROSEN. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to a great Nevadan, American, and member of the Greatest Generation, Carmella Wood, who passed away on January 26, 2020 at the age of 97 in Las Vegas, the city she called home in the Silver State since 2003.

Carmella, like many others of her generation, answered her country's call during World War II, volunteering to serve in the fight against tyranny. When the U.S. Army would not take her because of her 4-foot 11-inch height, she joined the war effort, working in a factory on the east coast building Corsair Bombers. Carmella's dedication to serving her country is reflected in the fact that even though the factory she was assigned to was 20 miles from her home, she never missed a day, sometimes having to walk in the snow the rest of the way to work when the bus she rode on could not completely reach the factory. She and the women she worked with day in and day out kept our troops in the fight, and these women would eventually come to be collectively and affectionately known as Rosie the Riveters. Rosies like Carmella produced over 297,000 airplanes, 102,000 tanks, 88,000 warships, and countless other pieces of wartime equipment which helped American and Allied troops defeat enemy forces both in the European and Pacific Theaters, winning the war and bringing an end to the terror Nazi Germany and Japan had inflicted upon countless countries.

After the war Carmella, like many other Rosies and members of the ''greatest generation'', returned to living their lives. They married, had kids of their own, and worked outside the home. However, Carmella never forgot her time as a Rosie. Over 20 years ago, she started attending national Rosie the Riveter Association reunions and other events where she was able to share her experiences and teach current generations about how these dedicated women kept America fighting in the war so their sacrifices and work are not forgotten or overlooked.

Mr. President, please join me in honoring and remembering Carmella Wood, one of our legendary Rosie the Riveters of World War II, a true Nevadan and American patriot who answered her Nation's call to service, someone who reflects the high ideals of this country. Her spirit, perseverance, and dedication are an inspiration to all Americans, and she will be truly missed.●

RECOGNIZING HULL'S SEAFOOD

• Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, as chairman of the Senate Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship, each week I honor a small business that demonstrates America's unique entrepreneurial spirit. I am pleased to recognize a business for its participation in Florida's integral economy and its involvement in the community. Today, it is my pleasure to name Hull's Seafood of Ormond Beach, FL, as the Senate Small Business of the Week.

Jimmy Hull, owner of Hull's Seafood, spent his childhood exploring and catching fresh fish at Ponce Inlet. At 20 years old, he obtained his captain's license, began running fishing charters, and selling the day's catch to local markets. Eventually, Hull's Seafood opened its doors in 1984. This restaurant and market makes a conscious effort to support sustainability by only selling fresh-caught, local seafood. They guarantee each of their customer's seafood is of the highest quality. Over the years, Jimmy and his team have continued to expand the business. Led by Jimmy's strategic vision, Hull's Seafood has evolved from a small take-out kitchen into a full-service restaurant and market. In 2018, Hull's Seafood received support from the city of Ormond Beach, which provided a building improvement grant designed to assist local small businesses. Jimmy was able to more than triple the size of the restaurant and double the number of employees, adding an additional forty workers.

Today, Hull's Seafood Market and Restaurant continues to supply customers and other local restaurants with the freshest seafood available. After operating in Ormond Beach for nearly 40 years, the restaurant has become a landmark within the community and a gathering place for local residents. Located on Ormond Beach's downtown Main Street, Hull's Seafood is active within its community, participating in many city events and supporting local artists by hosting concerts and displaying art in the restaurant dining room. Additionally, Hull's Seafood makes a point of showcasing other local businesses on their social media pages. Jimmy stays true to his passion and is a commercial fisherman who also operates the restaurant's charter boat to take passengers on fishing trips. In 2018, Jimmy was awarded the Governor's Business Ambassador Award for the restaurant's continuous effort to create local jobs. Jimmy and his team was commended for his advocacy for fisheries and helping to maintain their sustainability in Florida.

Hull's Seafood is an excellent example of a community and family oriented small business. The entire team's efforts toward sustainability and providing high quality seafood do not go unnoticed. I am proud to recognize Jimmy and everyone at Hull's Seafood for their hard work, and I look forward to seeing their future successes. Congratulations again on being named the Senate Small Business of the Week.•

TRIBUTE TO ORLY MUNZING

• Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I rise today in recognition of Orly Munzing, an extraordinary Vermonter and longtime advocate for family farms and resilient communities.

Orly founded Strolling of the Heifers in 2002 in Brattleboro, VT, to help bring awareness to the plight of small dairy farms. During Orly's tenure as executive director of Strolling of the Heifers, she transformed a small town parade into a widely renowned event celebrating sustainable agriculture and family farms. I am proud to have marched in many of these parades over the last 17 years to celebrate our farms and our communities in Vermont and around the country. Under Orly's leadership, Strolling of the Heifers has continued to expand, now including the farm-to-table culinary apprenticeship program to provide underserved community members with the vital skills necessary for obtaining good quality jobs in the food sector.

In addition to Strolling of the Heifers, Orly founded the nationally recognized Locavore Index, the first tool to measure the growth of the local food movement. She also created Windham Grows, a program to provide valuable skills and resources to farm and food entrepreneurs. Just this past year, Orly received the Innovation & Spirit Award from the Vermont Businesses for Social Responsibility as recognition of this work.

Prior to all these important accomplishments, Orly worked for 24 years as a learning specialist in the public school system and consulted with teachers on cutting-edge educational techniques. For decades, she has been a truly tireless champion who has made significant strides to create more healthy and prosperous rural communities. At a time of increased recognition of the profound impact agriculture and food have on the vibrancy of rural lands, our health, and the health of the planet, it is heartening to know that dedicated, passionate people like Orly are making a real difference in our communities.

Mr. President, I am not only enormously grateful for all of Orly's many contributions over the years, but I am also proud to call her a good friend. I wish her all the best in her retirement and know she will continue to fight for more environmentally sound and fundamentally just communities.•

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Ms. Roberts, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of January 3, 2019, as modified by the order of January 22, 2020, the Secretary of the Senate, on January 28, 2020, during the adjournment of the Senate, received a message from the House of Representatives announcing that the House had passed the following bill, without amendment:

S. 153. An act to promote veteran involvement in STEM education, computer science, and scientific research, and for other purposes.

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of January 3, 2019, as modified by the order of January 22, 2020, the Secretary of the Senate, on January 28, 2020, during the adjournment of the Senate, received a message from the House of Representatives announcing that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 943. An act to authorize the Director of the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum to support Holocaust education programs, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4704. An act to direct the Director of the National Science Foundation to support multidisciplinary research on the science of suicide, and to advance the knowledge and understanding of issues that may be associated with several aspects of suicide including intrinsic and extrinsic factors related to areas such as wellbeing, resilience, and vulnerability.

H.R. 5671. An act to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the United States Merchant Mariners of World War II, in recognition of their dedicated and vital service during World War II.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 943. An act to authorize the Director of the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum to support Holocaust education programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

H.R. 4704. An act to direct the Director of the National Science Foundation to support multidisciplinary research on the science of suicide, and to advance the knowledge and understanding of issues that may be associated with several aspects of suicide including intrinsic and extrinsic factors related to areas such as wellbeing, resilience, and vulnerability; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

H.R. 5671. An act to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the United States Merchant Mariners of World War II, in recognition of their dedicated and vital service during World War II; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

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–3801. A communication from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''User Fees for Agricultural Quarantine and Inspection Services'' ((RIN0579–AD77) (Docket No. APHIS–2013–0021)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 17, 2020; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–3802. A communication from the General Counsel of the Federal Housing Finance Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Rules of Practice and Procedure; Civil Money Penalty Inflation Adjustment'' (RIN2590–AB07) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 21, 2020; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–3803. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to operation of the Exchange Stabilization Fund (ESF) for fiscal year 2019; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–3804. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Control of Firearms, Guns, Ammunition and Related Articles the President Determines No Longer Warrant Control Under the United States Munitions List (USML)'' (RIN0694–AF47) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 17, 2020; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–3805. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on appropriations legislation within seven days of enactment; to the Committee on the Budget.

EC–3806. A communication from the Director of Congressional Affairs, Office of the General Counsel, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Adjustment of Civil Penalties for Inflation for Fiscal Year 2020'' (RIN3150–AK11) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 21, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3807. A communication from the Director of Congressional Affairs, Office of the General Counsel, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Revision of the NRC Enforcement Policy'' (NRC–2019–0242) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 21, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3808. A communication from the Director of Congressional Affairs, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulations, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Supplemental Guidance Regarding the Chromium-Coated Zirconium Alloy Fuel Cladding Accident Tolerant Fuel Concept'' (NUREG–0800) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 21, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3809. A communication from the Regulations Coordinator, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Medicare, Medicaid, and Children's Health Insurance Programs; Program Integrity Enhancements to the Provider Enrollment Process'' (RIN0938–AS84) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 17, 2020; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–3810. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a proposed license for the export of firearms, parts, and components abroad controlled under Category I of the U.S. Munitions List of 5.56mm and 7.62mm automatic rifles, sound suppressors, and major components to Estonia in the amount of $1,000,000 or more (Transmittal No. DDTC 19–101); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–3811. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a proposed license amendment for the export of defense articles, including technical data and defense services, to Italy to support the manufacture, production, test, and inspection of wing assemblies and sub-assemblies for the F–35 aircraft in the amount of $100,000,000 or more (Transmittal No. DDTC 19–062); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–3812. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Uniform Resource Locator (URL) for the Department's Agency Financial Report for fiscal year 2019; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–3813. A communication from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Reexamination of the Comparative Standards and Procedures for Licensing Noncommercial Educational Broadcast Stations and Low Power FM Stations, Report and Order'' ((MB Docket No. 19–3) (FCC 19–127)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 21, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3814. A communication from the Chairman of the Office of Proceedings, Surface Transportation Board, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Civil Monetary Penalties - 2020 Adjustment'' (Docket No. EP 716) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 21, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3815. A communication from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Sustainability Plan for the Solar Regional Test Centers''; to the Committee on Appropriations.

EC–3816. A communication from the Acting General Counsel of the National Credit Union Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Inflation Adjustment of Civil Monetary Penalties'' (RIN3133–AF09) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 23, 2020; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–3817. A communication from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Hydrogen and Fuel Cell Activities, Progress and Plans: September 2016 to August 2019''; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–3818. 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 ''Student Loan Debt Forgiveness'' (Rev. Proc. 2020–11) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 22, 2020; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–3819. 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 ''Transfers of Certain Property by U.S. Persons to Partnerships with Related Foreign Partners'' (RIN1545–BM95) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 22, 2020; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–3820. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department's Annual Report of Interdiction of Aircraft Engaged in Illicit Drug Trafficking; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–3821. A communication from the Acting Administrator, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the cost of response and recovery efforts for FEMA–3426-EM in the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico having exceeded the $5,000,000 limit for a single emergency declaration; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–3822. A communication from the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled, ''Enrollment Projections in D.C. Public Schools: Controls Needed to Ensure Funding Equity''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–3823. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Taking and Importing Marine Mammals; Taking Marine Mammals Incidental to the U.S. Navy Training and Testing Activities in the Atlantic Fleet Training and Testing Study Area'' (RIN0648–BI85) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 23, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3824. A communication from the Acting Secretary, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Adjustment of Civil Monetary Penalty Amounts'' (16 CFR Part 1.98) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 23, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3825. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone for Fireworks Display; Spa Creek, Annapolis, MD'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2019–0846)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 22, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3826. A communication from the Attorney, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Ohio River, Owensboro, KY'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2019–0820)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 22, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3827. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department

of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Morro Bay Harbor Entrance; Morro Bay, California'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2019–0963)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 22, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3828. A communication from the Attorney, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Neches River, Beaumont, TX'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2019–0614)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 22, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3829. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Straits of Mackinac, MI'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2019–0965)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 22, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3830. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zones; Waterway Training Areas, Captain of the Port Maryland - National Capital Region Zone'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2019–0765)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 22, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3831. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Special Local Regulations; Sector Upper Mississippi River Annual and Recurring Marine Events Update'' ((RIN1625–AA08) (Docket No. USCG–2018–1008)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 22, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3832. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Special Local Regulation; St. Thomas Lighted Boat Parade, St. Thomas, U.S. Virgin Island'' ((RIN1625–AA08) (Docket No. USCG–2019–0945)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 22, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3833. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Regulated Navigation Area; Thea Foss and Wheeler-Osgood Waterways EPA Superfund Cleanup Site, Commencement Bay, Tacoma, WA'' ((RIN1625–AA11) (Docket No. USCG–2018–0970)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 22, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3834. A communication from the Attorney, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Regulated Navigation Area; Monongahela, Allegheny, and Ohio Rivers, Pittsburgh, PA'' ((RIN1625–AA11) (Docket No. USCG–2019–0118)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 22, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3835. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Regulated Navigation Area; Lake Washington, Seattle, WA'' ((RIN1625–AA11) (Docket No. USCG–2019–0296)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 22, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3836. A communication from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Section 73.3555 Multiple Ownership'' ((MB Doc. No. 14–50) (47 CFR Part 73.3555)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 21, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Ms. MURKOWSKI, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources:

Report to accompany S. 2393, a bill to promote a 21st century energy workforce, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 116–208).

Report to accompany S. 2425, a bill to amend the Energy Policy and Conservation Act to establish the CHP Technical Assistance Partnership Program, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 116–209).

Report to accompany S. 2508, a bill to require the Secretary of Energy to establish a council to conduct a survey and analysis of the employment figures and demographics in the energy, energy efficiency, and motor vehicle sectors of the United States, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 116–210).

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. SANDERS (for himself, Mr. MERKLEY, and Mr. MARKEY):

S. 3227. A bill to require the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to designate per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances as hazardous substances under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself and Ms. MURKOWSKI):

S. 3228. A bill to amend section 249 of title 18, United States Code, relating to hate crimes, to clarify the motive requirement; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. CORTEZ MASTO (for herself and Ms. ROSEN):

S. 3229. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for an extension of the energy credit, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. CORTEZ MASTO (for herself and Mr. PORTMAN):

S. 3230. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for an extension of funding for technical assistance to small practices and practices in health professional shortage areas under the Merit-based Incentive Payment System (MIPS); to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SCHATZ (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. WARNER, and Mr. CARDIN):

S. 3231. A bill to increase the rates of pay under the General Schedule and other statutory pay systems and for prevailing rate employees by 3.5 percent, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. SCHATZ:

S. 3232. A bill to promote and support the local arts and creative economy in the United States; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. ENZI, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE):

S. 3233. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve access to skilled nursing facility services for hemophilia patients; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. PAUL:

S. 3234. A bill to adjust the normal and early retirement ages for receipt of benefits under the Social Security program, increase the maximum age for delayed retirement credit, and provide for progressive price indexing of benefits; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. MCSALLY (for herself and Mr. KAINE):

S. 3235. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to conduct a pilot program on posttraumatic growth, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CRAMER (for himself, Mr. DAINES, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. COTTON, Mr. INHOFE, and Mrs. BLACKBURN):

S. 3236. A bill to amend part D of title IV of the Social Security Act to ensure that child support for unborn children is collected and distributed under the child support enforcement program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. KING:

S. 3237. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve the annual wellness visit under the Medicare program; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. KING:

S. 3238. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide coverage of preventive home visits under Medicare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WICKER (for himself, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. CARPER, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. CASEY, and Mr. BOOKER):

S. 3239. A bill to designate the headquarters building of the Department of Transportation located at 1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE, in Washington, DC, as the ''William T. Coleman, Jr., Federal Building'' ; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mrs. GILLIBRAND (for herself and Mr. PORTMAN):

S. 3240. A bill to provide for the vacating of certain convictions and expungement of certain arrests of victims of human trafficking; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HEINRICH (for himself and Mr. UDALL):

S. 3241. A bill to amend the John D. Dingell, Jr. Conservation, Management, and Recreation Act to establish the Cerro de la Olla Wilderness in the Rio Grande del Norte National Monument, New Mexico; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Mr. DAINES):

S. 3242. A bill to amend the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 to protect

privacy rights, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. SHAHEEN:

S. 3243. A bill to increase students' and borrowers' access to student loan information within the National Student Loan Data System; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. ROSEN (for herself and Mrs. FISCHER):

S. 3244. A bill to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to improve the detection, prevention, and treatment of mental health issues among public safety officers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. CORTEZ MASTO (for herself and Mr. JONES):

S. 3245. A bill to advance STEM education, provide for improved worker training, retention, and advancement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. KENNEDY (for himself, Mr. SCHATZ, and Ms. CANTWELL):

S. 3246. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to direct the Federal Communications Commission to conduct a public auction of the C-band, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. SANDERS (for himself and Mr. MERKLEY):

S. 3247. A bill to ban the practice of hydraulic fracturing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. SANDERS, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. WARREN, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, and Mr. COONS):

S. Res. 484. A resolution recognizing January 27, 2020, as the anniversary of the first refugee and Muslim ban, calling on Congress to defund the Migrant Protection Protocols, and urging the President to restore refugee resettlement to historic norms; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for himself, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. BROWN, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. CORNYN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. ERNST, Mr. HAWLEY, Mr. JONES, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. PETERS, Mr. REED, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. SMITH, Mr. SULLIVAN, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. BARRASSO):

S. Res. 485. A resolution recognizing January 2020 as ''National Mentoring Month'' ; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. TESTER, Mr. BROWN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. RUBIO, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. TOOMEY, Ms. ERNST, Mr. WYDEN, and Mrs. SHAHEEN):

S. Res. 486. A resolution supporting the observation of National Trafficking and Modern Slavery Prevention Month during the period beginning on January 1, 2020, and ending on February 1, 2020, to raise awareness of, and opposition to, human trafficking and modern slavery; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TILLIS (for himself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. CRAPO, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. CORNYN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, and Mr. MARKEY):

S. Res. 487. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of Countering International Parental Child Abduction Month and expressing the sense of the Senate that Congress should raise awareness of the harm caused by international parental child abduction; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Ms. SINEMA (for herself, Ms. ERNST, Ms. ROSEN, and Mr. KING):

S. Con. Res. 35. A concurrent resolution providing for a joint hearing of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate and the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives to receive a presentation from the Comptroller General of the United States regarding the audited financial statement of the executive branch; to the Committee on the Budget.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 69

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mrs. LOEFFLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 69, a bill to allow reciprocity for the carrying of certain concealed firearms.

S. 208

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 208, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to permit certain retired members of the uniformed services who have a service-connected disability to receive both disability compensation from the Department of Veterans Affairs for their disability and either retired pay by reason of their years of military service or Combat-Related Special Compensation, and for other purposes.

S. 285

At the request of Ms. ERNST, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 285, a bill to require U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement to take into custody certain aliens who have been charged in the United States with a crime that resulted in the death or serious bodily injury of another person, and for other purposes.

S. 318

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 318, a bill to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to furnish medically necessary transportation for newborn children of certain women veterans.

S. 402

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 402, a bill to plan, develop, and make recommendations to increase access to sexual assault examinations for survivors by holding hospitals accountable and supporting the providers that serve them.

S. 505

At the request of Ms. DUCKWORTH, the names of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) and the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) were added as cosponsors of S. 505, a bill to ensure due process protections of individuals in the United States against unlawful detention based solely on a protected characteristic.

S. 578

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor 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. 633

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the names of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER), the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON), the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. JONES), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) were added as cosponsors of S. 633, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the members of the Women's Army Corps who were assigned to the 6888th Central Postal Directory Battalion, known as the ''Six Triple Eight''.

S. 642

At the request of Mr. ALEXANDER, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 642, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to Master Sergeant Rodrick ''Roddie'' Edmonds in recognition of his heroic actions during World War II.

S. 651

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 651, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the age requirement with respect to eligibility for qualified ABLE programs.

S. 696

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 696, a bill to designate the same individual serving as the Chief Nurse Officer of the Public Health Service as the National Nurse for Public Health.

S. 781

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 781, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the proper tax treatment of

personal service income earned in pass-thru entities.

S. 785

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the names of the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) were added as cosponsors of S. 785, a bill to improve mental health care provided by the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

S. 803

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the names of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY) and the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) were added as cosponsors of S. 803, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to restore incentives for investments in qualified improvement property.

S. 805

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 805, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the processing of veterans benefits by the Department of Veterans Affairs, to limit the authority of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to recover overpayments made by the Department and other amounts owed by veterans to the United States, to improve the due process accorded veterans with respect to such recovery, and for other purposes.

S. 817

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the names of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER) and the Senator from Georgia (Mrs. LOEFFLER) were added as cosponsors of S. 817, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to remove silencers from the definition of firearms, and for other purposes.

S. 850

At the request of Mr. SULLIVAN, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA) was added as a cosponsor of S. 850, a bill to extend the authorization of appropriations to the Department of Veterans Affairs for purposes of awarding grants to veterans service organizations for the transportation of highly rural veterans.

S. 887

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 887, a bill to revise counseling requirements for certain borrowers of student loans, and for other purposes.

S. 888

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 888, a bill to require a standard financial aid offer form, and for other purposes.

S. 889

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 889, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to make technical improvements to the Net Price Calculator system so that prospective students may have a more accurate understanding of the true cost of college.

S. 892

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the names of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) and the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) 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. 903

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 903, a bill to direct the Secretary of Energy to establish advanced nuclear goals, provide for a versatile, reactor-based fast neutron source, make available high-assay, low-enriched uranium for research, development, and demonstration of advanced nuclear reactor concepts, and for other purposes.

S. 1123

At the request of Mr. COONS, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1123, a bill to transfer and limit Executive Branch authority to suspend or restrict the entry of a class of aliens.

S. 1190

At the request of Mrs. CAPITO, the names of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON) and the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) were added as cosponsors of S. 1190, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for payments for certain rural health clinic and Federally qualified health center services furnished to hospice patients under the Medicare program.

S. 1249

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1249, a bill to prioritize funding for an expanded and sustained national investment in basic science research.

S. 1644

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1644, a bill to ensure that State and local law enforcement may cooperate with Federal officials to protect our communities from violent criminals and suspected terrorists who are illegally present in the United States.

S. 1757

At the request of Ms. ERNST, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1757, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the United States Army Rangers Veterans of World War II in recognition of their extraordinary service during World War II.

S. 1781

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1781, a bill to authorize appropriations for the Department of State for fiscal years 2020 through 2022 to provide assistance to El Salvador, Guatemala, and Honduras through bilateral compacts to increase protection of women and children in their homes and communities and reduce female homicides, domestic violence, and sexual assault.

S. 1827

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1827, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude corporations operating prisons from the definition of taxable REIT subsidiary.

S. 1908

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1908, a bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to improve the efficiency of summer meals.

S. 1954

At the request of Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1954, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint commemorative coins in recognition of the 75th anniversary of the integration of baseball.

S. 2321

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 2321, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint a coin in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the establishment of Negro Leagues baseball.

S. 2417

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the names of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE), the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) and the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT) were added as cosponsors of S. 2417, a bill to provide for payment of proceeds from savings bonds to a State with title to such bonds pursuant to the judgment of a court.

S. 2427

At the request of Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2427, a bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint and issue quarter dollars in commemoration of the 19th Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 2570

At the request of Ms. SINEMA, the names of the Senator from Illinois (Mr.

DURBIN), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) and the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) 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. 2602

At the request of Mr. BURR, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2602, a bill to exclude vehicles to be used solely for competition from certain provisions of the Clean Air Act, and for other purposes.

S. 2661

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2661, a bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to designate 9–8–8 as the universal telephone number for the purpose of the national suicide prevention and mental health crisis hotline system operating through the National Suicide Prevention Lifeline and through the Veterans Crisis Line, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. GARDNER, the names of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) and the Senator from Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY) were added as cosponsors of S. 2661, supra.

S. 2705

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the names of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) were added as cosponsors of S. 2705, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to modify the requirements relating to the use of construction authority in the event of a declaration of war or national emergency, and for other purposes.

S. 2715

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2715, a bill to develop and implement policies to advance early childhood development, to provide assistance for orphans and other vulnerable children in developing countries, and for other purposes.

S. 2743

At the request of Mr. GARDNER, the names of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) and the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) were added as cosponsors of S. 2743, a bill to establish the China Censorship Monitor and Action Group, and for other purposes.

S. 2773

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2773, a bill to require non-Federal prison, correctional, and detention facilities holding Federal prisoners or detainees under a contract with the Federal Government to make the same information available to the public that Federal prisons and correctional facilities are required to make available.

S. 2807

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2807, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve the quality of care furnished by hospice programs under the Medicare program.

S. 2809

At the request of Mr. VAN HOLLEN, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2809, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to impose a surtax on high income individuals.

S. 2836

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2836, a bill to prohibit the Secretary of Health and Human Services from taking any action to implement, enforce, or otherwise give effect to the final rule, entitled ''Protecting Statutory Conscience Rights in Health Care; Delegations of Authority''.

S. 2864

At the request of Ms. SINEMA, the names of the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) and the Senator from Georgia (Mrs. LOEFFLER) were added as cosponsors of S. 2864, a bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to carry out a pilot program on information sharing between the Department of Veterans Affairs and designated relatives and friends of veterans regarding the assistance and benefits available to the veterans, and for other purposes.

S. 2881

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2881, a bill to require the Federal Communications Commission to make not less than 280 megahertz of spectrum available for terrestrial use, and for other purposes.

S. 2898

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2898, a bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for a full annuity supplement for certain air traffic controllers.

S. 2950

At the request of Mr. SULLIVAN, the names of the Senator from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA) and the Senator from Alabama (Mr. JONES) were added as cosponsors of S. 2950, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to concede exposure to airborne hazards and toxins from burn pits under certain circumstances, and for other purposes.

S. 2970

At the request of Ms. ERNST, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2970, a bill to improve the fielding of newest generations of personal protective equipment to the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

S. 2973

At the request of Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, the name of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2973, a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to harmonize the definition of employee with the common law.

S. 2991

At the request of Mr. SULLIVAN, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) 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. 3017

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3017, a bill to increase transparency and accountability with respect to World Bank lending for the People's Republic of China, and for other purposes.

S. 3018

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3018, a bill to require the United States Executive Director of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development to oppose assistance by the Bank for any country that exceeds the graduation threshold of the Bank and is of concern with respect to religious freedom.

S. 3023

At the request of Ms. ERNST, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3023, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize the Director of the National Institutes of Health to make awards to outstanding scientists, including physician-scientists, to support researchers focusing on pediatric research, including basic, clinical, translational, or pediatric pharmacological research, and for other purposes.

S. 3056

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the names of the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 3056, a bill to designate as wilderness certain Federal portions of the red rock canyons of the Colorado Plateau and the Great Basin Deserts in the State of Utah for the benefit of present and future generations of people in the United States.

S. 3067

At the request of Mrs. CAPITO, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3067, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to combat the opioid crisis by promoting access to non-opioid treatments in the hospital outpatient setting.

S. 3086

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Ms.

MCSALLY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3086, a bill to provide for the conversion of temporary judgeships to permanent judgeships, and for other purposes.

S. 3099

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3099, a bill to provide for the conveyance of certain property to the Southeast Alaska Regional Health Consortium located in Sitka, Alaska, and for other purposes.

S. 3100

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3100, a bill to convey land in Anchorage, Alaska, to the Alaska Native Tribal Health Consortium, and for other purposes.

S. 3139

At the request of Mr. DAINES, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mrs. LOEFFLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3139, a bill to amend chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, to more comprehensively address the interstate transportation of firearms or ammunition.

S. 3167

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3167, a bill to prohibit discrimination based on an individual's texture or style of hair.

S. 3174

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3174, a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to the sale and marketing of tobacco products, and for other purposes.

S. 3176

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the names of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. JONES), the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO), the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) and the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER) were added as cosponsors of S. 3176, a bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 and the United States-Israel Strategic Partnership Act of 2014 to make improvements to certain defense and security assistance provisions and to authorize the appropriations of funds to Israel, and for other purposes.

S. 3190

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of 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.

S. 3206

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the names of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 3206, a bill to amend the Help America Vote Act of 2002 to increase voting accessibility for individuals with disabilities and older individuals, and for other purposes.

S. 3217

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3217, a bill to standardize the designation of National Heritage Areas, and for other purposes.

S. 3220

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3220, a bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to clarify that the provision of home and community-based services is not prohibited in an acute care hospital, and for other purposes.

S.J. RES. 60

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 60, a joint resolution to amend the War Powers Resolution to improve requirements and limitations in connection with authorizations for use of military force and narrowings and repeals of such authorizations, and for other purposes.

S.J. RES. 68

At the request of Ms. HARRIS, her name was added as a cosponsor 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.

At the request of Mr. KAINE, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 68, supra.

S. CON. RES. 34

At the request of Mr. DAINES, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 34, a concurrent resolution affirming the importance of religious freedom as a fundamental human right that is essential to a free society and protected for all people of the United States under the Constitution of the United States, and recognizing the 234th anniversary of the enactment of the Virginia Statute for Religious Freedom.

S. RES. 234

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 234, a resolution affirming the United States commitment to the two-state solution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, and noting that Israeli annexation of territory in the West Bank would undermine peace and Israel's future as a Jewish and democratic state.

S. RES. 420

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the names of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 420, a resolution encouraging the President to expand the list of the Department of Veterans Affairs of presumptive medical conditions associated with exposure to Agent Orange to include Parkinsonism, bladder cancer, hypertension, and hypothyroidism.

S. RES. 458

At the request of Mr. LANKFORD, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 458, a resolution calling for the global repeal of blasphemy, heresy, and apostasy laws.

S. RES. 469

At the request of Mr. GRAHAM, the names of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) and the Senator from Florida (Mr. SCOTT) were added as cosponsors of 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.

S. RES. 481

At the request of Ms. ROSEN, the names of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. JONES), the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT), the Senator from Mississippi (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH), the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. HAWLEY), the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO), the Senator from Utah (Mr. ROMNEY), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN), the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE), the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BRAUN), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET), the Senator from Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), the Senator from

Missouri (Mr. BLUNT), the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY), the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN), the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN), the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN), the Senator from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY), the Senator from Florida (Mr. SCOTT) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 481, a resolution commemorating the 75th anniversary of the liberation of the Auschwitz extermination camp in Nazi-occupied Poland.

At the request of Mr. WARNER, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 481, supra.

At the request of Mr. GARDNER, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 481, supra.

S. RES. 482

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 482, a resolution supporting the contributions of Catholic schools.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 484—RECOGNIZING JANUARY 27, 2020, AS THE ANNIVERSARY OF THE FIRST REFUGEE AND MUSLIM BAN, CALLING ON CONGRESS TO DEFUND THE MIGRANT PROTECTION PROTOCOLS, AND URGING THE PRESIDENT TO RESTORE REFUGEE RESETTLEMENT TO HISTORIC NORMS

Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. SANDERS, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. WARREN, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, and Mr. COONS) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 484

Whereas the world is in the midst of the worst global displacement crisis in history, with more than 25,900,000 refugees worldwide, according to United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) estimates;

Whereas UNHCR reports that global resettlement needs have doubled in recent years, reaching over 1,440,000 refugees in 2020;

Whereas the United States Refugee Admissions Program (USRAP) is a life-saving solution critical to global humanitarian efforts, which serves to strengthen global security, leverage United States foreign policy goals, and support regional host countries while serving individuals and families in need;

Whereas the United States has been a global leader in responding to displacement crises around the world and promoting the safety, health, and well-being of refugees and displaced persons;

Whereas refugees are the most vetted travelers to enter the United States and are subject to extensive screening checks, including in-person interviews, biometric data checks, and multiple interagency checks;

Whereas the United States Government leverages resettlement to encourage other countries to keep their doors open to refugees, allow refugee children to attend school, and allow adults to work;

Whereas the USRAP emphasizes early self-sufficiency through employment, and most adult refugees are employed within their first six months of arriving to the United States;

Whereas refugees contribute to their communities by starting businesses, paying taxes, sharing their cultural traditions, and being involved in their neighborhoods, and reports have found that refugees contribute more than they consume in State-funded services—including for schooling and health care;

Whereas, for over 40 years, the United States has resettled up to 200,000 refugees per year, with an average admissions goal of 95,000 refugees per year;

Whereas the United States Government has abdicated its leadership by setting a record-low refugee admissions goal in fiscal year 2020 at 18,000;

Whereas, on January 27, 2017, President Donald J. Trump released an executive order banning individuals from seven Muslim-majority countries and all refugees from entering the country;

Whereas, since that time, the President has taken further executive and administrative actions to ban people from Muslim-majority countries and to dismantle the United States refugee program, resulting in significantly lowered capacity and loss of institutional memory and experience in the historically successful USRAP;

Whereas the President issued a Proclamation on November 9, 2018, that wrongfully and illegally blocks people who cross between ports of entry from applying for asylum, and since then has taken further aggressive steps to dismantle the United States asylum system;

Whereas the Department of Homeland Security started implementation of the Migrant Protection Protocols on January 29, 2019, and it has exposed tens of thousands of asylum seekers to torture, kidnapping, trafficking, and exploitation by returning them to dangerous border cities in Mexico;

Whereas the 2018 Department of State country report for Mexico acknowledges serious and targeted risks faced by migrants and asylum seekers in, and transiting through, Mexico, such that it remains an unsafe place for many;

Whereas the United States has returned more than 24,000 asylum seekers alone to Nuevo Laredo and Matamoros, widely recognized as among the most violent cities in the world, located in the state of Tamaulipas, which is the subject of a Department of State ''Level 4: Do Not Travel'' advisory;

Whereas sending asylum seekers to another country limits and may completely eliminate their opportunity to identify and meet with counsel, thereby lowering their chances of obtaining relief; and

Whereas all individuals seeking asylum in the United States are entitled to due process and access to an attorney: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) reaffirms the United States' proud history of refugee resettlement and protection of asylum seekers;

(2) recognizes January 27, 2020, as the anniversary of the first refugee and Muslim ban;

(3) reaffirms the strong bipartisan commitment of the United States to promote the safety, health, and well-being of refugees, including through resettlement and the asylum seeking process to the United States for those who cannot return home;

(4) underscores the importance of the United States Refugee Admissions Program and a robust asylum system as critical tools for United States global leadership;

(5) recognizes the profound consequences faced by refugees, asylum seekers, and their families who have been stranded, separated, and scarred by current United States policies, leaving thousands mid-process and more with little hope of protection in the United States; and

(6) calls upon the United States Government—

(A) to resettle a robust number of refugees to meet global need in fiscal years 2020 and 2021 with an emphasis on rebuilding the resettlement program and returning to historic norms;

(B) to operate the program in good faith in an attempt to meet their own stated objectives, restore historic refugee arrivals, improve consultation with Congress, and adhere to the clear congressional intent within the Refugee Act of 1980 (Public Law 96–212);

(C) to ensure that no funds be made available by any Act to implement or enforce the Migrant Protection Protocols announced by the Secretary of Homeland Security on December 20, 2018, or any subsequent revisions to those protocols;

(D) to enact the National Origin-Based Antidiscrimination for Nonimmigrants Act, introduced in the Senate as S.1123 (116th Congress) and in the House of Representatives as H.R.2214 (116th Congress), which would terminate the Muslim, refugee, and asylum bans; and

(E) to recommit to offering freedom to individuals fleeing from persecution and oppression regardless of their country of origin or religious beliefs.

SENATE RESOLUTION 485—RECOGNIZING JANUARY 2020 AS ''NATIONAL MENTORING MONTH''

Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for himself, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. BROWN, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. CORNYN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. ERNST, Mr. HAWLEY, Mr. JONES, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. PETERS, Mr. REED, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. SMITH, Mr. SULLIVAN, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. BARRASSO) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:

S. RES. 485

Whereas the goals of National Mentoring Month are to raise awareness of mentoring, recruit individuals to mentor, celebrate the powerful impact of caring adults who volunteer time for the benefit of young people, and encourage organizations to engage and integrate quality in mentoring into the efforts of the organizations;

Whereas there are young people across the United States who make everyday choices that lead to the big decisions in life without the guidance and support on which many other young people rely;

Whereas a mentor is a caring, consistent presence who devotes time to a young person to help that young person discover personal strength and achieve the potential of that young person;

Whereas quality mentoring encourages positive life and social skills, promotes self-esteem, bolsters academic achievement and college access, supports career exploration, and nurtures youth leadership development;

Whereas mentoring happens in various settings, including community-based programs, elementary and secondary schools, colleges, government agencies, religious institutions, and the workplace, and in various ways, including formal mentoring matches and informal relationships with teachers, coaches, neighbors, faith leaders, and others;

Whereas mentoring programs have been shown to be effective in helping young people make positive choices;

Whereas studies have shown that incorporating culture and heritage into mentoring programs can improve academic outcomes and increases community engagement, especially for Alaskan Native and American Indian youth;

Whereas young people who meet regularly with mentors are 46 percent less likely than peers to start using illegal drugs;

Whereas research shows that young people who were at risk for not completing high school but who had a mentor were, as compared with similarly situated young people without a mentor—

(1) 55 percent more likely to be enrolled in college;

(2) 81 percent more likely to report participating regularly in sports or extracurricular activities;

(3) more than twice as likely to say they held a leadership position in a club or sports team; and

(4) 78 percent more likely to pay it forward by volunteering regularly in the communities of young people;

Whereas students who are chronically absent are more likely to fall behind academically, and mentoring can play a role in helping young people attend school regularly, as research shows that students who meet regularly with a mentor are, as compared with the peers of those students—

(1) 52 percent less likely to skip a full day of school; and

(2) 37 percent less likely to skip a class;

Whereas youth development experts agree that mentoring encourages positive youth development and smart daily behaviors, such as finishing homework and having healthy social interactions, and has a positive impact on the growth and success of a young person;

Whereas mentors help young people set career goals and use the personal contacts of the mentors to help young people meet industry professionals and train for and find jobs;

Whereas each of the benefits of mentors described in this preamble serves to link youth to economic and social opportunity while also strengthening communities in the United States; and

Whereas, despite those described benefits, an estimated 9,000,000 young people in the United States feel isolated from meaningful connections with adults outside the home, constituting a ''mentoring gap'' that demonstrates a need for collaboration and resources: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes January 2020 as ''National Mentoring Month'';

(2) recognizes the caring adults who serve as staff and volunteers at quality mentoring programs and help the young people of the United States find inner strength and reach their full potential;

(3) acknowledges that mentoring is beneficial because mentoring supports educational achievement and self-confidence, supports young people in setting career goals and expanding social capital, reduces juvenile delinquency, improves positive personal, professional, and academic outcomes, and strengthens communities;

(4) promotes the establishment and expansion of quality mentoring programs across the United States to equip young people with the tools needed to lead healthy and productive lives; and

(5) supports initiatives to close the ''mentoring gap'' that exists for the many young people in the United States who do not have meaningful connections with adults outside the home.

SENATE RESOLUTION 486—SUPPORTING THE OBSERVATION OF NATIONAL TRAFFICKING AND MODERN SLAVERY PREVENTION MONTH DURING THE PERIOD BEGINNING ON JANUARY 1, 2020, AND ENDING ON FEBRUARY 1, 2020, TO RAISE AWARENESS OF, AND OPPOSITION TO, HUMAN TRAFFICKING AND MODERN SLAVERY

Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. TESTER, Mr. BROWN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. RUBIO, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. TOOMEY, Ms. ERNST, Mr. WYDEN, and Mrs. SHAHEEN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 486

Whereas the United States abolished the transatlantic slave trade in 1808 and abolished chattel slavery and prohibited involuntary servitude in 1865;

Whereas, because the people of the United States remain committed to protecting individual freedom, there is a national imperative to eliminate human trafficking and modern slavery, which is commonly considered to mean—

(1) the recruitment, harboring, transportation, provision, or obtaining of an individual through the use of force, fraud, or coercion for the purpose of subjecting that individual to involuntary servitude, peonage, debt bondage, or slavery; or

(2) the inducement of a commercial sex act by force, fraud, or coercion, or in which the individual induced to perform that act is younger than 18 years of age;

Whereas forced labor and human trafficking generates revenues of approximately $150,000,000,000 annually worldwide, and there are an estimated 40,000,000 victims of human trafficking across the globe;

Whereas victims of human trafficking are difficult to identify and are subject to manipulation, force, fraud, coercion, and abuse;

Whereas the Department of Justice has reported that human trafficking and modern slavery has been reported and investigated in each of the 50 States and the District of Columbia;

Whereas the Department of State has reported that the top 3 countries of origin of federally identified human trafficking victims in fiscal year 2018 were the United States, Mexico, and the Philippines;

Whereas, to help businesses in the United States combat child labor and forced labor in global supply chains, the Department of Labor has identified 148 goods from 76 countries that are made by child labor and forced labor;

Whereas, since 2007, the National Human Trafficking Hotline has identified nearly 52,000 cases of human trafficking;

Whereas, of the more than 23,500 endangered runaways reported to the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children in 2019, 1 in 6 were likely child sex trafficking victims;

Whereas the Administration for Native Americans of the Department of Health and Human Services reports that American Indian, Alaska Native, and Pacific Islander women and girls have a heightened risk for sex trafficking;

Whereas the Department of Justice found that studies on the topic of human trafficking of American Indians and Alaska Natives suggest there are—

(1) high rates of sexual exploitation of Native women and girls;

(2) gaps in data and research on trafficking of American Indian and Alaska Native victims; and

(3) barriers that prevent law enforcement agencies and victim service providers from identifying and responding appropriately to Native victims;

Whereas, according to the Government Accountability Office, from fiscal year 2013 through fiscal year 2016, there were only 14 Federal investigations and 2 Federal prosecutions of human trafficking offenses in Indian country;

Whereas, to combat human trafficking and modern slavery in the United States and globally, the people of the United States, the Federal Government, and State and local governments must be—

(1) aware of the realities of human trafficking and modern slavery; and

(2) dedicated to stopping the horrific enterprise of human trafficking and modern slavery;

Whereas the United States should hold accountable all individuals, groups, organizations, and countries that support, advance, or commit acts of human trafficking and modern slavery;

Whereas, through education, the United States must also work to end human trafficking and modern slavery in all forms in the United States and around the world;

Whereas victims of human trafficking deserve a trauma-informed approach that integrates the pursuit of justice and provision of social services designed to help them escape, and recover from, the physical, mental, emotional, and spiritual trauma they endured;

Whereas combating human trafficking requires a whole-of-government effort that rests on a unified and coordinated response among Federal, State, and local agencies and that places equal value on the identification and stabilization of victims, as well as the investigation and prosecution of traffickers;

Whereas laws to prosecute perpetrators of human trafficking and to assist and protect victims of human trafficking and modern slavery have been enacted in the United States, including—

(1) the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.);

(2) title XII of the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2013 (Public Law 113–4; 127 Stat. 136);

(3) the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act of 2015 (Public Law 114–22; 129 Stat. 227);

(4) sections 910 and 914(e) of the Trade Facilitation and Trade Enforcement Act of 2015 (Public Law 114–125; 130 Stat. 239 and 274);

(5) section 1298 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (22 U.S.C. 7114);

(6) the Abolish Human Trafficking Act of 2017 (Public Law 115–392; 132 Stat. 5250);

(7) the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2017 (Public Law 115–393; 132 Stat. 5265);

(8) the Frederick Douglass Trafficking Victims Prevention and Protection Reauthorization Act of 2018 (Public Law 115–425; 132 Stat. 5472); and

(9) the Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2017 (Public Law 115–427; 132 Stat. 5503);

Whereas the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act of 2015 (Public Law 114–22; 129

Stat. 227) established the United States Advisory Council on Human Trafficking to provide a formal platform for survivors of human trafficking to advise and make recommendations on Federal anti-trafficking policies to the Interagency Task Force to Monitor and Combat Trafficking established by the President;

Whereas the Department of Defense, the General Services Administration, and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration issued a final rule (80 Fed. Reg. 4967) to implement Executive Order 13627, entitled ''Strengthening Protections Against Trafficking in Persons in Federal Contracts'', that clarifies the policy of the United States on combating trafficking in persons as outlined in the Federal Acquisition Regulation by strengthening the prohibition on contractors from charging employee recruitment fees;

Whereas, although such laws and regulations are currently in force, it is essential to increase public awareness, particularly among individuals who are most likely to come into contact with victims of human trafficking and modern slavery, regarding conditions and dynamics of human trafficking and modern slavery precisely because traffickers use techniques that are designed to severely limit self-reporting and evade law enforcement;

Whereas January 1 is the anniversary of the effective date of the Emancipation Proclamation;

Whereas February 1 is—

(1) the anniversary of the date on which President Abraham Lincoln signed the joint resolution sending the 13th Amendment to the Constitution of the United States to the States for ratification to forever declare, ''Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude . . . shall exist within the United States, or any place subject to their jurisdiction''; and

(2) a date that has long been celebrated as National Freedom Day, as described in section 124 of title 36, United States Code; and

Whereas, under the authority of Congress to enforce the 13th Amendment to the Constitution of the United States ''by appropriate legislation'', Congress, through the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.), updated the post-Civil War involuntary servitude and slavery statutes and adopted an approach of victim protection, vigorous prosecution, and prevention of human trafficking, commonly known as the ''3P'' approach: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate supports—

(1) observing National Trafficking and Modern Slavery Prevention Month during the period beginning on January 1, 2020, and ending on February 1, 2020, to recognize the vital role that the people of the United States have in ending human trafficking and modern slavery;

(2) marking the observation of National Trafficking and Modern Slavery Prevention Month with appropriate programs and activities, culminating in the observance on February 1, 2020, of National Freedom Day, as described in section 124 of title 36, United States Code;

(3) urging continued partnerships with Federal, State, and local agencies, as well as social service providers and nonprofit organizations to address human trafficking with a collaborative, victim-centered approach; and

(4) all other efforts to prevent, eradicate, and raise awareness of, and opposition to, human trafficking and modern slavery.

SENATE RESOLUTION 487—SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF COUNTERING INTERNATIONAL PARENTAL CHILD ABDUCTION MONTH AND EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT CONGRESS SHOULD RAISE AWARENESS OF THE HARM CAUSED BY INTERNATIONAL PARENTAL CHILD ABDUCTION

Mr. TILLIS (for himself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. CRAPO, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. CORNYN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, and Mr. MARKEY) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 487

Whereas thousands of children in the United States have been abducted from the United States by parents, separating those children from their parents who remain in the United States;

Whereas it is illegal under section 1204 of title 18, United States Code, to remove, or attempt to remove, a child from the United States or retain a child (who has been in the United States) outside of the United States with the intent to obstruct the lawful exercise of parental rights;

Whereas more than 11,500 children were reported abducted from the United States between 2008 and 2018;

Whereas, during 2018, 1 or more cases of international parental child abduction involving children who are citizens of the United States were identified in 107 countries around the world;

Whereas the United States is a party to the Convention on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction, done at The Hague, October 25, 1980 (TIAS 11670) (referred to in this preamble as the ''Hague Convention on Abduction''), which—

(1) supports the prompt return of wrongly removed or retained children; and

(2) calls for all participating parties to respect parental custody rights;

Whereas the majority of children who were abducted from the United States have yet to be reunited with their custodial parents;

Whereas, during 2018, Argentina, Brazil, Ecuador, Egypt, India, Jordan, Lebanon, Peru, and the United Arab Emirates were identified under the Sean and David Goldman International Child Abduction Prevention and Return Act of 2014 (22 U.S.C. 9101 et seq.) as engaging in a pattern of noncompliance (as defined in section 3 of that Act (22 U.S.C. 9101));

Whereas the Supreme Court of the United States has recognized that family abduction—

(1) is a form of child abuse with potentially ''devastating consequences for a child'', which may include negative impacts on the physical and mental well-being of the child; and

(2) can cause a child to ''experience a loss of community and stability, leading to loneliness, anger, and fear of abandonment'';

Whereas, according to the 2010 Report on Compliance with the Hague Convention on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction by the Department of State, research shows that an abducted child is at risk of significant short- and long-term problems, including ''anxiety, eating problems, nightmares, mood swings, sleep disturbances, [and] aggressive behavior'';

Whereas international parental child abduction has devastating emotional consequences for the child and for the parent from whom the child is separated;

Whereas the United States has a history of promoting child welfare through institutions including—

(1) in the Department of Health and Human Services, the Children's Bureau of the Administration for Children and Families; and

(2) in the Department of State, the Office of Children's Issues of the Bureau of Consular Affairs;

Whereas Congress has signaled a commitment to ending international parental child abduction by enacting the International Child Abduction Remedies Act (22 U.S.C. 9001 et seq.), the International Parental Kidnapping Crime Act of 1993 (Public Law 103–173), which enacted section 1204 of title 18, United States Code, and the Sean and David Goldman International Child Abduction Prevention and Return Act of 2014 (22 U.S.C. 9101 et seq.);

Whereas the Senate adopted Senate Resolution 543, 112th Congress, on December 4, 2012, condemning the international abduction of children;

Whereas the Senate adopted Senate Resolution 431, 115th Congress, on April 19, 2018, to raise awareness of, and opposition to, international parental child abduction;

Whereas all 50 States and the District of Columbia have enacted laws criminalizing parental kidnapping;

Whereas, in 2018, the Prevention Branch of the Office of Children's Issues of the Department of State—

(1) fielded more than 5,200 inquiries from the general public relating to preventing a child from being removed from the United States; and

(2) enrolled more than 4,700 children in the Children's Passport Issuance Alert Program, which—

(A) is one of the most important tools of the Department of State for preventing international parental child abductions; and

(B) allows the Office of Children's Issues to contact the enrolling parent or legal guardian to verify whether the parental consent requirement has been met when a passport application has been submitted for an enrolled child;

Whereas the Department of State cannot track the ultimate destination of a child through the use of the passport of the child issued by the Department of State if the child is transported to a third country after departing from the United States;

Whereas a child who is a citizen of the United States may have another nationality and may travel using a passport issued by another country, which—

(1) increases the difficulty in determining the whereabouts of the child; and

(2) makes efforts to prevent abductions more critical;

Whereas, during 2018, 232 children were returned to the United States and an additional 174 cases were resolved in other ways; and

Whereas, in 2018, the Department of Homeland Security, in coordination with the Prevention Branch of the Office of Children's Issues of the Department of State, enrolled 236 children in a program aimed at preventing international parental child abduction: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes and observes ''Countering International Parental Child Abduction Month'' during the period beginning on April 1, 2020, and ending on April 30, 2020, to raise awareness of, and opposition to, international parental child abduction; and

(2) urges the United States to continue playing a leadership role in raising awareness about the devastating impacts of international parental child abduction by educating the public about the negative emotional, psychological, and physical consequences to children and parents victimized by international parental child abduction.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 35—PROVIDING FOR A JOINT HEARING OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET OF THE SENATE AND THE COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES TO RECEIVE A PRESENTATION FROM THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES REGARDING THE AUDITED FINANCIAL STATEMENT OF THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH

Ms. SINEMA (for herself, Ms. ERNST, Ms. ROSEN, and Mr. KING) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Budget:

S. CON. RES. 35

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring),

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This resolution may be cited as the ''Fiscal State of the Nation Resolution''.

SEC. 2. ANNUAL JOINT HEARING OF BUDGET COMMITTEES TO RECEIVE A PRESENTATION BY THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 45 days (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and holidays) after the date on which the Secretary of the Treasury submits to Congress the audited financial statement required under paragraph (1) of section 331(e) of title 31, United States Code, on a date agreed upon by the chairmen of the Budget Committees and the Comptroller General of the United States, the chairmen shall conduct a joint hearing to receive a presentation from the Comptroller General—

(1) reviewing the findings of the audit required under paragraph (2) of such section; and

(2) providing, with respect to the information included by the Secretary in the report accompanying such audited financial statement, an analysis of the financial position and condition of the Federal Government, including financial measures (such as the net operating cost, income, budget deficits, or budget surpluses) and sustainability measures (such as the long-term fiscal projection or social insurance projection) described in such report.

(b) PRESENTATION OF STATEMENT IN ACCORDANCE WITH GAO STRATEGIES AND MEANS.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall ensure that the presentation at each joint hearing conducted under subsection (a) is made in accordance with the Strategies and Means of the Government Accountability Office, to ensure that the presentation will provide professional, objective, fact-based, nonpartisan, nonideological, fair, and balanced information to the Members attending the hearing.

(c) RULES APPLICABLE TO HEARING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Each joint hearing conducted by the chairmen of Budget Committees under subsection (a) shall be conducted in accordance with Standing Rules of the Senate and the Rules of the House of Representatives which apply to such a hearing, including the provisions requiring hearings conducted by committees to be open to the public, including to radio, television, and still photography coverage.

(2) PERMITTING PARTICIPATION BY SENATORS AND MEMBERS NOT SERVING ON BUDGET COMMITTEES.—Notwithstanding any provision of the Standing Rules of the Senate or the Rules of the House of Representatives, any Senator and any Member of the House of Representatives (including a Delegate or Resident Commissioner to the Congress) may participate in a joint hearing under subsection (a) in the same manner and to the same extent as a Senator or Member of the House of Representatives who is a member of either of the Budget Committees.

(d) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term ''Budget Committees'' means the Committee on the Budget of the Senate and the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives.

(e) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The requirement under subsection (a) shall apply with respect to any audited financial statement under section 331(e)(1) of title 31, United States Code, submitted on or after the date of adoption of this resolution.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 1 P.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. Chief Justice, I ask unanimous consent that the trial adjourn until 1 p.m., Wednesday, January 29, and that this order also constitute the adjournment of the Senate.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 2:54 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, January 29, 2020, at 1 p.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

CHARLES A. STONES, OF KANSAS, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE FEDERAL AGRICULTURAL MORTGAGE CORPORATION, VICE BRUCE J. SHERRICK.

SECURITIES INVESTOR PROTECTION CORPORATION

THOMAS M. MISTELE, OF FLORIDA, TO BE A DIRECTOR OF THE SECURITIES INVESTOR PROTECTION CORPORATION FOR A TERM EXPIRING DECEMBER 31, 2022, VICE GREGORY KARAWAN, TERM EXPIRED.

FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

JUDY SHELTON, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM FOR THE UNEXPIRED TERM OF FOURTEEN YEARS FROM FEBRUARY 1, 2010, VICE JANET L. YELLEN, RESIGNED.

CHRISTOPHER WALLER, OF MINNESOTA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM FOR A TERM OF FOURTEEN YEARS FROM FEBRUARY 1, 2016, VICE SARAH BLOOM RASKIN, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

FINCH FULTON, OF ALABAMA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION, VICE CARLOS A. MONJE, JR.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

JOHN CHASE JOHNSON, OF OKLAHOMA, TO BE INSPECTOR GENERAL, FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION. (NEW POSITION)

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

WILLIAM ELLISON GRAYSON, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF ESTONIA.

UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

JENNY A. MCGEE, OF TEXAS, TO BE AN ASSOCIATE ADMINISTRATOR OF THE UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT, VICE R. DAVID HARDEN.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

JULIE ELIZABETH HOCKER, OF PENNSYLVANIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF LABOR, VICE KATHLEEN MARTINEZ, RESIGNED.

UNITED STATES PAROLE COMMISSION

ALMO J. CARTER, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE A COMMISSIONER OF THE UNITED STATES PAROLE COMMISSION FOR A TERM OF SIX YEARS, VICE CRANSTON J. MITCHELL, TERM EXPIRED.