



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 165

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, DECEMBER 5, 2019

No. 194

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,

December 5, 2019.

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

NANCY PELOSI,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

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

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

AND STILL I RISE

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

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, and still I rise, with my mnemonic notes.

And still I rise, Mr. Speaker. I rise because I love my country. And because I love my country, I do not rise with any degree of schadenfreude. I take no pleasure in what this House is about to do. I am not gleeful.

I rise because I believe that we must do what Dr. King called to our atten-

tion when he said that, on some issues, you must do that which is neither safe nor politic nor popular. You do it because conscience tells you it is the right thing to do.

I rise to announce that I believe that we are about to do the right thing. And I know that we are doing the right thing for a multiplicity of reasons, one of which is you cannot allow the Chief Executive Officer to send a letter of absolute, intractable defiance indicating that there will be no level of cooperation with the lawful constitutional body that is investigating actions—actions taken by the President.

You cannot allow this kind of recalcitrance to exist, because, if you do, there are no guardrails. We cannot allow a President to move through the land without guardrails. He has to know that there are boundaries.

So I rise to say, today, that this House is moving in a historic direction, that, when it is written across the pages of time that this House took the action that I believe it will take, I think we will all find that it was the right thing to do.

I rise also to say this: The Constitution allows a President to be impeached more than once. If we impeach now or at some time in the near future for one issue that we dearly should, then we find later that the President has other issues that merit impeachment, we can impeach again. There is no limit on the number of times.

I don't think you do it needlessly. Every time I have called it to the attention of this House, there was purpose and reason behind it, and I believe that we can do it more than once if it becomes necessary.

I think the Senate ought to act. I think the Senate ought to convict. But if the Senate does not convict, it does not mean that the House is now hamstrung and cannot move forward again with impeachment.

So I rise with no degree of schadenfreude. I rise with love of coun-

try and heart, and I rise understanding that Dr. King was eminently correct: There are times when we must do that which is neither safe nor politic nor popular. We do it because it is the right thing to do.

I rise because I believe we are embarking upon the right course for this House and for our history.

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

STEMMING THE TIDE OF OPIOID OVERDOSES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) for 5 minutes.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, while still more work needs to be done to confront our Nation's challenges with opioids, I am pleased to report that my home State of North Carolina is working to stem the tide and has witnessed a drop in opioid overdoses.

In my district, Surry County and its healthcare professionals, first responders, and addiction counselors deserve recognition as contributing to the county witnessing a drop of over 75 percent in opioid-related emergency room visits within the last year.

This comes as we implement one of the most significant bills that Congress passed last year, the comprehensive SUPPORT for Patients and Communities Act.

I helped introduce that legislation with bipartisan colleagues, and I am glad to report that the bill is achieving its goal in stemming the tide of addiction by improving prevention and public health efforts, enhancing treatment and recovery programs, and providing communities more tools in their fight.

Again, Mr. Speaker, more work needs to be done to confront our Nation's

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

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



Printed on recycled paper.

H9259

challenges with opioids, but Congress laid the groundwork for this work to be done at the State and local level with the passage of the SUPPORT for Patients and Communities Act.

A HISTORIC FIGHT FOR FREEDOM AND AUTONOMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Ms. PLASKETT) for 5 minutes.

Ms. PLASKETT. Mr. Speaker, I want to spend my 5 minutes to tell a story, a history story from the Virgin Islands.

This month and for the next 6 months in the Virgin Islands, we commemorate a historic fight for freedom and autonomy. On the small, 20-square-mile island of St. John, one of the earliest and longest lasting slave rebellions began on November 23, 1733. This rebellion was preceded by incomparable conditions that slaves were living in on the island of St. John in the Virgin Islands.

Conditions were devastating. The life expectancy of slaves in the Virgin Islands never went above the age of 30 years old, and this rebellion was caused by a drought and a plague of insects that placed 1,000 enslaved people of St. John at risk of starvation.

This caused an unprecedented amount of slaves to run away, what we call on the island "marooning," living in the bush. This led to the vicious and inhumane Slave Code of 1733. The new rules threatened amputation, breaking on the wheel, burning alive, and other brutal punishment for those who ran away.

This, then, led to 150 slaves, all of whom were part of the Akwamu tribe from Ghana, to begin an uprising. The Akwamu hoped to turn St. John into an Akwamu-controlled state.

On the evening of November 23, the slaves entered the fort on Coral Bay with cane knives concealed in bundles of wood. They proceeded to kill all of the soldiers at the fort. Others across the island, many who were able to escape, escaped to the island of St. Thomas, where they took word to the governor. The governor then, under pressure, sent troops, sent soldiers to St. John, who were then also destroyed.

The next 10 weeks saw guerilla-style warfare between the troops and the Akwamu rebels. Afraid that the rebellion would spread to the nearby island of Tortola, the British sent reinforcements. They were quickly dispatched and quickly rode back to Tortola.

Again, John Maddox, a privateer from the island of St. Kitts, made a deal with the Danish officials to aid the quelling of St. John. He, too, was not successful.

William Vessup, an owner of a plantation, who was in disrepute with the Danes, attempted to lure slaves onto a ship, the organizers of the rebellion, and told them that they would give them food and support if they would

come on the ship. They did not fall for the trickery, and he also was dispatched.

It wasn't until the Spanish Armada and the French came that this rebellion was able to be quelled in 1734, almost 6 months later; and with it, many were jailed. Some were sent to St. Croix to work to death, which was what they decided to give to them, and many also decided not to go back into slavery and jumped off of a cliff on the island to their death—but to freedom.

These 150 Akwamu on the island of St. John were some of the first African people in the Americas to have a sense of freedom, as volatile and short-lived as it might have been.

It is important to acknowledge, however, that, for the majority of enslaved people on the islands of St. John, St. Thomas, and St. Croix, neither outcome would lead to freedom. The enslaved people on the island of St. John and the rest of the Danish West Indies would ultimately wait another 114 years for the next rebellion for their freedom to come.

CELEBRATING THE CAREERS OF THREE CENTRE COUNTY PUBLIC SERVANTS

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, recently, I had the pleasure of traveling back to Pennsylvania's 15th Congressional District to celebrate the careers of three dedicated public servants in Centre County.

Last month, Centre County Treasurer Richard Fornicola and Centre County Controller Chuck Witmer served their last day at the Centre County Courthouse and began their much-deserved retirements.

Rich Fornicola began his term as Centre County treasurer in January 2000 and has worked diligently over the past two decades overseeing every penny that was received and disbursed by Centre County, including hunting permits and fishing licenses, as well as overseeing bids for county contracts.

Chuck Witmer has spent 15 years in public service in Centre County, having worked as the deputy controller for just under 4 years before being elected to serve as county controller. Over the years, Chuck has exhibited fantastic leadership that includes overseeing the county ledger, seeing the budget is adhered to, completing the county audit, and more.

This week, Prothonotary and Clerk of Courts Debra Immel will be serving her last day at the courthouse as well. Debra began her career in Centre County in 1976 as a department clerk and quickly rose through the ranks of deputy prothonotary and acting prothonotary. In 1999, Debra was elected to her current position and has served in county government ever since.

Mr. Speaker, together, these individuals have given more than 90 years of

service to Centre County, and they have worked hard to make Centre County a better place to live. I would like to congratulate Rich and Chuck and Debra on their retirements and wish them all the best in their new life chapter.

HONORING THE LIFE AND SERVICE OF COACH JOHN MCKISSICK

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

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of longtime Summerville High School football coach, Hall of Famer, John McKissick, who passed away on Thanksgiving Day.

Coach McKissick was the greatest high school football coach our country has ever seen. In fact, he held the record for the most wins of any football coach anywhere at any single level. Over the course of his 62-year career, he led the Green Wave to 10 State championships and 621 wins.

Coach McKissick was a mentor and a father figure to thousands of student athletes. In total, he coached over 5,000 young men throughout his career.

I had the honor of attending his funeral earlier this week, and I got to meet several of his former players, many in their fifties, sixties, seventies, and even eighties, who all told me about the incredible impact he had on their lives.

He famously told his players that it is not about the Xs and Os; it's about the Jims and the Joes. He called his players his boys. He treated them like family because they were, and that feeling was mutual.

It is impossible to imagine high school football or Summerville without him, but his amazing legacy will live on forever.

May God bless his family, his friends, former players, and the entire Summerville community.

Thank you for everything, Coach.

□ 1015

RECOGNIZING THE NEWBERRY FIRE DEPARTMENT

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

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the heroic actions by members of the Newberry Fire Department.

On March 1, 2019, the alpha shift, comprised of Captain Andrew Morris, Lieutenant Brian Beck, Senior Engineer Benjamin Dukes, firefighter Richard Doran, and volunteer firefighter Barry Brown, were working a wreck on Third Street when they received an urgent call of a hit-and-run incident on Louis Rich Road.

The firefighters responded to the call and found the victim of the hit and run

completely unresponsive. The firefighters immediately performed CPR on the victim and as a result of these actions, the person gained a pulse and began breathing. The brave actions of these dedicated public servants resulted in a life being saved, and in the words of the late Prime Minister of Great Britain Winston Churchill, who said the following: There are times when doing one's best is not good enough. One must do what is required.

The brave firefighters of Newberry Fire Department's alpha shift did what was required, and as a result, a life was saved.

CONGRATULATING SARI FELDMAN ON HER RETIREMENT

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

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize and congratulate Sari Feldman on her recent retirement as the executive director of the Cuyahoga County Public Library.

Ms. Feldman began her tenure at the Cleveland Public Library in 1997 as head of community services, later serving as deputy director. In 2003, Ms. Feldman was named the executive director of the Cuyahoga County Public Library where she oversaw one of the country's busiest public libraries for 16 years.

Ms. Feldman's leadership was instrumental to strengthening the libraries across Cuyahoga County and ensuring they were prepared to engage and serve the community in the 21st century.

Throughout her time as executive director, she directed an expansive \$110 million capital improvement program for the county's libraries and navigated the library system through significant cuts in State funding without reducing hours or service.

From 2015 to 2016, Ms. Feldman also served as the president of the American Library Association, a testament to her importance not only to northeast Ohio but to the entire Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Ms. Feldman for her enduring leadership, service, and dedication to engaging and empowering the Cuyahoga County community.

I congratulate her successor, Tracy Strobel, the new executive director for the Cuyahoga County Public Library.

As a northeast Ohio native with decades of experience, I trust Tracy will continue to advance Cuyahoga County Public Library's mission of being at the center of community life where reading, lifelong learning, and civic engagement thrive.

AMERICANS SHOULD RENEW IN THEIR HEARTS OUR NATION'S MOTTO

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

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, our Nation's motto of "In God We Trust" is

inscribed on the wall above our heads. The word "trust" is typically defined as to have confidence, faith, or hope in someone or something. In this case, it is obviously trust in God.

To have confidence or faith or hope in God requires that we know something about God. This knowledge is gained by reading and studying the inspired word of God, which is, of course the Bible. God has revealed Himself to us in the pages of the Bible, and to trust in God means that we also trust His teachings as revealed in the Bible.

Among those teachings is a prescription for the way we should lead our lives, the way we should treat each other, and how we should rely on God and His teachings to, in fact, trust in Him.

John Adams wrote that only a moral and religious people can self-govern. In my opinion, the morals to which he is referring to are laid out in God's teachings in both the Old Testament and the New Testament of the Bible.

Almost every day we hear someone ask for God's blessings on our Nation. The next time you hear someone ask for God to bless our Nation, please ask yourself what is it about America and our Nation that we are asking God to bless? Just what is there about our Nation that is, in fact, blessable?

Are we asking God to bless the killing of more than 61 million babies in the last 46 years? Are we asking God to bless the rancor and incivility that permeates much of our public discourse? These and other issues cause me to fear that we are on the verge of being an unblessable Nation.

The Old Testament is replete with times when God's chosen people, the Nation of Israel, would stray so far from His teachings that He would subject them to awful events and terrible circumstances to cause them to turn their hearts back to Him. I believe that we are on that same destructive path.

We must ask ourselves what should we do to turn our Nation's heart back to God? There is no legislative fix for this problem. The path to a blessable Nation must start in the heart of each one of us. To return to the moral high ground that has allowed our Nation to prosper under God's blessings, we must each have a moral code to live by.

For me that moral code is the Judeo-Christian code found in God's Word. Jesus Christ is my personal savior, and I try to live his teachings every day. Some days I am better at it than others, but each of us must have a moral code that is based on truth, not on whims or feelings. This awakening must start now.

It can start by claiming God's promise to the Nation of Israel that applies to our Nation, as well. It is found in II Chronicles 7:14, which says: "If my people, who are called by my name will humble themselves and pray and seek my face and turn from their wicked ways," emphasis on wicked ways, "then I will hear them from heaven, and I will forgive their sin, and heal

their land." Each of us individually and our Nation as a whole has never needed that promise more than we need it today.

Mr. Speaker, we should renew in our hearts every day our Nation's motto, "In God We Trust."

DEMOCRACY IS FACING A CONSTITUTIONAL CRISIS

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

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, more than 200 years ago, the delegates of the Constitutional Convention gathered in Philadelphia to help chart a path forward for the newly independent United States of America.

After deliberation, the Framers established a system of government with three equal branches, the legislative, executive, and judiciary, along with a system of checks and balances to ensure no single branch had too much power. After years of control by a foreign power, our Framers understood the importance of self-governance and ensuring no monarch could once again rule over our country.

Now, more than 200 years since the ratification of our Constitution, our democracy faces a constitutional crisis that the Framers never could have imagined. The office of the President of the United States, the most powerful position in the world, yields immense influence with the expectation to use that power in a principled manner.

However, that principled approach has since vanished as self-interest has consumed the Oval Office. In the pursuit of that self-interest, this President has compromised our national security by withholding critical military assistance to Ukraine, military assistance approved by the Congress, the legislative branch, to provide assistance to preserve their sovereignty and counter Russian aggression.

That same system of checks and balances described in the Constitution over 200 years ago is now under attack. The President, as well as the Members of Congress, take an oath of office when stepping into this amazing place of our Republic to be leaders in our country, to protect, to preserve, and defend the Constitution of the United States as long as we hold this office. As part of that oath, it is my constitutional duty to protect the Constitution from all threats, even within our own government.

This June, I announced my support for the House of Representatives to begin an impeachment inquiry. In the 6 months since then, with new details revealed weekly and daily, my support for the House impeachment inquiry has never been stronger. This President has jeopardized our national security to affect an election; no one is above the law, not even the President.

On Tuesday, The House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence

voted to approve a comprehensive report outlining actions regarding Ukraine and the obstruction of justice. For 2 weeks last month, the American people heard various witnesses share their account of the President and the things that were happening in our government.

As an African American I stand here today, Mr. Speaker, and I am very sensitive to any action to oppress my right to vote. My history as an African American in this country causes me to be very alert. Furthermore, the report details a concerted effort by the White House to defy authorized congressional subpoenas for documents, a right the Supreme Court has affirmed Congress possesses.

During the Constitutional Convention, it was noted that Madison rose and asked his colleagues two questions: "Shall any man be above justice? Shall that man be above it who can commit the most extensive injustice?"

With great power comes great responsibility. That responsibility has been ignored, and it has been demonstrated in the office of our President that his only interest is his self-interest and not that which is the best interest of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, Congress will be tasked with making a decision that will likely alter the course of history. However, taking the evidence into account, this is not a difficult decision. When history looks back, I will be one of the Members of Congress who kept my oath, who served and voted to protect, preserve, and defend the Constitution of the United States.

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

RECOGNIZING DRs. LYNN AND SAM COFIELD

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

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in special recognition of my lifelong friends, Drs. Lynn and Sam Cofield of Trigg County, Kentucky, for their remarkable careers and outstanding contributions to their local community and beyond. This year marks their retirement, and I want to congratulate Lynn and Sam for many decades of success.

Lynn and Sam met while attending veterinary school at Auburn University. They married in 1984 and bought the Trigg County Veterinary Clinic located in Cadiz, Kentucky. While practicing veterinary medicine, they also managed a 160-acre farm they called Riverview West. They raised a herd of purebred Charolais cattle and quickly rose to prominence among the cattle industry. Producing and exhibiting Charolais cattle became passions for Lynn and Sam, who continued to expand their influence in the agriculture community.

From 1986 to 1991 Lynn served as Kentucky Junior Charolais Association adviser where I was one of her many students who traveled the livestock show circuit with the Cofield family. Lynn was also active in many organizations over the years ranging from 4-H and FFA to the Kentucky Veterinary Medical Association.

Sam served on the Farm Bureau Board of Directors and the Trigg County Health Department Board. Both Lynn and Sam supplied the Trigg County community with high-quality, honest veterinary medicine until 2019. Their clinic sold in February, and in October they began a hard-earned and much-deserved retirement. In the words of those who know them best, the Cofields are staples in Trigg County and the surrounding communities.

Countless families can tell stories of how the Cofields cared for their pets and livestock from beginning to end. The Cofields let no obstacle prevent them from providing top-notch medical care. Whether in the wee hours of the morning or in the pouring rain, the Cofields were there ready to lend a hand.

Once again, I want to congratulate Drs. Lynn and Sam Cofield on their notable careers and recent retirement. I thank them both for being exceptional leaders in the First Congressional District of Kentucky.

HONORING THE WORK OF THE KENTUCKY MAGISTRATES AND COMMISSIONERS ASSOCIATION

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize the work of the Kentucky Magistrates and Commissioners Association headquartered in Frankfort, Kentucky.

On October 30, 2019, the Association provided over 500 new pairs of shoes to Monroe County schools. The shoes were delivered to my hometown and my former school Tompkinsville Elementary. I am deeply grateful to the elected magistrates and commissioners who made this donation on behalf of the KMCA. Their actions represent the best of the Commonwealth and make me proud to represent one of its six congressional districts.

I want to particularly thank several members of the KMCA from the Monroe County Fiscal Court: Magistrates Jamie Veach, Roger Deckard, Ricky Bartley, Ricky Graves, and Mark Williams, in addition to county judge, Mitchell Page. I also want to thank my good friend, J.C. Young, executive director of the Kentucky Magistrates and Commissioners Association for spearheading the effort.

□ 1030

No child should worry that they might leave the house without adequate footwear, and because of the actions of the Kentucky Magistrates and Commissioners Association, Monroe County's most vulnerable are better off today than they were only a few short weeks ago.

Mr. Speaker, once again, I thank the KMCA for choosing Monroe County and for the time and energy they sacrificed

to improve the everyday lives of dozens of schoolchildren. Their efforts are applauded in Kentucky's First Congressional District.

CONGRATULATING NEW PAL FOOTBALL

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

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the New Palestine High School football team for winning the Indiana high school Class A football state championship. This marks the second year in a row the Dragons have gone undefeated.

I applaud Coach Kyle Ralph, who now has an 88-4 record in his 7-season tenure at New Pal.

I also congratulate the whole team for their hard work in this fantastic accomplishment. Congratulations to all the Dragon nation.

CONGRATULATING EHHS CHEERLEADING

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Eastern Hancock High School cheerleading squad for winning the Indiana Cheer Championship Varsity D division.

After placing fourth at the semi-State competition, the Royals returned to the State competition for a victorious first place win.

The Royal cheerleading squad has displayed dedication, hard work, and sheer talent. They have made the Sixth District very proud.

RECOGNIZING GREENSBURG AG TEACHER GREG SCHNEIDER

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Greensburg Community High School agriculture teacher and FFA adviser Greg Schneider.

Greg Schneider was recently awarded the honorary American FFA degree through his commitment to the advancement of ag education. The degree recognizes those who have gone beyond valuable daily contributions to make a positive difference in the lives of their students.

Congratulations to Greg, who has inspired confidence in a new generation of farmers.

RECOGNIZING SHELBYVILLE CENTRAL SCHOOL'S KRIS BAKER

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Shelbyville Central Schools' special education coordinator, Kris Baker, for winning a prestigious education award.

Kris' work has earned her the 2019 Early Career Special Education Administrator Award. Ms. Baker won the award for her dedication to autism education and assistive technology at Earlywood Educational Services.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Kris for the work she has done for those in need, and I congratulate her on this honor.

CONGRATULATING ANALYTICAL ENGINEERING ON GOLD HIRE VETS MEDALLION AWARD

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Analytical Engineering of Columbus and the May family for receiving the Gold HIRE Vets Medallion

Award from the U.S. Department of Labor.

This marks the second year in a row that Analytical Engineering, Inc., has earned this esteemed award. They were 1 of only 12 companies in Indiana to win this award by hiring and retaining veterans.

As a Beirut veteran myself, I appreciate companies like Analytical Engineering for taking care of those who have served our country.

SEND NDAA TO PRESIDENT

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my Democratic colleagues to stop playing political games and send the NDAA to President Trump's desk.

The NDAA has been a bipartisan piece of legislation that we, as Congress, have passed for 58 straight years. The NDAA is essential for our men and women in uniform and for our National Defense Strategy.

Now, in the final hour, House Democrats want to wedge partisan policies into this bill. As Democrats continue to divide Congress over nondefense issues, they play right into the hands of our enemies.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to stop indulging in this political theater and pass the NDAA.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 34 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

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

PRAYER

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

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

Once again we come to You to ask wisdom, patience, peace, and understanding for the Members of this people's House.

Give them the generosity of heart and the courage of true leadership to work toward a common solution to the many issues facing our Nation.

As true statesmen and -women, may they find fortitude to make judgments to benefit all Americans in their time of need.

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

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's pro-

ceedings and announces to the House her approval thereof.

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SCHNEIDER) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. SCHNEIDER led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

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

WE ARE RUNNING OUT OF TIME

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

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Madam Speaker, climate change is an immediate and existential threat to our national security, economy, and the future we leave to our children.

This is a global problem that requires urgent international solutions, but the Trump administration is dangerously squandering this crucial moment. Quite simply, we are running out of time.

By formally beginning withdrawal from the Paris climate agreement, the President is ceding American leadership on climate and actively undermining critical efforts to curb emissions and transition to a clean energy economy.

As signatory countries around the world meet this week for a conference in Madrid, I am introducing a resolution, joined by more than 100 of my House colleagues as original cosponsors, condemning the administration's actions. This resolution sends a strong message that the House opposes the President's reckless, irresponsible decision to abandon the climate agreement, and we stand ready to fulfill the commitments that our Nation made under the Paris Agreement to address the climate threat.

I urge my colleagues to join me in this clear call for global action and critically needed U.S. leadership.

WAGES ARE RISING IN SOUTH CAROLINA

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, yesterday, Jessica Holdman with The Post and Courier reported that wages in South Carolina

rose faster than expected this year and will continue to rise. I was alerted to this by Gary David and Christopher Thompson on WVOC by iHeartRadio. I am grateful for President Donald Trump's actions to increase wages by reducing taxes and regulations.

According to Doug Woodward, economist with the University of South Carolina's Darla Moore School of Business, this is the best job market we have seen in a generation. USC economist Joey Von Nessen says, "workers are in high demand right now, and we are seeing strong wage growth as a result. This includes wage growth for workers across the pay scale, with those on the lower end benefiting the most."

By creating jobs, raising wages, and consistently working to promote opportunities, President Trump is continuing his record of keeping his promises. I am grateful that President Trump is focused to work for American families and jobs, despite the failed Russian hoax and today the impeachment hoax.

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

CUTS TO SNAP AFFECT EVERYONE

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

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Madam Speaker, I want to talk about the administration's move to cut hundreds of thousands of people from SNAP, our Nation's safety net for those faced with food insecurity.

By the USDA's own estimates, nearly 700,000 people will be hurt by this policy. 700,000, that is appalling. That is 700,000 people who will struggle to feed themselves while they work towards getting back on their feet. That is 700,000 people who will have to decide whether to pay their bills or go hungry.

But this doesn't just affect those who will be cut from the food assistance program, this affects everyone. SNAP dollars are spent in local small businesses and help bring money to struggling communities. Simply put, this rule will make more people go hungry and hurt our communities in the process.

In Congress, we worked together on this issue. We reached a consensus, and we passed bipartisan legislation. So this policy is not what we passed, and it is not what the American people want. I am calling on this administration to stop this cruel policy.

RECOGNIZING BITTLE PORTERFIELD

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

Mr. CLINE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to memorialize Roanoke businessman Mr. Bittle Porterfield, III,

who contributed greatly to the arts, education, and business community throughout southwest Virginia.

Among the many civic leadership roles held during his lifetime, Mr. Porterfield served on the Virginia Council on Higher Education, was president of the Taubman Museum of Art, and the Roanoke Valley Chamber of Commerce in addition to being chairman of both the Roanoke Valley Business Council and the United Way of Roanoke Valley.

Mr. Porterfield believed in Roanoke's potential and knew that the Star City could play a pivotal role in cultural development. As a veteran, a Roanoke native, and an innate leader, Mr. Porterfield believed that it was his life's purpose to serve others and his community.

I am grateful for the commitment and passion Bittle Porterfield had for the Roanoke Valley and wish to extend my deepest sympathies to his family for their loss. May they find peace in knowing that his legacy of service will live on through the countless lives he touched.

CALLING ATTENTION TO LYME DISEASE

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

Mr. DELGADO. Madam Speaker, I rise today to call attention to an urgent issue in upstate New York. Lyme and tick-borne diseases are deeply prevalent in my district, New York 19, and across the country.

From 2007 to 2017, Lyme disease cases rose by 78 percent in my district. Approximately half of adult deer ticks in the State carry the bacteria that causes Lyme disease. We should be doing all we can to address this and invest in more effective ways to both diagnose and treat this disease.

That is why this week, I, along with fellow members of the bipartisan Lyme Disease Caucus, introduced legislation to supplement congressionally appropriated funding for research with the Stamp Out Lyme Disease Act. Our bill would create a postage stamp to raise awareness about the disease and directly support medical research to treat and cure tick-borne illnesses.

I urge the House to take up this legislation and move us closer to a cure.

RECOGNIZING THE REPEAL OF PROHIBITION

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the repeal of prohibition. On this day in 1933, the 21st Amendment was ratified, ending the prohibition of alcohol.

Today, throughout Pennsylvania, breweries, wineries, and distilleries

have become one of the Commonwealth's fastest growing industries, and quite frankly, agri-businesses. Pennsylvania is home to more than 300 wineries, which produce more than 1.6 million gallons of wine each year. This equates to roughly \$1.4 billion in economic impact.

Recently, Woody Lodge Winery, a disabled veteran and female-owned business from Cambria County, racked up six awards at the Atlantic Seaboard Wine Association competition, including two best-in-category awards.

The craft beer industry is also booming. Each year, craft brewers pump nearly \$6 billion into Pennsylvania's economy and are responsible for more than 100,000 jobs and generate \$2.2 billion in wages. For the past three years, Pennsylvania has been the number one producer of craft beer in the Nation.

As we look back on 13 long years of prohibition in this country, let's raise a glass to how far we have come in the 86 years since.

THE AMERICAN PEOPLE STAND BEHIND THE INTERNATIONAL FIGHT TO COMBAT CLIMATE CHANGE

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

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Madam Speaker, this past week I had the privilege to join Speaker PELOSI and several of my colleagues at the 2019 United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change in Madrid, commonly known as COP25.

Our visit sent a message: No matter what the current President says or does, the American people stand behind the international fight to combat climate change. We are still in.

Our only chance to stop the climate crisis is for the entire world to come together on solutions to stop pollution, protect public health, and build a clean energy economy. I was greatly encouraged and reinvigorated by the world leaders I met in Madrid who were deeply passionate and understand the urgency in finding ways forward on this global crisis.

I pledge to bring that passion back to the House as a member of the Select Committee on the Climate Crisis as we continue our work to put together an action plan for both Congress and our country.

□ 1215

HONORING MAHANTONGO VALLEY FARM FOR WHITE HOUSE CHRISTMAS TREE

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

Mr. MEUSER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Mahantongo Valley Farm owners Larry and Joanne Snyder, who reside in Pennsylvania's

Ninth District and whose farm is located in Schuylkill and Northumberland Counties.

One of their beautiful Christmas trees was selected by the President and First Lady to adorn the Blue Room in the White House during this holiday season.

The Snyder's magnificent 23-foot Douglas fir was personally delivered last week by the Snyder family to the White House, where they were greeted by First Lady Melania Trump.

Mahantongo Valley Farms has been in the Snyder family for over 200 years, but this is the first time one of their trees has won the National Christmas Tree Contest. There are over 13,000 Christmas tree farms across the country, making this a truly remarkable accomplishment.

Madam Speaker, I would like to thank the Snyder family for their contribution to this wonderful Christmas tradition and for making Pennsylvania and particularly Pennsylvania's Ninth District very proud.

ADDRESS URGENT PRIORITIES OF AMERICA

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

Mr. CICILLINE. Madam Speaker, it has been less than a year since Democrats took back the majority in the House. In that short time, we have passed nearly 400 bills to get government working for the people again, by increasing access to quality, affordable healthcare and protecting coverage for preexisting conditions; by raising family wages; by making bold investments in rebuilding our Nation's infrastructure; and by cleaning up corruption in Washington and getting the government to work for the people again.

We have sent more than 275 bipartisan bills to the Senate, where MITCH MCCONNELL is refusing to vote on them. These bills include legislation to protect and strengthen coverage for preexisting conditions, to ensure equal pay for equal work, and to fight back against the debilitating effects of climate change and ban offshore drilling.

We also voted to give 33 million Americans a long-overdue pay raise by raising the minimum wage, provide Gold Star families with much-needed tax relief, and secure our Nation's elections.

Yet, MITCH MCCONNELL has described himself as the "grim reaper" and won't take up any of this legislation.

We are busy doing the work of the American people. We have passed over 375 bipartisan bills that are sitting in the Senate. It is time for the Senate to take up these bills and address the urgent priorities of the American people.

HONORING TREVON TYLER

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

Ms. STEVENS. Madam Speaker, last week, tragedy struck the South Lyon community in Oakland County, Michigan, as we learned of the death of Trevon Tyler.

Just 17 years old, Trevon died from complications following knee surgery.

Trevon was a beloved member of the South Lyon community and a member of the South Lyon East High School football team.

His coach called him “the nicest, most fun-loving, caring kid.” He “walked with a pretty big pep in his step. He always said hi to everybody. Everybody loved him. He was a little bit of a jokester, had this big laugh, always made you smile.”

Trevon’s incredible family, friends, classmates, and teammates are all heartbroken by his passing. His life was cut tragically short, but he will always be remembered by that smile, his laugh, his friendship, and his contributions to our community.

Today, we are called to live our lives more like Tre, with joy and love at the forefront.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. SEWELL of Alabama) laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, December 5, 2019.

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

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on December 5, 2019, at 9:04 a.m.:

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 5277.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

CHERYL L. JOHNSON.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4, VOTING RIGHTS ADVANCEMENT ACT OF 2019, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. RES. 326, EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES REGARDING UNITED STATES EFFORTS TO RESOLVE THE ISRAELI-PALESTINIAN CONFLICT THROUGH A NEGOTIATED TWO-STATE SOLUTION

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 741 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 741

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 4) to amend the Voting Rights Act of 1965 to revise the criteria for determining which States and political sub-

divisions are subject to section 4 of the Act, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary now printed in the bill, modified by the amendment printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the resolution (H. Res. 326) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding United States efforts to resolve the Israeli-Palestinian conflict through a negotiated two-state solution. The amendments to the resolution and the preamble recommended by the Committee on Foreign Affairs now printed in the resolution, modified by the amendments printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, shall be considered as adopted. The resolution, as amended, shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution and preamble, as amended, to adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

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

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

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Speaker, on Wednesday, the Rules Committee met and reported a rule, House Resolution 741, providing for consideration of two measures.

First, the rule provides for consideration of H.R. 4, the Voting Rights Advancement Act of 2019, under a closed rule. The rule self-executes a manager’s amendment offered by Chairman NADLER and provides 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking member of the Committee on the Judiciary. The rule provides one motion to recommit.

Additionally, the rule provides for consideration of H. Res. 326, expressing

the sense of the House of Representatives regarding United States efforts to resolve the Israeli-Palestinian conflict through a negotiated two-state solution, under a closed rule.

The rule self-executes two manager’s amendments offered by Chairman ENGEL. The rule provides for 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Madam Speaker, the Voting Rights Act of 1965 is one of the great legislative achievements of American history. It is perhaps the greatest single statute of the 20th century, in a century of great statutes, including the National Labor Relations Act and the Fair Labor Standards Act.

But the Voting Rights Act was born out of the blood, sweat, and tears of the American civil rights movement; in the wake of Freedom Summer; in the murders of Schwerner, Chaney, Goodman, and other civil rights heroes; and in the after the famous March on Washington, where Dr. King made his “I Have a Dream” speech.

The Voting Rights Act transformed American politics by bringing into our elections millions of voters who had been disenfranchised for a century after the Civil War ended. It changed the nature of politics in the Deep South and across the United States, and it changed the politics of the United States Congress as well.

Theoretically, the 13th, 14th, and 15th Amendments had solved the problem of disenfranchisement after the Civil War. The 13th Amendment abolished slavery; the 14th Amendment established equal protection; and the 15th Amendment banned discrimination in voting. But after the dismantling of reconstruction, African Americans were subjected to a regime of disenfranchisement that included violence, terror, grandfather clauses, literacy tests, poll taxes, and an ever-expanding panoply of devices, tricks, and tactics to keep Black people from being able to register to vote and to participate in elections.

The civil rights movement and President Lyndon Johnson fought for the Voting Rights Act, which passed in 1965 and which included a package of strong remedies targeting discriminatory voting practices and devices in the areas where discrimination was most egregious and virulent.

A key component of the Voting Rights Act was section 5, the preclearance requirement, which compelled covered States—that is, the States to which it applied—to stop discriminating and to subject all changes in their voting practices to the Department of Justice or to the United States District Court for the District of Columbia.

States were covered if they had used illegal voting discrimination devices like literacy tests, poll taxes, and character exams, and if fewer than 50 percent of the people were registered to vote or allowed to participate.

The Voting Rights Act was challenged immediately in litigation called *South Carolina v. Katzenbach*, but in 1966, the Supreme Court rejected arguments that the Voting Rights Act violated the Constitution.

The Supreme Court said Congress may use any rational means to effectuate the constitutional prohibition on race discrimination in voting. It upheld the preclearance requirement against attack.

Specifically, it was said by South Carolina that it violated the so-called equal footing doctrine, but the Supreme Court said that the equal footing doctrine applied to the admission of States and not to the Congress' power under section 5 of the 14th Amendment or section 2 of the 15th Amendment.

All of this worked for the Voting Rights Act to usher in a new era of real democracy in America. The preclearance requirement meant that the States, counties, and jurisdictions that had been discriminating had to submit to the Department of Justice or to Federal court their plans for changes. That worked to enfranchise millions of voters across America. It worked for the election of thousands of African American elected officials at the local, State, and Federal levels.

The genius of section 5 was that jurisdictions had to submit potentially discriminatory changes before the harm took place. Anybody can go ahead and sue under section 2 after an election is over, but then it is too late because the harm has already been done, the election has taken place. So even if you win in court, the court is not going to order a rerun of the election. It is not going to require all the voting to take place again, so it is too late at that point.

Section 5 puts the burden on the potentially discriminating parties to prove that they are not discriminating when they make changes in voting laws.

It works all the way up until 2013, when the Supreme Court rendered its 5-4 decision in *Shelby County v. Holder*. The *Shelby County* case struck down the section 4(b) formula for which States were covered, declaring that this formula was now out-of-date because it went back many, many decades to the 1960s and 1970s and that the Congress would need to update the formula to address current needs in the field and to show that the formula relates to the current problems that we are targeting.

The Court said specifically that coverage was based on decades-old data and eradicated practices, like literacy tests, which don't exist anymore. So when it got struck down, dozens of States and counties that were previously required to preclear changes related to voting didn't have to do it anymore, and they began very quickly, almost instantly, to roll back various kinds of voter protections and to pass strict voter identification laws, to pass

massive voter purges, to implement cuts to early voting, to close polling places, and so on.

I am going to read from one of the witnesses who testified before the House Judiciary Committee, Kristen Clarke, the president and executive director of the Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights, who said:

"We have vetted complaints from tens of thousands of voters in Shelby, many revealing systemic voting discrimination. In short, this is how Shelby has impacted our democracy."

"First, we have seen the resurgence of discriminatory voting practices, some motivated by intentional discrimination, and this discrimination has been most intense in the very jurisdictions that were once covered by section 5. They range from the consolidation of polling sites to make it less convenient for minority voters to vote to the curtailing of early voting hours, the purging of minority voters from the rolls under the pretext of list maintenance, strict photo ID requirements, abuse of signature match verification requirements . . . , the threat of criminal prosecution, and more."

□ 1230

"Second, we have seen increased levels of recalcitrants in hostility among elected officials who institute and reinstitute discriminatory voting changes with impunity. . . ."

"Third, the loss of public notice regarding changes in voting practices that could have a discriminatory effect is significant. . . ."

"Fourth, the public no longer has the ability to participate in the process of reviewing practices before they take effect. . . ."

"Fifth, the preclearance process had an identifiable deterrent effect that is now lost."

"Sixth, the status quo is not sustainable. Civil rights organizations are stepping up to fill the void created by the *Shelby* decision at insurmountable expense."

"And finally, this will be the first redistricting cycle in decades" in which redistricting takes place without the Voting Rights Act.

That is one example of testimony that we got from all over America about what the *Shelby County v. Holder* decision meant by dismantling section 5 by knocking out section 4(b) of the Voting Rights Act.

H.R. 4 is doing precisely what the Supreme Court invited us to do in the *Shelby County* decision: to pass a new coverage formula for the Civil Rights Act preclearance requirement based on new data in a new formula designed to address current contemporary problems.

The Judiciary Committee and the House Administration Committee had a combined total of 17 hearings: 9 on the Judiciary side with its Subcommittee on the Constitution, Civil Rights and Civil Liberties, and 8 in the House Administration Committee's

Subcommittee on Elections. They heard about restrictive and discriminatory practices taking place in numerous States across the country, including Texas and Georgia, where, after the end of preclearance, Georgia voters faced a myriad of new voting barriers, including the closure of more than 200 precinct polling places, spoiled voter registration materials, purging of more than 1 million voters in a racially discriminatory way, restrictive voter ID laws, systematic rejection of absentee ballots, and more.

We also looked in North Carolina, which passed a so-called monster voter suppression law, which resulted in race discrimination in accessing the polls, including the closure of dozens of polling sites and long voting lines. The law eliminated same-day voter registration, reduced early voting by a week, curtailed satellite polling sites for elderly and disabled voters, and so on.

Madam Speaker, this legislation is the product of massive legislative inspection of voting conditions across the United States of America today, and it threads the needle that was offered to us by the Supreme Court in the *Shelby County* decision by amending the Voting Rights Act to revise the section 4(b) criteria and providing other voter protections at the same time.

Specifically, the bill creates a new coverage formula that applies to all States and hinges on a finding of repeated voting violations in the preceding 25 years.

It establishes a process for reviewing voting changes in jurisdictions nationwide, focused on a limited set of measures such as voter ID laws and the reduction of multilingual voting materials; it requires reasonable public notice for voting changes; it allows the Attorney General authority to request Federal observers; and it increases accessibility and protection for Native American and Alaska Native voters.

Just turning, now, to H.R. 326, for more than 20 years, American Presidents from both political parties and Israeli Prime Ministers have supported reaching a two-state solution that establishes a democratic Palestinian state to coexist peacefully and constructively side by side with a democratic Israel.

Middle East peace talks have favored the two-state solution and opposed settlement expansions, moves towards unilateral annexation of territories, and efforts to arrive at Palestinian statehood outside the framework of negotiations with Israel.

In 2002, President Bush stated: "My vision is two states, living side by side in peace and security."

In 2013, President Obama reiterated this exact same commitment, stating that: "Negotiations will be necessary, but there is little secret about where they must lead—two states for two peoples."

This resolution emphasizes the sentiment of the past 20 years of peace talks

by expressing the sense of this House of Representatives that only a two-state solution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict can ensure Israel's survival as a secure democratic state and fulfill the legitimate aspirations for a secure and democratic Palestinian state. It further expresses the sense that any U.S. proposal that fails to endorse a two-state solution will put a peaceful end to the conflict only further out of reach.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I thank Representative RASKIN for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Madam Speaker, the right to vote is of paramount importance in our Republic. We all agree on that. Prohibitions against discriminatory barriers to the right to vote have been grounded in Federal law since the Civil War and, more recently, through the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

We all agree: Discrimination should have no place in our voting system. However, the majority would have us believe that the Voting Rights Act does not prevent any of this and would rather pass this partisan legislation for a Federal takeover of elections.

I anticipate that the 2013 Supreme Court case *Shelby County v. Holder* will be brought up many times today, but I would like to point out to my Democratic colleagues that, in that decision, the Supreme Court only struck down one outdated provision of the Voting Rights Act.

This provision, section 4(b), was struck down because it was outdated as it had not been updated since 1975, and it violated principles of equal State sovereignty and federalism. H.R. 4 is, quite simply, unconstitutional, as the Supreme Court had held that Federal control over local elections is allowed only when there is proof of discriminatory treatment in voting.

Further, I believe it is important to point out that other very important provisions of the Voting Rights Act remain in place, including section 2 and section 3.

Section 2 applies nationwide and prohibits voting practices or procedures that discriminate on the basis of race, color, or the ability to speak English. Section 2 is enforced through Federal lawsuits just like every other Federal civil rights law, and the United States and civil rights organizations have brought many cases to enforce the guarantees of section 2 in court, and they may do so in the future, as well.

Section 3 of the Voting Rights Act also remains in place. This section authorizes Federal courts to impose preclearance requirements on States and political subdivisions that have enacted voting procedures that treat people differently based on race in violation of the 14th and 15th Amendments.

If a Federal court finds a State or a political subdivision to have treated people differently based on race, then

the court has discretion now to retain supervisory jurisdiction and impose preclearance requirements as they see fit until a future date at the court's discretion. This is all valid now without this bill.

Section 3 has been utilized recently, in fact. U.S. District Judge Lee Rosensthal issued an opinion in a redistricting case that required that the city of Pasadena, Texas, be monitored by the Justice Department because it had intentionally changed its city council districts to decrease Hispanic influence.

States should be allowed to implement their own laws regarding their elections and voting security to ensure all results are accurate on election day. State and local governments know more about how to handle their elections than bureaucrats in Washington, D.C.

I applaud State and local governments that are taking the necessary steps to modernize and secure their elections. For example, in Arizona, my home State, we have made continual progress on improving voter turnout and participation.

Mr. RASKIN said that the section that was taken out by the courts was genius. Well, I believe the opposite is true.

Arizona was under this outdated preclearance formula, and I can tell you personally that this section was not genius. Both Arizona Democrats and Republicans, alike, thought to have to preclear every single decision that elected election officials made with the Federal bureaucrats in Washington, D.C., was a total disaster.

Arizona now has free, open, and secure elections, despite not being under this Federal control preclearance anymore. Nearly 80 percent of Arizonans vote by mail. We have a robust online voter registration system, so it is easy to register to vote. We have approximately 1 month of early voting.

While Arizona has made voting easier and more accessible for voters, we have also made our elections more secure by outlining the practice of ballot harvesting. In Arizona, we believe it should be easy to vote and hard to cheat. The policies in Arizona seem to be working, as we have seen in election after election that voter turnout continues to grow.

A couple months ago, I had the opportunity to participate in a field hearing in Phoenix, Arizona, to discuss the Voting Rights Act. There, I spoke with staff of the Maricopa County Recorder, an elected Democrat. She relayed to me how disappointed they were to not have been asked to testify at this hearing as they felt that they had not been able to speak to the story of the successes in Arizona and why they were very concerned about H.R. 4. They did not want the Federal Government preclearing every single decision they made.

Think about it: They don't want to have to go back to the Federal Govern-

ment every single time they change early ballots or voting locations. They, instead, are making great progress and strides. Voter turnout has soared. They don't want bureaucrats in Washington, D.C., slowing down important and time-sensitive decisions.

This rule also includes H. Res. 326.

I am curious why my Democratic colleagues decided to bring forward this nonbinding resolution as opposed to bringing up H.R. 336, a bill that I am personally a proud cosponsor of, which is identical to the text of S. 1, the Strengthening America's Security in the Middle East Act of 2019, which passed the Senate by a vote of 77-23—totally bipartisan—on February 5, 2019. Instead of the nonbinding resolution we have before us today, H.R. 336 would take concrete steps to counter the BDS movement against Israel.

□ 1245

Instead, I am saddened the Democrats brought up this resolution, a resolution that rebukes and ties the hands of the Trump administration and embarrasses Israel. In fact, the resolution expressly states a proposal must be put forward that is consistent with previous administrations' proposals, completely undercutting the Trump administration. This should not be a partisan issue with only Democrat sponsors and not one Republican cosponsor as this bill has. We should not be handicapping our President.

My Republican colleagues on the Foreign Affairs Committee tell me that a resolution that supports a two-state solution, without attempting to undermine the President, could have been bipartisan. However, this resolution singles out settlement expansion and annexation. These are some of the most delicate issues in our bilateral relationship with Israel, and it shines a spotlight on them in the middle of an ongoing and contentious time in Israel.

The resolution spells out specific Palestinian Authority demands without listing critical Israeli preconditions, such as acknowledging Israel's right to exist as a Jewish state with an undivided Jerusalem as Israel's capital and providing assurances for Israel's safety and security through a demilitarized zone.

As a whole, this resolution disproportionately criticizes the Israeli Government while failing to recognize the dangerous actions targeting innocent Israelis that further remove the possibility of peace.

We already voted to support a two-state solution over the summer in H. Res. 246 in a bipartisan manner.

So why do we need this partisan bill?

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

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. My good friend from Arizona chides me for having described section 5, the preclearance requirement of the Voting Rights Act, as genius, which is amazing to me because this has been a bipartisan national commitment and a

bipartisan commitment in Congress since 1965 when it passed on a bipartisan basis, since 1982 when it was reauthorized on a bipartisan basis, and since 2006 when President Bush signed it, as well, and celebrated it.

So we have had Presidents Bush, Clinton, and Obama, a continuous array of Presidents, supporting it, and Congresses supporting it.

If you don't have it, here is what happens: The NAACP Legal Defense Fund testified to us about successful litigation they had in Texas against a restrictive voter ID law that had discriminatory racial impact. They won on the lawsuit under section 2, but it was too late.

In the meantime, who was elected in Texas?

A U.S. Senator, all 36 Members of the House of Representatives, a Governor, a lieutenant governor, and so on.

The reason why section 5 is genius and why we need to restore the preclearance formula is because it requires States to submit in advance laws that could be potentially discriminatory.

I was amazed to hear again the language of federalizing control and a Federal takeover of elections when this has been a bipartisan commitment for decades grounded in the Constitution of the United States which tells us in Article I, Section 4 we can regulate elections; Section 2 of the Fifteenth Amendment saying we can regulate elections to prevent race discrimination; Section 5 of the Fourteenth Amendment, and the republican Guarantee Clause, which tells us we must guarantee to people of the States a republican form of government, which means representative government based on democracy.

Finally, I will allow my friend to portray what is going on in her State her way, and she paints a lovely picture. I would just refer her to page 25 of the Judiciary Committee report which says that in Arizona polling places were closed throughout the State, many with significant populations of Latino voters, in advance of the 2016 election. Maricopa County, 31 percent Latino, closed 171 polling places, Mohave County closed 34, and so on. So there is another story to be told there which is embodied in the work.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GOTTHEIMER).

Mr. GOTTHEIMER. Madam Speaker, I thank Mr. RASKIN for yielding me time.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the rule which adopts bipartisan language which I introduced with my good friends, Congressman TOM REED and Congressman TED DEUTCH, reaffirming the United States' ironclad commitment to providing security assistance to our historic ally, Israel, which, as ever, is key to America's national security in the region, especially in our fight against terror.

This vote officially puts to rest the splinter view of adding new conditions

on aid to Israel and reinforces our historic commitment to restoring a two-state solution.

I want to thank my good friend, House Foreign Affairs Committee Chairman ELIOT ENGEL, for his leadership on this issue and for including our language in his manager's amendment.

Madam Speaker, as we have seen in recent weeks, Israel, the democracy in the region, faces threats like no other country of missile and rocket attacks from terrorist organizations, including Hamas, Hezbollah, and Palestinian Islamic Jihad, as well as the ongoing threat of Iranian-backed forces in Syria.

Vital security assistance to Israel, including missile defense funding for Iron Dome, David's Sling, and Arrow 3, helps our ally to defend itself and preserve its qualitative military edge in the region. That is why in 2016 under the Obama administration, the U.S. and Israel signed a 10-year Memorandum of Understanding which constituted the single largest pledge of security assistance to Israel in America history. The MOU also increased the amount of defense dollars that go to U.S. businesses here at home, with as much as \$1.2 billion a year invested in the United States.

We know that this aid helps save countless lives, and we know that the United States is better off when Israel is fully equipped to defend itself. That is why I led a bipartisan amendment with my colleagues, Congressman REED and Congressman DEUTCH, which reaffirms our commitment to providing this assistance without additional conditions or exceptions.

Our amendment was cosponsored by a total of 36 Members of Congress, Republicans and Democrats, who know that this assistance should not be subject to politics. I deeply appreciate all of our colleagues' support for our amendment, for this vital, lifesaving assistance, and for the bipartisan U.S.-Israel relationship.

This language is absolutely necessary because of the extreme and misguided views of some, especially several currently running for our Nation's highest office, who seemingly believe that assistance to Israel should be held hostage until Israel makes concessions according to their beliefs, including how Israel treats Gaza, which is controlled by the foreign terrorist organization Hamas.

We must stand together in rejecting that harmful view—as one Senator called it, the view of having leverage against Israel, our ally.

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

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Speaker, I yield the gentleman from New Jersey 10 additional seconds.

Mr. GOTTHEIMER. Madam Speaker, when our ally, Israel, faces more than 450 rockets fired by Palestinian and Jihad terrorists in Gaza, it must have the ability to defend itself, no matter what.

That is why with this vote we commit ourselves to strengthening the U.S.-Israel relationship by ensuring that we fulfill our guarantee to provide vital security assistance to the key democracy in the region.

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

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS).

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I thank my good friend, Mrs. LESKO, for her participation in the Election Subcommittee hearing in Phoenix.

Also, Madam Speaker, I want to thank you personally for your hard work in making sure that every person throughout this great Nation gets that opportunity to vote and for your work in furthering civil discussion and civil rights in your career.

Madam Speaker, I do rise in opposition to the rule for H.R. 4 today.

The Voting Rights Act is currently in place. The bill that we will be debating tomorrow is not a reauthorization of this important and historically bipartisan legislation that has prevented discrimination at the ballot box.

It has only been since the U.S. Supreme Court decision in *Shelby County v. Holder* that Democrats have decided to politicize the Voting Rights Act. This landmark decision left the vast majority of the Voting Rights Act in place.

What it struck down was 40-year-old data and the formula used to determine which States were to be placed under the control of the Department of Justice, known as preclearance. The Supreme Court deemed this data and formula was no longer accurate nor relevant for our country's current climate.

The 2013 opinion held that regardless of how to look at the record, no one can fairly say that it shows anything approaching the pervasive, flagrant, widespread, and rampant discrimination that faced Congress in 1965, and that clearly distinguished the covered jurisdictions from the rest of the Nation.

So what does H.R. 4 do?

It doubles down and would attempt to put every State and jurisdiction under preclearance. This is a bill to federalize elections, regardless of what my colleagues have said in this institution today. During last night's Rules Committee meeting, it became clear that the majority was unable to determine the number of States or jurisdictions that would be covered by this preclearance if H.R. 4 were to become law tomorrow. Apparently, we have to pass this bill before the American people can even find out if they would be subjected to it.

This is a proposition that the majority knows is bad policy, and it is a non-starter for myself, my colleagues in this Chamber, and those in the other body across this Capitol, the Supreme Court, too, but perhaps most importantly, the thousands of local election

officials across the country who would be crippled if this bill were to ever become law.

H.R. 4, the Voting Rights Advancement Act, is not a Voting Rights Act reauthorization bill. This is only about preclearance and the Democratic majority giving the Department of Justice control over all election activity.

While it is not in my committee's jurisdiction in the House Administration Committee, our Subcommittee on Elections majority held seven field hearings and one listening session across the U.S., encompassing eight different States and over 13,000 miles of air travel. Even with this gargantuan effort, the Democrats were still unable to produce a single voter who wanted to vote and was unable to cast a ballot.

This is a great thing. We ought to celebrate it. Credit should be given to the Voting Rights Act for helping to achieve this. The 2018 midterm election produced the highest voting turnout in four decades according to data from the Census Bureau, especially among minority voters. That, again, should be celebrated.

Sections 2 and 3 of the Voting Rights Act that are currently in effect are continuing to safeguard the public from discrimination at the ballot box. Every eligible American who wants to vote in our country's elections should be able to cast a ballot. That is why we have the Voting Rights Act, a great example of a bipartisan solution that is working to help Americans today and protecting Americans from discrimination.

Unfortunately, H.R. 4 is just a political attempt from the Democrats to give the Federal Government more control over how States run their elections. I have now seen four voting bills from the majority come to this floor. All of them have one common theme, and that is to federalize elections.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this rule.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Alabama (Ms. SEWELL), who has been such a magnificent leader on this legislation.

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, today I proudly rise to support the rule on H.R. 4, the Voting Rights Advancement Act of 2019.

Voting rights are primal. They are the cornerstone of our democracy. No right is more precious to our citizenship than the right of all Americans to be able to vote. When Americans are not able to cast their ballots, their votes are silenced, and we, especially as elected officials, should be alarmed if any American who wants to cast a ballot is unable to cast a ballot.

What H.R. 4 does is it restores the Voting Rights Act of 1965 by giving a new coverage formula. In fact, the Roberts Court specifically said in striking down section 4(b) that it was outdated. So H.R. 4 is our effort, the efforts of three committees, hours of testimony, lots and lots of stakeholders, and lots

and lots of people who were American citizens not able to vote; it is that effort that led to a narrowly tailored new coverage formula. That new coverage formula does not look back to the 1960s or to the 1970s. It looks back 25 years, that is 1994 and going forward.

It requires adjudicated violations of voter discrimination. It is narrowly tailored, and it hits the mark as to what the Supreme Court requires us to do in saying that Congress could feel free to update its coverage formula.

The Supreme Court and Roberts, in his opinion, also said that voter discrimination still existed. It admitted that it still existed. And H.R. 4 is our effort to actually provide a modern-day voter coverage formula that will allow States and jurisdictions with the most egregious forms of discrimination to be required to preclear.

□ 1300

The Shelby v. Holder decision originated out of Shelby County, Alabama. I am honored every day to represent Alabama's Seventh Congressional District. It is a district that knows all too well the importance of voting.

You see, my district includes not only Birmingham and Montgomery but my hometown of Selma, Alabama. It was on a bridge in my hometown that our colleague JOHN LEWIS and so many other foot soldiers bled on that bridge for the equal right of all Americans to be able to vote.

This is exactly what H.R. 4 does. It restores the full protections of the Voting Rights Act of 1965. In so doing, it provides a mechanism by which the most egregious States and localities must preclear before the elections. It is so hard to unring the bell once an election has already taken place. So section 2, while it has been used to litigate and to get good results, it only can occur after the election has taken place.

So I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that this is not only an important piece of legislation for our Nation to ensure that every American—American—who has the ability, who is 18 years of age or older, has the right to access a ballot box.

It is clear to me that since the Shelby v. Holder decision, so many States have now instituted voter discrimination laws. Some of them have been in the guise of voter fraud, but the Brennan Center and so many others have found that voter fraud happens minusculely in any election.

It is not about voter fraud. It is about voter suppression, suppressing the voices of certain Americans. And that is un-American, Mr. Speaker.

Just the 2018 midterm elections alone highlight the voter discrimination that occurred.

In Georgia, the Republican candidate for Governor used his power as secretary of state to put 53,000 voter registrations on hold, nearly 70 percent of which belonged to African American voters.

In North Dakota, Republicans established a new requirement that voters must show an ID that they live at a residential street address. It was not enough that they had a P.O. Box. That law was a barrier to thousands of Native Americans who live on reservations and use P.O. Boxes rather than residential street addresses.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DOGGETT). The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman.

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, as my colleague from Maryland has shown, in Maricopa County, Arizona, which I think is where the gentlewoman is from, there is still voter discrimination.

Mr. Speaker, this is a seminal piece of legislation that will restore rights for the people. All of us, Republicans and Democrats, should be about making sure it is easier to vote, not harder to vote.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote for the rule and the underlying legislation, H.R. 4.

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ZELDIN), my good friend.

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Arizona for yielding me time and for her strong opposition to this rule.

Let's be clear, H. Res. 326 is a one-sided, partisan, and ill-timed resolution. This past summer, Members of this Chamber came to the floor and passed, almost unanimously, a very strong statement opposing the Boycott, Divestment and Sanctions movement, as well as much of the language that is in this resolution, H. Res. 326. This is actually a watered-down version of what we passed last summer. There is nothing in this resolution that we didn't already pass almost unanimously last summer.

So, what happened? We woke up the day after that resolution passed last summer, and the Republicans wanted to pass legislation with teeth. I know that we have a lot of strong, bipartisan support for passing legislation with teeth, S.1/H.R. 336, legislation that already passed the Senate with almost 80 votes. But, unfortunately, for some of my colleagues, they woke up the next day and instead of wanting to pass legislation with teeth that would do something about it, do something about that strong statement that we made, we have been seeing this resolution passed as the main effort for the second half of this year.

In the last 2 years, Israel has been hit by over 2,600 rockets and mortars, and 1,500 of those rockets were fired from the Gaza Strip into Israel in the past year alone. Last week, every headline in the region was about Israel being bombarded with over 450 rockets, and that was just one moment in time.

This resolution fails to not only recognize these latest attacks but all the

persistent assaults on innocent Israelis by Palestinian terrorists. Notice this resolution is reprimanding Israel, but it says nothing about Palestinian terrorists.

My friend on the other side of the aisle, when he was giving his opening remarks, was reprimanding Israel and didn't say anything about Palestinian terrorists murdering innocent Israelis; nothing about the pay-to-slay program where the Palestinians financially reward terrorism and incite violence; nothing about Hamas denying humanitarian aid, calling jihad an obligation, and saying that they do not recognize Israel as a Jewish state.

This reality is lost in this resolution. This resolution completely fails to mention that Israel has made repeated attempts to offer peace proposals to the Palestinian Authority. Time and again, the Palestinian Authority has rejected peace proposals because they refuse publicly and privately to accept a Jewish state in Israel.

This resolution is silent on fundamental facts that shape the way Israel has dealt with this constant threat on its border. This resolution chooses to reference President Obama's policy toward Israel while intentionally leaving out President Trump's policy, ensuring a partisan outcome for this resolution.

Support for Israel in this Chamber has long been bipartisan. For whatever reason, the majority is choosing to advance in the resolution tomorrow that is going to have one of the most partisan votes to ever take place regarding Israel in the history of the House of Representatives. Congratulations.

H. Res. 326 undercuts the administration's efforts to strengthen our critical alliance with our greatest ally, Israel, and the timing of this vote is fooling no one. This resolution is a clear rebuke to the Trump administration's recent reversal of the Obama administration's targeting of Israel with U.N. Security Council Resolution 2334.

If House Democrats want to pass bipartisan legislation with teeth, they should bring S.1/H.R. 336, which has already passed the Senate, as I mentioned, with strong, bipartisan support and was introduced by Congressman MICHAEL MCCAUL in the House. There is even a discharge petition led by Congressman BRIAN MAST for this bill that has almost 200 signatures on it. If it came to a vote in this Chamber, it would pass.

How about we focus on passing legislation that gets through the House? It has already been through the Senate. It will be signed by the President. We will be doing something about that strong statement that we made last summer.

I urge all of my colleagues to vote against this rule and against this partisan resolution.

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Speaker, all I will observe is that the gentleman from New York oddly begins by attacking a resolution for being a recycled version of language we have already adopted on

a massive bipartisan basis in the House. Then he closes by attacking us for this resolution being partisan and divisive in some way. Obviously, those two things don't match up.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Voting rights guarantee all of our other rights. When Americans are obstructed from freely participating in elections, our democracy is imperiled.

This bill, six long years overdue, restores a key provision of the Voting Rights Act that was wrongfully nullified by Republican-appointed justices.

How troubling that a law that President Lyndon Johnson long ago secured now is being obstructed, while our home State of Texas has become ground zero for voter suppression. State Republicans have aggressively, illegally purged voting rolls. They eliminated mobile voting to quash especially student and senior voters. They enacted a cumbersome voter ID law. And they horribly, illegally gerrymandered our State.

Republicans split 100 voting precincts to create the district which I serve today, creating one of the most crooked districts that weaken the accessibility and accountability of Congress Members. A three-judge Federal court with two Republican-appointed judges unanimously condemned Texas redistricting as intentional racially discriminatory intent in its work.

Fortunately, the Texas Civil Rights Project, MoveTexas, LULAC, and other groups have challenged the suppression, but this bill is essential to offer the protection that they, and our democracy, deserve.

We need preclearance in Texas. We need preclearance to clear away all the obstacles Republicans insist on imposing to ensure that our State remains a voter nonparticipation State for democracy.

Madam Speaker, let's support H.R. 4.

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

If we defeat the previous question, I will bring to the floor H.R. 2207, the Protect Medical Innovation Act of 2019, which most people know as the bill that will eliminate the medical device tax.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. SEWELL of Alabama). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, H.R. 2207 was introduced by Mr. KIND from Wisconsin, and it has 253 bipartisan cosponsors, including myself.

Since the medical device tax was imposed by the Affordable Care Act, commonly known as ObamaCare, folks

have known that it was detrimental to innovation and to patient access to necessary devices and treatments. The 2.3 percent excise tax has been suspended twice because we know it is bad policy. So what are we waiting for?

Madam Speaker, we should be bringing legislation to this floor that showcases how we can work together. The American people need to see us united on issues as important as this. We need to stand together when opportunities like these arise to better the lives and truly help all of our constituencies. H.R. 2207 does just that.

Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. WALORSKI).

Mrs. WALORSKI. Madam Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to oppose the previous question.

If we defeat the previous question, Republicans will amend the rule to include the repeal of the medical device tax.

The medical device tax takes effect on January 1, 2020, unless Congress acts. Time is of the essence. Yet, my friends across the aisle continue to waste our time and energy and, more importantly, clock time that we need to stop this tax from going into effect.

This is a bipartisan bill with 253 of us cosponsoring it. All I am asking is that the 253 cosponsors get an opportunity before this expires to say stop this, stop the wheels from grinding. Let's do something that counts for our fellow Americans, for senior citizens who are the recipients of a lot of these medical device implants.

It brings quality of life. Oftentimes, it brings the extension of very important quality of life to seniors. It is less time in hospitals. It has been proven—back up on people's feet to engage back in the workforce and their part of the American Dream.

Instead of having nothing happening in a bipartisan way, as our fellow Americans are watching what is happening in this House, if 253 of us agree on this today, we can stop this onerous tax. We can stop costing healthcare and the exorbitant amount of increases sent back down to all of our constituents.

This is a big deal in the State of Indiana, where I come from. What we do in the State of Indiana with 300 medical device manufacturing companies supporting nearly 55,000 good-paying jobs—nationally, the industry directly employs over half a million people.

□ 1315

It is no understatement to say that thousands of jobs are at stake if the medical device tax comes back in 26 days. When the tax was in effect for the 3 years of 2012 to 2015, industry lost almost 30,000 jobs nationwide, according to government data.

Madam Speaker, we should be focusing on important, urgent, bipartisan issues like this. We can do something together to make our constituents and to make our Nation better.

I urge my colleagues to support this important bill. Twenty-six days to go. We can work together. Over 250 of us are cosponsoring this legislation.

I ask, on behalf of every citizen, everybody working in the medical device industry, and for the sake of our own economy, let's do something that makes sense for this country.

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time to close.

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, in closing, H.R. 4 is totally partisan, without one Republican cosponsor; and H. Res. 326, another totally partisan bill, ties the Trump administration's hands and embarrasses Israel.

Madam Speaker, I urge "no" on the previous question, "no" on the underlying measure, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

I want to thank my friend from Arizona, who rightfully invites us to focus on legislation that will bring us together.

The gentlewoman from Indiana, who I have not had the good fortune of meeting yet, accuses me of wasting not just time, but something called "clock time," which sounds like a really low blow.

In any event, I think our legislation actually will bring us together and should bring us together. The rule is for two pieces of legislation that I thought ought to have and would have complete bipartisan support.

The first is simply to update the preclearance coverage formula, section 4(b) in the Voting Rights Act, as we were instructed to do by the Supreme Court in the *Shelby County v. Holder* decision.

The Voting Rights Act is the product of a massive political and social struggle in the country to make America move forward, but it had been supported by huge bipartisan majorities in 1965, in 1982, and in 2006. Yet, today, our friends across the aisle now attack it as a Federal takeover of State elections, which is absolutely flabbergasting that the Republican Party, the party of Lincoln, is now attacking the Voting Rights Act and the preclearance requirement for being some kind of assault on Federalism when it vindicates the right of all Americans to vote, as we are not only authorized to do under the 14th and 15th Amendments, but we are obligated to do under the republican Guarantee Clause to make sure that all Americans are in a representative relationship with their government.

So I invite them to come on back over to this side of the Voting Rights Act.

Obviously, we are all for a two-state solution, as American Presidents of both parties have been for, for the last several decades, so I invite them to come back over for that, too.

This resolution cannot be both a tired rehash of everything we have done in the past, as was claimed, but

also some kind of partisan departure. The partisan departure is on their side.

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

The material previously referred to by Mrs. LESKO is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 741

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 3. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution, the House shall proceed to the consideration in the House of the bill (H.R. 2207) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the excise tax on medical devices. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 4. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 2207.

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

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

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

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

INSIDER TRADING PROHIBITION ACT

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 2534 and to insert extraneous material thereon.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 739 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 2534.

The Chair appoints the gentlewoman from Alabama (Ms. SEWELL) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1321

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2534) to amend the Securities Exchange Act of

1934 to prohibit certain securities trading and related communications by those who possess material, nonpublic information, with Ms. SEWELL of Alabama in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Chairwoman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chairwoman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2534, the Insider Trading Prohibition Act, introduced by the gentleman from Connecticut, Representative JIM HIMES.

This long overdue bill creates a clear definition of illegal insider trading under the securities laws so that there is a codified, consistent standard for courts and market participants to better protect the hard-earned savings of millions of Americans and bring certainty to the U.S. securities market.

For nearly 80 years, the Securities and Exchange Commission—that is, the SEC—has sought to hold corporate insiders accountable for insider trading through general statutory antifraud provisions and rules it has promulgated under those provisions. This has resulted in a web of court decisions that generally prohibit insiders with a duty of trust and confidence to a corporation from secretly trading on material, nonpublic corporate information for their own personal gain.

These insiders are also generally prohibited from tipping outsiders, known as tippees, who then trade on the information themselves, even though they know it was wrongfully obtained.

But, because there isn't a statutory definition of "insider trading," there is uncertainty around who is subject to insider trading prohibitions; and, with various court decisions, liability for this type of violation has shifted.

For example, in 2014, an appeals court added a brand-new requirement that the tippee must not just know that information was wrongfully disclosed but must also know about the specific personal benefit that the insider received.

This decision has severely hampered the SEC's ability to prosecute insider trading cases and, according to Preet Bharara, the former U.S. attorney for the Southern District of New York "provides a virtual roadmap for savvy hedge fund managers to insulate themselves from tippee liability by knowingly placing themselves at the end of a chain of insider information and avoiding learning details about the sources of obvious confidential and improperly disclosed information."

So I am pleased that this bill codifies existing case law and overturns this new controversial requirement, creating a clear, consistent standard for the SEC, the courts, and market participants to follow, and does so in a way that, as Columbia Law School professor John Coffee testified before one of our subcommittees, “expands liability in ways that should not be controversial.”

I would like to commend Representative HIMES for his efforts since the bill was marked up in May in committee to ensure that it fairly reflects existing law. In addition to extensive outreach to current and former regulators and prosecutors, investor advocates, and institutional investors, Mr. HIMES also repeatedly engaged with our colleagues on the opposite side of the aisle.

As a result, Ranking Member MCHENRY will offer an amendment which will remove unnecessary ambiguities, clarify the intent of the bill to reflect existing insider trading case law, and ensure that the bill preserves the SEC’s ability to bring bad actors to justice under other related insider trading laws.

I plan to support this amendment as a reasonable bipartisan compromise, so I urge all Members to support this commonsense bill that makes the definition of illegal trading very clear for all so that the SEC can effectively crack down on corporate insiders who illegally trade on inside information.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Chair, preventing fraud and abuse within our financial system and cracking down on bad actors for illegal insider trading is a nonpartisan priority. This kind of fraud and illegal activity hurts everyday investors, and it also makes our markets less efficient, accurate, and reliable.

Current law prohibits trading on material insider information in breach of a fiduciary duty under the antifraud provisions of the Federal securities law.

The Securities and Exchange Commission and the Department of Justice are the Federal agencies tasked with enforcing insider trading. Both agencies regularly use their authority by bringing insider trading cases against bad actors who violate our insider trading laws.

The SEC has not asked for this bill, however, unlike other bills that Republicans have voted for out of this House in the past month. Moreover, Democrats have not fully identified a problem within the current body of the law that inhibits the prosecution of bad actors who illegally trade on material, nonpublic information.

As it is written before us on the floor at this moment, this bill could potentially create more confusion and uncertainty within the law of insider trading. It could even expand liability for

good faith traders, which would hurt the efficiencies of our markets, chill vital information gathering, and weaken investor confidence.

Republican and Democrat SEC chairs alike, with vastly different approaches to enforcement matters, have expressed concern over Congress codifying a prohibition on insider trading into one single statute. Specifically, they voiced concerns that Congress would write a law that could be both overly broad and too narrow at the same time.

I share their concerns with the bill as drafted before us today, and I am pleased to hear that the chair has indicated that the majority will be accepting the ranking member’s amendment shortly.

I am concerned that the current version of the bill, however, does not include an explicit personal benefit test, as set forth by the Supreme Court precedents. I am troubled that an unclear phrasing such as “relating to the market” is overbroad and will allow judges and prosecutors to expand the law.

I am also concerned that the bill, as drafted, lacks an exclusivity provision that would make this bill the exclusive law of the land.

Finally, the rule of construction section before us is troubling, because the Financial Services Committee has not even had a chance to debate this specific language. I fear that this language could add more confusion and uncertainty around insider trading laws, with rogue judges and prosecutors using the language to expand the bounds of insider trading law.

I do believe that the ranking member’s amendment goes a distance in clarifying that, but, as I will talk about, I will be having an amendment later on as well that I believe further clarifies that.

□ 1330

Drafting a statute that appropriately and accurately captures the subtleties of insider trading case law and regulations that have been shaped and finessed over decades into one single statute isn’t easy, to say the least.

Achieving bipartisan support also isn’t easy, especially when it involves nuanced and technical substance such as the body of insider trading law.

My colleague, Ranking Member MCHENRY, will be offering his amendment momentarily that represents a bipartisan agreement with the author to improve the bill by including some Republican priorities and improving the bill to better track current insider trading law.

As I had mentioned, I will be offering an amendment as well in an attempt to further clarify and improve this proposal.

So, while we are unsure exactly what the final product is going to look like here, I do want to commend both Mr. HIMES and Ranking Member MCHENRY for working together to attempt to

reach a bipartisan agreement to improve this bill with the amendment and to make it clear that it is Congress’ intent to codify existing law without broadening it into new areas. I hope that the author of the legislation will accept my amendment as well.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Chair, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. HIMES), the chair of the Strategic Technologies and Advanced Research Subcommittee of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, and a valued member of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. HIMES. Madam Chair, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

I rise, delighted today by our consideration of H.R. 2534, the Insider Trading Prohibition Act, because, after years of work, we are going to produce a bipartisan product which actually does address a significant challenge in insider trading law, and that is, in general, that, to date, there has existed, remarkably, no specific statutory prohibition on insider trading.

I am a believer, as I know everyone else in this Chamber is, that, if we are going to create criminal or civil liability, the legislators of the Congress of the United States should make specific how and when and under what circumstances we do so. And that is what we are doing today. I am delighted to report, in bipartisan fashion.

But let me back up for a second, for those who don’t sit on the committee or watch this particular space all that closely, just to explain why this is important.

Insider trading is an activity in which somebody who has information that they have been entrusted with, or for which they have paid or come by in some dishonest fashion, uses it to secure a market advantage. They have information that others don’t. They trade on that information. That allows them to get a material gain.

There is a problem with that, quite apart from the notion that it is only insiders or those people who are not acting based on their talent or their intelligence or their hard work, but acting based on who they know or, worse yet, who they might have paid, that they are the ones who benefit from our capital markets. I think that notion sort of strikes at the fundamental sense of fairness that we all carry around.

But, inasmuch as this behavior exists, it is profoundly damaging to the capital markets that are such a hallmark of the United States, and it is damaging because those capital markets rely on the confidence that millions of American families have out there that their hard-earned savings can be put into the market, invested, and redeployed in a way that is fair to them, that will create a return, and that they are doing so on a level playing field, not competing with people who may have an inside advantage.

Now, the good news here is that, in the generations preceding us, we have, in fact, prosecuted insider trading, but we have done so under antifraud provisions of the Securities Acts that were passed in the early 1930s; and, as a result, there is not a particularly good fit between the concept of fraud and the concept of insider trading.

And to my friend Mr. HUIZENGA's point, as he knows, this has led to a vast body of court-determined law, starting with the *Dirks* decision in 1984, moving through *Materia*, *Carpenter*, *O'Hagan*, all court decisions which crafted the concept of liability around insider trading, culminating in the 2014 Newman decision by the Second Circuit, leading then to the *Salman* decision at the Supreme Court in 2016.

All of these cases that I have mentioned have created uncertainty about the nature of liability and have resulted in overturned convictions of people who behaved in ways that would violate our intuitive sense of right and wrong.

So, because of this uncertainty, because of the overturning of convictions, now is the moment for us to finally do what we are here to do, which is to make it very clear what the law of the land is.

So the moment has come to pass this legislation, and I am delighted to say it comes after years of working with experts like the aforementioned Professor John Coffee, past and present Commissioners of the Securities and Exchange Commission, and consultation with prosecutors as well as with defense attorneys.

This is a fairly fiddly and technical area of the law, and so it was my intention, over the years, to make sure that we crafted good law which created liability for bad behavior but which did not, in fact, create liability for behavior like doing a little extra work to secure an advantage in investments.

It was also very, very important to me that this be done on a bipartisan basis. There is really nothing partisan about this bill. Neither party believes in insider trading or wants to support insider trading. This is not a question of balancing regulation or allocating public resources; this is a question of clarity of law.

So I want to close, apart from just saying that that has been the track record of the establishment and writing of this legislation, by thanking Ranking Member MCHENRY and Ranking Member HUIZENGA.

There will be an amendment offered by Ranking Member MCHENRY which the Democrats support. It does improve the bill. It is not really a compromise in the sense that it actually makes for a better bill.

But I am pleased to say that, after a lot of hard work, this is, in fact, the product of some very robust engagement between the Democratic and Republican Representatives in this Chamber. That is not easy to achieve under these circumstances.

So I want to start, first and foremost, by thanking Chairwoman WATERS and Chairwoman MALONEY for their sponsorship and then, again, Mr. MCHENRY and Mr. HUIZENGA, who committed to really understanding what is a technical corner of the law and offered, in good faith, amendments, including some ideas that we will shortly be taking up.

And then, finally, as every Member in this Chamber knows, hard work happens and gets done and leads to success only because of the commitment and very, very hard work of the staff on both sides of the aisle. So, before yielding back my time to the chairwoman, I do want to specifically thank Katelynn Bradley, Ben Harney, David Fernandez, and David Karp from the Financial Services staff; Mark Snyder, my legislative director, and Rachel Kelly, his predecessor, from my staff.

And then, on the Republican side, big thanks to Kimberly Betz, McArn Bennett, and Jamie McGinnis.

Madam Chair, I urge passage of this law. This will be a good thing for the confidence in our capital markets. It will be a good thing in reassuring the American public that we can get things done on a bipartisan basis. On that basis, I urge passage of H.R. 2534, the Insider Trading Prohibition Act.

Mr. HUIZENGA. Madam Chair, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. STEIL), the newest member of the Investor Protection, Entrepreneurship, and Capital Markets Subcommittee.

Mr. STEIL. Madam Chair, I thank my colleague from Michigan. Our districts touch in the middle of Lake Michigan, so I have never been to that part of my district, and maybe the gentleman has not either, but I appreciate him yielding.

I rise today to urge support of the Insider Trading Prohibition Act.

I want to thank Chairwoman WATERS, Ranking Member MCHENRY, as well as Mr. HUIZENGA and Mr. HIMES for their work on this important piece of legislation.

As we have seen far too often in this Congress, partisanship and poison pills can get in the way of progress and good ideas. I think all of us, at our core, agree on that. Although this took a little bit of time, I am pleased that we came here today reaching agreements from earlier in the week.

I spent my time working for a period of time at a publicly traded company. I saw firsthand the importance of having markets that operate efficiently but, also, fairly.

Millions of Americans have retirement accounts, 401(k)s, and pensions as it relates to their retirement, and it is critical that those individuals can rely and trust the markets that they are relying on for their end of life.

Millions of Americans are invested in these markets and these investments, the integrity of which is critical. They need to know that we are fighting on their behalf to ensure the game is not

rigged to help and favor a privileged few.

This bill includes, in particular, important clarifications that will improve our ability to police insider trading. It also incorporates changes supported by the ranking member in an amendment that I offered that I think provides important clarifications to allow the government to go after the bad guys.

This will ensure the bill is targeted at bad behavior and does not inadvertently prevent people from engaging in legitimate trades. It strikes the balance that I think is crucial if we want to have vibrant and trustworthy public markets.

I, again, want to urge my colleagues to support this nonpartisan legislation.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HUIZENGA. Madam Chair, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY), the distinguished ranking member.

Mr. MCHENRY. Madam Chair, I thank the ranking member of the Investor Protection, Entrepreneurship, and Capital Markets Subcommittee, Mr. HUIZENGA, for his good work in committee and working on important legislation for economic growth and for his constituents in Michigan.

Madam Chair, preventing and punishing bad actors for illegal insider trading is one of the top priorities of Republicans on the House Financial Services Committee because this illegal activity hurts everyday Main Street investors as well as the integrity and the efficiency of our markets.

Trading on material insider information in breach of a fiduciary duty is currently prohibited by court-made law under the antifraud provisions of the Federal securities laws that we have. The Securities and Exchange Commission and the Department of Justice have the power to bring insider trading cases, and both agencies regularly exercise this power and have done so for decades.

Our body of insider trading laws has been developed through those decades of judicial precedent to protect investors and the markets by punishing bad actors who illegally trade on insider information.

Codifying nuanced case law and regulations that have been developed over decades into a single statute is really difficult. It is a very difficult undertaking, and it is, really, a very delicate piece of legislating that must occur.

Both Republicans and Democrats who have served on the Securities and Exchange Commission have expressed concerns about Congress drafting a statute that accurately captures this extensive and expansive body of law without expanding it into new areas, inadvertently, perhaps, or perfectly by design in some areas.

Moreover, bipartisanship is never easy. It is a give-and-take. It is a difficult process. I appreciate the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. HIMES)

for his willingness to work with us in a bipartisan manner.

The bill on the floor today is not perfect, and, as the gentleman from Connecticut knows, I have several concerns with this bill.

I have concerns about the lack of an explicit personal benefit test consistent with Supreme Court precedent.

I am concerned that ambiguous language currently in the bill, such as “relating to the market,” is ripe for activist judges and overzealous prosecutors and private plaintiffs to exploit, leading to greater uncertainty for anyone involved in investing. That is not what we want; that is not what we seek; and that should not be this undertaking. And I also don’t believe that that is the intention of my colleague from Connecticut in the drafting of this bill.

I am also troubled that the Rules Committee print before us does not include an exclusivity provision establishing that this bill is the insider trading law rather than just an additional action around insider trading.

Finally, the Rules Committee print includes a rule of construction section that has yet to be vetted through the Financial Services Committee; and without a full understanding of the implications of this language, the bill could further open the door for activist judges, overzealous prosecutors, and trial lawyers, creating even more confusion around insider trading law.

□ 1345

That is not good for investors. That is not good for our markets. It is not good for anyone outside of a narrow few that personally benefit through fees around lawsuits.

My amendment, which I will offer in a minute, addresses some of these concerns, and I appreciate my colleague from Connecticut, and I appreciate the chair of the Financial Services Committee, Ms. WATERS, for their engagement so that we can actually come to a bipartisan agreement on this important act.

Now, Republicans continue to support sensible bipartisan insider trading bills, such as the one that Chairwoman WATERS and I brought forth, or she brought forth, as the first action of our committee on this House floor in this Congress, which was promoting Transparent Standards for Corporate Insiders Act, which we passed out of this Chamber. And starting off with the fact that we are going to be tough on bad actors from the Financial Services Committee and doing it in a bipartisan way shows our seriousness. And this bill before us is an addition to that seriousness that we take against bad actors in our area of jurisdiction.

Finally, I would say this: We currently have out of decades of lawsuits, decades of regulatory enforcement, we have the greatest clarity on insider trading that we have ever had in this Nation, and that is due to two Supreme Court cases, in particular, giving us serious rules of the road. And I think

that clarity is good. And what we want out of this legislation is to put in statute what is confirmed and established currently in the marketplace and currently in the courts of law.

This is not to create more confusion or more lawsuits, but rather, codify what is a well-regulated, bright-line space that we currently have. And we want to take that consistency that we currently have and establish it in statute. And that is the reason why Republicans have engaged deeply with Democrats over the last 5 months to come to some reasonable conclusion on this important matter of banning insider trading.

So Congress will have its say. I believe we will have a bipartisan vote for final passage, if my amendment is adopted, and I would hope that that would take place. And we have had good conversations along those lines, and I think we have workable language that could be acceptable to all in this body.

I want to thank everyone who has participated, but most particularly Mr. HIMES from Connecticut. While we don’t agree on every issue—heck, I don’t think you would get reelected in Connecticut if you agreed with me on every issue, nor I in North Carolina in my district—bipartisanship is a hard thing, but if we are going to do big, important things, we have to try for that. And when you are in the majority, it is implicit you have more votes than those in the minority.

So Democrats could pass this bill on their own. They could. And if they wanted to just use this as a political issue, they could just jam the language they have; they could, right? But it was your willingness to reach out, so that we could actually have a big bipartisan vote, rather than a narrow victory. That is also something that is a marker, that most in this country don’t hear about, that we actually do talk. We may disagree on big things, we may, and from time to time Chairwoman WATERS and I have had our public disagreements, but at the same time we have been able to come to terms on important things in our jurisdiction and get things done.

So while that is not the everyday case for this Congress, when it happens, I think we should actually acknowledge it. Not that anybody is going to pat us on the back for it, but we should acknowledge it.

I thank my colleagues on the Democrat side of the aisle for their work, and I thank my colleagues on the Republican side of the aisle for their work, as well.

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

Madam Chair, I would like to take this time to, again, congratulate the work that has been done. I do believe that there is additional work that is before us.

I will be having an amendment that I will be offering a little later on, and at this point, I think, as it is coming to-

gether, there still is not going to be total agreement or total unanimity. You will see with the ranking member’s amendment a number of Republicans who will join this bill. I believe that with the adoption of my amendment you would see even further Republican support of the underlying bill.

There will be some dissent. There is dissent within the industry. There is dissent within those prosecutors and the regulators. As I had noted, both Republican and Democrat chairs of the SEC and commissioners of the SEC have said that having Congress act on this particular issue will set off a new chain of events, a new set of legal challenges that will take years to settle in the courts, as well, and they are comfortable with the options that they have the way current law has settled.

Having said that, again, as the ranking member had said, in an attempt to codify a number of those Supreme Court rulings is commendable. I tend to be one who believes that Congress has a responsibility to review and look at and examine whether they should codify precedent.

I find it interesting that on both sides this happens and with the regulators, and that everyone seems to pick and choose a little bit as to what subject area they would like to codify and what subject area they would continue to like to have flexibility on, based on those lawsuits.

At this time the ranking member and his work with the gentleman from Connecticut has made significant progress, and I look forward to adopting the gentleman from North Carolina’s amendment and the potential adoption of my amendment, as well, as we move forward.

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

Ms. WATERS. Madam Chair, I yield myself the remainder of my time.

Madam Chairwoman, H.R. 2534, the Insider Trading Prohibition Act, is a long overdue piece of legislation that simply spells out the definition of illegal insider trading under the securities laws. It creates clarity for participants in financial markets and empowers the SEC to punish bad actors.

As we have discussed, this bill is supported by groups, including the Council of Institutional Investors, the California State Teachers’ Retirement System, the North American Securities Administrators Association, Healthy Markets, and Public Citizen.

Madam Chair, I thank the ranking member, Mr. MCHENRY, for his very kind comments. I thank him for his cooperation. I thank him for recognizing that it is possible to have bipartisan legislation. And I thank him for recognizing that Mr. HIMES has worked very hard to ensure that he would have this as bipartisan legislation, rather than simply having the Democrats try to run roughshod over the opposite side of the aisle to get this done.

I urge all Members to vote “yes” on this important bill. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

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

In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Financial Services, printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 116-39, shall be considered as adopted.

The bill, as amended, shall be considered as the original bill for the purpose of further amendment under the 5-minute rule and shall be considered as read.

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

H.R. 2534

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

SECTION 1 SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Insider Trading Prohibition Act”.

SEC. 2. PROHIBITION ON INSIDER TRADING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78a et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 16 the following new section:

“SEC. 16A. PROHIBITION ON INSIDER TRADING.

“(a) PROHIBITION AGAINST TRADING SECURITIES WHILE AWARE OF MATERIAL, NONPUBLIC INFORMATION.—It shall be unlawful for any person, directly or indirectly, to purchase, sell, or enter into, or cause the purchase or sale of or entry into, any security, security-based swap, or security-based swap agreement, while aware of material, nonpublic information relating to such security, security-based swap, or security-based swap agreement, or relating to the market for such security, security-based swap, or security-based swap agreement, if such person knows, or recklessly disregards, that such information has been obtained wrongfully, or that such purchase or sale would constitute a wrongful use of such information.

“(b) PROHIBITION AGAINST THE WRONGFUL COMMUNICATION OF CERTAIN MATERIAL, NONPUBLIC INFORMATION.—It shall be unlawful for any person whose own purchase or sale of a security, security-based swap, or entry into a security-based swap agreement would violate subsection (a), wrongfully to communicate material, nonpublic information relating to such security, security-based swap, or security-based swap agreement, or relating to the market for such security, security-based swap, or security-based swap agreement, to any other person if—

“(1) the other person—

“(A) purchases, sells, or causes the purchase or sale of, any security or security-based swap or enters into or causes the entry into any security-based swap agreement, to which such communication relates; or

“(B) communicates the information to another person who makes or causes such a purchase, sale, or entry while aware of such information; and

“(2) such a purchase, sale, or entry while aware of such information is reasonably foreseeable.

“(c) STANDARD AND KNOWLEDGE REQUIREMENT.—

“(1) STANDARD.—For purposes of this section, trading while aware of material, nonpublic information under subsection (a) or communicating material nonpublic information under subsection (b) is wrongful only if the information has been obtained by, or its communication or use would constitute, directly or indirectly—

“(A) theft, bribery, misrepresentation, or espionage (through electronic or other means);

“(B) a violation of any Federal law protecting computer data or the intellectual property or privacy of computer users;

“(C) conversion, misappropriation, or other unauthorized and deceptive taking of such information; or

“(D) a breach of any fiduciary duty, a breach of a confidentiality agreement, a breach of contract, a breach of any code of conduct or ethics policy, or a breach of any other personal or other relationship of trust and confidence.

“(2) KNOWLEDGE REQUIREMENT.—It shall not be necessary that the person trading while aware of such information (as proscribed by subsection (a)), or making the communication (as proscribed by subsection (b)), knows the specific means by which the information was obtained or communicated, or whether any personal benefit was paid or promised by or to any person in the chain of communication, so long as the person trading while aware of such information or making the communication, as the case may be, was aware, consciously avoided being aware, or recklessly disregarded that such information was wrongfully obtained, improperly used, or wrongfully communicated.

“(d) DERIVATIVE LIABILITY.—Except as provided in section 20(a), no person shall be liable under this section solely by reason of the fact that such person controls or employs a person who has violated this section, if such controlling person or employer did not participate in, or directly or indirectly induce the acts constituting a violation of this section.

“(e) AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Commission may, by rule or by order, exempt any person, security, or transaction, or any class of persons, securities, or transactions, from any or all of the provisions of this section, upon such terms and conditions as it considers necessary or appropriate in furtherance of the purposes of this title.

“(2) DIRECTED TRADING.—The prohibitions of this section shall not apply to any person who acts at the specific direction of, and solely for the account of another person whose own securities trading, or communications of material, nonpublic information, would be lawful under this section.

“(3) RULE 10B-5-1 COMPLIANT TRANSACTIONS.—The prohibitions of this section shall not apply to any transaction that satisfies the requirements of Rule 10b-5-1 (17 C.F.R. 240.10b5-1), or any successor regulation.

“(f) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Section 10(b) and 14(e) and any judicial precedents from judicial decisions under such sections shall apply to the purchase or sale of or entry into, any security, security-based swap, or security-based swap agreement to the extent such decisions do not conflict with the provisions of this section.”.

(b) COMMISSION REVIEW OF RULE 10B-5-1.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Securities and Exchange Commission shall review Rule 10b-5-1 (17 C.F.R. 240.10b5-1) and make any modifications the Securities and Exchange Commission determines necessary or appropriate because of the amendment to the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 made by this Act.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—The Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78a et seq.) is further amended—

(1) in section 21(d)(2), by inserting “, section 16A of this title” after “section 10(b) of this title,”;

(2) in section 21A—

(A) in subsection (g)(1), by inserting “and section 16A,” after “thereunder,”; and

(B) in subsection (h)(1), by inserting “and section 16A,” after “thereunder,”; and

(3) in section 21C(f), by inserting “or section 16A,” after “section 10(b)”.

The CHAIR. No further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in House Report 116-320. Each such further amend-

ment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. MCHENRY

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 116-320.

Mr. MCHENRY. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 1, beginning on line 17, strike “relating to the market for” and insert “any nonpublic information, from whatever source, that has, or would reasonably be expected to have, a material effect on the market price of any”.

Page 2, beginning on line 11, strike “relating to the market for” and insert “any nonpublic information, from whatever source, that has, or would reasonably be expected to have, a material effect on the market price of any”.

Page 3, line 21, insert before the period the following: “for a direct or indirect personal benefit (including pecuniary gain, reputational benefit, or a gift of confidential information to a trading relative or friend)”.

Page 5, strike lines 12 through 17 and insert a closing quotation mark and a period.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 739, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. MCHENRY. Madam Chair, as I just mentioned a few minutes ago, I have concerns with H.R. 2534, the Insider Trading Prohibition Act in its current form. And, Madam Chair, my amendment addresses several of these concerns and improves this bill to better demonstrate congressional intent of codifying current insider trading law and not expanding it.

I thank the bill's sponsor, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. HIMES) and his staff for their diligence and patience in working with us over the last few months and over the recent Thanksgiving holiday. I also want to thank both of our staffs, as well as the Waters' staff. And I want to thank Mr. HIMES for agreeing to support this amendment in order to make this underlying bill a bipartisan approach to codify insider trading law and punish bad actors.

My amendment reflects Republican priorities discussed at our May markup, such as the inclusion of an explicit personal benefit test consistent with Supreme Court precedent, the removal of the novel rule of construction section from the Rules print of this bill, and a clarification of ambiguous words to ensure judges and prosecutors know that this bill is not intended to expand or create new insider trading liability.

The bill as drafted does not explicitly include the so-called personal benefit test, a significant element of insider trading law that prosecutors must currently satisfy in certain insider trading cases. In the 2016 *Salman* case, the Supreme Court noted that in order for a violation to have occurred, the insider or “tipper” providing the material, nonpublic information must have received a direct or indirect personal benefit, including but not limited to, pecuniary gain, reputational benefit, or a gift of confidential information to a trading relative or friend.

Including an explicit personal benefit test, as set forth by the Supreme Court, ensures that this important test cannot be read more broadly by judges than the Supreme Court has allowed, and also, this prevents activist judges and overzealous prosecutors from reading the test out of law entirely.

My amendment also clarifies the ambiguities within the “relating to the market” phrasing in the underlying bill. This phrase “relating to the market” is not a legal term of art defined within the existing body of insider trading law, nor is it defined in this bill. It is entirely plausible for an activist judge or a rogue prosecutor to interpret this phrase far more broadly than the drafters of the bill intended.

This amendment provides a limiting principle by applying only to nonpublic information that has or is reasonably expected to have a material effect on the market price of a security. This ensures that the statute will still capture cases where the receipt of material, nonpublic information was not from the company itself, but from another source. This is referenced in the Supreme Court’s 1987 *Carpenter* decision.

Finally, my amendment strikes the rule of construction section in the underlying bill that was not reviewed or debated in the House Financial Services Committee. I believe this provision is, at best, unnecessary and at worst, could have been read as giving a congressional stamp of approval for a poorly reasoned judicial set of decisions.

□ 1400

As such, my amendment would ensure that Congress’ intent is to simply codify existing law, not expand liability or create additional defenses for those accused of insider trading. This is about codifying what is already existent, period, end of statement.

That being said, my amendment does not achieve all the Republican goals that we have previously outlined in our committee markup and committee hearing. Unfortunately, the bill, even if it is amended by this amendment, still will not contain an exclusivity provision to make this the exclusive law of the land for insider trading.

While my amendment does not make this bill perfect, it does allow for Congress to exercise its Article I authority to produce a comprehensive insider trading law for the first time and does

so in a bipartisan manner that simply intends, we believe, to codify current insider trading law without expanding liability to good-faith people innocent under the law.

Mr. Chair, I urge its adoption, and I thank the bill’s sponsor for working with us on it.

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

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment, even though I am not opposed to it.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. KENNEDY). Without objection, the gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

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

First, I thank Ranking Member MCHENRY for offering this amendment to H.R. 2534 to help further ensure that this commonsense bill codifies the law against insider trading in a fair manner.

When we marked up the bill in committee in May, I understood that my Republican colleagues had several concerns with the bill but nevertheless voiced their support in hopes of having those concerns addressed before the bill made its way to the House floor.

At the end of the day, those concerns amounted to wanting additional clarity that H.R. 2534 reflected the current judge-made law against insider trading, aside from the controversial 2014 appeals court decision that has been subject to criticism from many sides.

After months of discussion with the bill’s sponsor, Representative HIMES, Ranking Member MCHENRY has crafted this amendment to do just that. In particular, the amendment would clarify that the existing law that requires the SEC to establish some personal benefit to a tipper in cases involving tipper and tippee liability; clarify that the material, nonpublic information that forms the basis of liability may be related to either a specific security or to any security if that information would have or reasonably be expected to have a material effect on the market price of that security; and remove the rule of construction to avoid confusion and ambiguity and to ensure that this act is not the exclusive means by which the SEC, the Department of Justice, or private litigants may pursue insider trading.

If the amendment is accepted, I believe that the bill would provide the SEC with clear additional authority to bring to justice corporate insiders and others who take unfair advantage of confidential information. In addition, because the bill uses the same terms identified in the current case law against insider trading, the SEC and market participants can easily understand what those terms mean.

Again, Mr. Chair, I thank Ranking Member MCHENRY for strengthening the bill, and I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this amendment.

Mr. Chair, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Con-

necticut (Mr. HIMES), the sponsor of this important legislation.

Mr. HIMES. Mr. Chairman, what is the balance of time available?

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

Mr. HIMES. Mr. Chairman, I thank Ranking Member WATERS for yielding me time.

I rise very briefly to welcome the amendment by Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. MCHENRY raised four substantive points. Three of those points are incorporated in this amendment, which we are very happy to accept.

I think it is, again, not a compromise, but an improvement of the bill.

In my very little remaining time, we did have discussions about exclusivity. As the ranking member knows, the idea here is to create a law under which insider trading is prosecuted. That is the objective.

As the ranking member knows, it is a fairly complicated situation when including specific exclusivity language. Ultimately, that was not included in the ranking member’s proposed amendment here, but we should continue to work together to make sure that this is about clarifying and simplifying and making more efficient rather than making more complex.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. HUIZENGA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 116-320.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 1, line 10, strike “AWARE OF” and insert “USING”.

Page 1, line 14, strike “aware of” and insert “using”.

Page 2, line 22, strike “aware of” and insert “using”.

Page 2, beginning on line 24, strike “aware of” and insert “using”.

Page 3, line 3, strike “aware of” and insert “using”.

Page 3, line 23, strike “aware of” and insert “using”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 739, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

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

Mr. Chair, I will be brief. I am concerned that the bill before us today focuses specifically on awareness of information rather than the use of wrongful information in connection with security trading.

Specifically, this bill defines trading while “aware” of material and nonpublic information or communicating material and nonpublic information as wrongful only if the information was obtained by way of, or its communication or use would constitute: theft, bribery, misrepresentation, espionage; a violation of Federal computer data and intellectual property protection and privacy laws; conversion, misappropriation, or other deceptive means; and any breach of a fiduciary duty, a contractual relationship, a code of conduct, or a personal confidence or trust.

A person violates the bill’s prohibitions on trading with and communicating material on nonpublic information so long as this person “knew” the information was wrongfully obtained, actively avoided gaining such knowledge, or recklessly disregarded the wrongful use, communication, or obtainment of this information.

It does not matter, under the bill, whether they know the method by which the information was obtained or communicated or if any benefit actually came from communication of the information.

In short, Mr. Chair, I believe that this would, in turn, allow activist judges and prosecutors to go after individuals regardless of their intention or actual profit from wrongful actions.

That is why my amendment is very simple. It would strike all occurrences of the phrase “aware of” and insert the word “using.” In other words, you can be aware of something, but if you are not going to actually use that information, why would you be held to a criminal standard?

My amendment would have the effect of limiting who can be prosecuted under this bill to people who actually use wrongful information to gain a profit.

As we all know, in our lives, there are all kinds of rumors around us all the time, whether it is about our work life or our family or whatever might be going on, somebody in the neighborhood. It is hard to know what information is actually true or actually accurate.

What we have currently is this assumption that being aware of something makes you criminally liable versus actually using that information.

The current bill could allow prosecution of people who traded and are simply aware of information but perhaps would have traded regardless of their awareness of that information.

I am prepared to support this underlying bill with the adoption of my amendment.

I was pleased to see the adoption of the amendment from the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY). I believe these are perfecting amendments. I believe that these are issues that need to be further addressed.

While I, too, have some concerns about exclusivity and some of the other things that the gentleman from

North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY) discussed, I believe that this particular issue is of significance, and it is sufficient enough and significant enough to pull my support across the finish line as we move forward on this.

Mr. Chair, I urge all of my colleagues to accept this perfecting amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chair, I strongly oppose Representative HUIZENGA’s amendment that replaces the bill’s standard of illegal insider trading while “aware of” material, nonpublic information with trading while “using” material, nonpublic information.

This narrower standard is inconsistent with current law, would severely weaken the bill, and would create substantial enforcement hurdles to the benefit of bad actors and to the detriment of the SEC.

If the amendment is adopted, the SEC would have to prove that the reason the defendant traded was because of a specific piece of information. That means that the SEC would have a hard time proving its case in court unless it had an email from a defendant explaining his motive for trading. Not many bad actors engaging in illegal insider trading are that dumb.

Moreover, such a change would benefit insider traders at hedge funds or other market intelligence firms because they would merely have to tell the judge that they had other reasons or data to support their trade.

The SEC’s existing rule 10b-5 clearly states that the appropriate standard is awareness. Changing it to “use,” as Representative HUIZENGA’s amendment would do, dramatically and substantially weakens the SEC’s authority to prosecute insider trading.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to reject the amendment offered by Mr. HUIZENGA.

Mr. Chair, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. HIMES), the sponsor of this important legislation.

Mr. HIMES. Mr. Chairman, I thank Chairwoman WATERS for yielding me the time.

I rise in reluctant opposition to this amendment because it has been a hallmark of this process that I very much enjoyed working with Mr. MCHENRY and Mr. HUIZENGA. The reason I rise in opposition is really twofold or threefold.

Number one, as Mr. HUIZENGA may recall, the original draft of the bill would make it prosecutable to prosecute somebody who is in possession of material, nonpublic information. My Republican friends correctly pointed out that we are often in possession of information that we may not be aware of. Certainly, if you were to take a

look at my email inbox, you would know that to be true. So at the suggestion of the Republicans, we changed the standard from “in possession” to “aware of.”

While I know that Mr. HUIZENGA is acting in good faith, Chairwoman WATERS got it exactly right. If we go to a use standard, it would require prosecutors to actually get inside the motivation of why somebody made a trade. They would have to prove that you made this trade because you had inside information.

In support of Mr. HUIZENGA’s good faith, I understand where he is coming from, but let’s also face that the confluence of circumstances where you have material, nonpublic information and you were going to do that trade at precisely that moment is a very, very rare event.

While I understand where Mr. HUIZENGA is coming from, what I would suggest is, instead of creating probably an impossible prosecutorial burden, let’s acknowledge that if in that very rare event where you want to make a trade and you happen to be in possession of material, nonpublic information, let that trade go by. That is rare enough that it shouldn’t in any way, I think, speaking as somebody who has spent time in this industry, compromise the effectiveness or the efficiency of our capital markets.

Again, reluctantly, I stand in opposition to Mr. HUIZENGA’s amendment. I hope he will nonetheless support the underlying bill.

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

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 196, noes 231, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 648]

AYES—196

Abraham	Burchett	Estes
Aderholt	Burgess	Ferguson
Allen	Byrne	Fitzpatrick
Amash	Calvert	Fleischmann
Amodei	Carter (GA)	Flores
Armstrong	Carter (TX)	Fortenberry
Arrington	Chabot	Fox (NC)
Babin	Cheney	Fulcher
Bacon	Cline	Gaetz
Baird	Cloud	Gallagher
Balderson	Cole	Gianforte
Banks	Collins (GA)	Gibbs
Barr	Comer	Gohmert
Bergman	Conaway	Gonzalez (OH)
Bilirakis	Cook	Gonzalez-Colón
Bishop (NC)	Crawford	(PR)
Bishop (UT)	Crenshaw	Gooden
Bost	Curtis	Granger
Brady	Davidson (OH)	Graves (GA)
Brooks (AL)	Davis, Rodney	Graves (LA)
Brooks (IN)	DesJarlais	Graves (MO)
Buchanan	Diaz-Balart	Green (TN)
Buck	Duncan	Griffith
Bucshon	Dunn	Grothman
Budd	Emmer	Guest

Guthrie
Hagedorn
Harris
Hartzler
Hern, Kevin
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Hill (AR)
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Hurd (TX)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Katko
Keller
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Kustoff (TN)
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
Lesko
Long
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Marchant
Marshall
Massie
Mast

McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
Meadows
Meuser
Miller
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Murphy (NC)
Newhouse
Norman
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Pence
Perry
Posey
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reschenthaler
Rice (SC)
Rigglesman
Roby
Rodgers (WA)
Roe, David P.
Rogers (KY)
Rooney (FL)
Rose, John W.
Rouzer
Roy
Rutherford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner

Shimkus
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Spano
Staubert
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Timmons
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Waltz
Watkins
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Wright
Yoho
Young
Zeldin

NOES—231

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Axne
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brindisi
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Case
Casten (IL)
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Cisneros
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Cox (CA)
Craig
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Cunningham
Davids (KS)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny K.
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado

Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael
F.
Engel
Escobar
Eshoo
Español
Evans
Finkenauer
Fletcher
Foster
Frankel
Fudge
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Golden
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Green, Al (TX)
Grijalva
Haaland
Harder (CA)
Hastings
Hayes
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Horn, Kendra S.
Horsford
Houlihan
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)

Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lujan
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McAdams
McBath
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Morelle
Moulton
Mucarsel-Powell
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Norcross
Norton
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Phillips

Pingree
Plaskett
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rose (NY)
Rouda
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan
Sablan
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff

Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sewell (AL)
Shalala
Sherman
Sherrill
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (WA)
Soto
Spanberger
Speier
Stanton
Stevens
Suzuki
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus

Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres Small
(NM)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Van Drew
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wexton
Wild
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—9

Biggs
Cartwright
Gabbard

Gosar
Hunter
Radewagen

San Nicolas
Serrano
Wilson (FL)

□ 1442

Mses. McCOLLUM, FUDGE, Messrs. LOEBSACK, PETERS, SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, PHILLIPS, DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. LURIA, Mses. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, MUCARSEL-POWELL, Messrs. MALINOWSKI, NADLER, ROSE of New York, CICILLINE, CLYBURN, PAYNE, Ms. BASS, and Mrs. HAYES changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Messrs. BUCHANAN, LAMBORN and JOHNSON of Louisiana changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. KENNEDY) having assumed the chair, Mr. PAYNE, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2534) to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to prohibit certain securities trading and related communications by those who possess material, nonpublic information, and, pursuant to House Resolution 739, he reported the bill, as amended by that resolution, back to the House with a further amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

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

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, this 5-minute vote on passage of the bill will be followed by 5-minute votes on ordering the previous question on House Resolution 741; and adoption of House Resolution 741, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 410, nays 13, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 649]

YEAS—410

Abraham
Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Allred
Amodei
Arrington
Axne
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Bergman
Beyer
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bost
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brady
Brindisi
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Case
Casten (IL)
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Cisneros
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Cline
Cloud
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Comer
Conaway
Connolly
Cook
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Cox (CA)
Craig
Crawford
Crenshaw

Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Cunningham
Curtis
Davids (KS)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny K.
Davis, Rodney
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael
F.
Duncan
Dunn
Emmer
Engel
Escobar
Español
Estes
Evans
Ferguson
Finkenauer
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fletcher
Flores
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxy (NC)
Frankel
Fudge
Fulcher
Gaetz
Gallagher
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Golden
Gomez
Gonzalez (OH)
Gonzalez (TX)
Gooden
Gottheimer
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Green, Al (TX)
Grijalva
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Haaland
Hagedorn
Harder (CA)
Hartzler
Hastings
Hayes
Heck
Hern, Kevin
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Higgins (NY)
Himes

Holding
Hollingsworth
Horn, Kendra S.
Horsford
Houlihan
Hoyer
Hudson
Huffman
Hurd (TX)
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson (TX)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Keller
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim
Kind
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Kustoff (TN)
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamb
Lamborn
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Lesko
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Loudermilk
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marshall
Mast
Matsui
McAdams
McBath
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum

McEachin	Richmond	Suoizzi
McGovern	Riggleman	Swalwell (CA)
McHenry	Roby	Takano
McKinley	Rodgers (WA)	Taylor
McNerney	Roe, David P.	Thompson (CA)
Meadows	Rogers (AL)	Thompson (MS)
Meeks	Rogers (KY)	Thompson (PA)
Meng	Rooney (FL)	Thornberry
Meuser	Rose (NY)	Timmons
Miller	Rose, John W.	Tipton
Mitchell	Rouda	Titus
Moolenaar	Rouzer	Tlaib
Mooney (WV)	Roybal-Allard	Tonko
Moore	Ruiz	Torres (CA)
Morelle	Ruppersberger	Torres Small
Moulton	Rush	(NM)
Mucarsel-Powell	Rutherford	Trahan
Mullin	Ryan	Trone
Murphy (FL)	Sánchez	Turner
Murphy (NC)	Sarbanes	Underwood
Nadler	Scalise	Upton
Napolitano	Scanlon	Van Drew
Neal	Schakowsky	Vargas
Neguse	Schiff	Veasey
Newhouse	Schneider	Vela
Norcross	Schrader	Velázquez
Norman	Schrier	Visclosky
Nunes	Schweikert	Wagner
O'Halleran	Scott (VA)	Walberg
Ocasio-Cortez	Scott, Austin	Walden
Olson	Scott, David	Walker
Omar	Sensenbrenner	Walorski
Palazzo	Sewell (AL)	Waltz
Pallone	Shalala	Wasserman
Palmer	Sherman	Schultz
Panetta	Sherrill	Waters
Pappas	Shimkus	Watkins
Pascrell	Simpson	Watson Coleman
Payne	Sires	Weber (TX)
Pence	Slotkin	Webster (FL)
Perlmutter	Smith (MO)	Welch
Perry	Smith (NE)	Wenstrup
Peters	Smith (NJ)	Westerman
Peterson	Smith (WA)	Wexton
Phillips	Smucker	Wild
Pingree	Soto	Williams
Pocan	Spanberger	Wilson (FL)
Porter	Spano	Wilson (SC)
Posey	Speier	Wittman
Pressley	Stanton	
Price (NC)	Staubert	
Quigley	Stefanik	
Raskin	Steil	Yarmuth
Ratcliffe	Steube	Young
Reschenthaler	Stevens	Zeldin
Rice (NY)	Stewart	
Rice (SC)	Stivers	

NAYS—13

Amash	Griffith	Massie
Armstrong	Harris	Roy
Biggs	Hill (AR)	Yoho
Bishop (NC)	Huizenga	
Davidson (OH)	King (IA)	

NOT VOTING—7

Cartwright	Gosar	Serrano
Eshoo	Hunter	
Gabbard	Reed	

□ 1453

Mr. CRAWFORD changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to be present during roll call vote number 649. Had I been present, I would have voted: on roll call vote number 649, YES.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4, VOTING RIGHTS ADVANCEMENT ACT OF 2019, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. RES. 326, EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES REGARDING UNITED STATES EFFORTS TO RESOLVE THE ISRAELI-PALESTINIAN CONFLICT THROUGH A NEGOTIATED TWO-STATE SOLUTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 741) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4) to amend the Voting Rights Act of 1965 to revise the criteria for determining which States and political subdivisions are subject to section 4 of the Act, and for other purposes, and providing for consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 326) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding United States efforts to resolve the Israeli-Palestinian conflict through a negotiated two-state solution, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 228, nays 196, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 650]

YEAS—228

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

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

NAYS—196

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

Womack Wright Young
Woodall Yoho Zeldin

NOT VOTING—6

Cartwright Gosar Jayapal
Gabbard Hunter Serrano

□ 1503

So the previous question was ordered.
The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic de-
vice, and there were—yeas 226, nays
196, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 651]

YEAS—226

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

Stanton Torres Small
Stevens (NM)
Suozi Trahan
Swalwell (CA) Trone
Takano Underwood
Thompson (CA) Van Drew
Thompson (MS) Vargas
Titus Veasey
Tonko Vela
Torres (CA) Velázquez

NAYS—196

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

NOT VOTING—8

Cartwright Gosar Schrader
Cunningham Hunter Serrano
Gabbard Ratcliffe

□ 1511

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on
the table.

□ 1515

COMMEMORATING THE 75TH ANNI- VERSARY OF PEACEFUL ZION BAPTIST CHURCH

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

Mr. PAYNE. Madam Speaker, I rise
today to commemorate one of my dis-
trict's most venerable churches. This
year marks the 75th anniversary of the
Peaceful Zion Baptist Church in East
Orange, New Jersey.

It has been known as a sanctuary for
those in need throughout that time. It
runs a food pantry for those in need of
a meal. It provides clothing for those
who could use a warm coat or socks.

The community of Peaceful Zion is
so strong that members have been
known to bring food to ailing families.
One of its members said: "Everyone is
there for one another."

Congratulations to Peaceful Zion
Baptist Church on its 75th anniversary.
They are a blessed beacon of loving
care in my 10th District in New Jersey.

YESTERDAY'S IMPEACHMENT HOAX

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

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Madam Speaker,
this morning, Speaker PELOSI an-
nounced that yesterday's hearing in
the Judiciary Committee will, with
"leading American constitutional
scholars," give Congress no choice—no
choice—but to impeach the President.
But let's take a look at who exactly
testified at yesterday's impeachment
hoax.

Professor Karlan donated over \$12,000
to liberal Democrat politicians, went
after the President's 13-year-old son,
and she can't even walk past the
Trump Hotel without having to cross
the street.

Professor Gerhardt donated thou-
sands of dollars to former President
Obama and Hillary Clinton. He also
worked against Justice Kavanaugh
during his nomination process.

Professor Feldman called for the
President's impeachment in 2017 based
on a tweet, just over a month into his
Presidency.

However, Professor Turley, who
voted against the President, had this
to say about the lack of evidence
against President Trump: "Impeach-
ments have to be based on proof, not
presumptions."

Abuse of power? Madam Speaker, an
impeachment with this fact pattern is
an abuse of power by the House of Rep-
resentatives.

DEMOCRATS ARE WORKING FOR THE GOODNESS AND GREATNESS OF THIS NATION

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was
given permission to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, we do have a very solemn responsibility to uphold the rule of law, but it is important to note that Democrats and the majority in the House have worked every day for the American people.

Among the 400 bills that we have supported are: H.R. 986, the Protecting Americans with Preexisting Conditions Act of 2019, legislation that I have consistently worked on for almost a decade; the Equality Act, which gives equality to all people; the Paycheck Fairness Act, to treat women fairly; the Climate Action Now Act and other legislation to recognize the crisis in climate change; national flood insurance, which my constituents in Texas are desperate for; directing the removal of United States Armed Forces from hostilities in the Republic of Yemen; and then, of course, a signature bill that I have written over a 2-year period, the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act, which expands the rights of Native Americans and provides \$291 million for our law enforcement and prosecutors.

Finally, let me say, I was very proud to stand for H. Res. 183, condemning anti-Semitism as hateful expressions of intolerance, which are contradictory to the values and aspirations that define the people of the United States, and condemning anti-Muslim discrimination and bigotry against minorities as hateful expressions of intolerance.

We have been working on behalf of the American people. We ask the other body to work, but we are doing our job for the goodness and the greatness of this Nation.

PENNSYLVANIA'S 12TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT'S ENERGY ECONOMY IS BOOMING

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

Mr. KELLER. Madam Speaker, the energy economy of Pennsylvania's 12th Congressional District is booming, creating good-paying jobs and providing low-cost energy to thousands of families across the Commonwealth and our Nation.

As evidence of this, our district is happy to welcome Thailand-based natural gas company BKV to Pennsylvania's 12th Congressional District. Next week, BKV will be opening an office in Tunkhannock, Pennsylvania. They will join other natural gas companies in Pennsylvania's 12th Congressional District that are creating jobs, giving back to the community, and helping our rural district thrive with the resources right under our feet.

Pennsylvania's 12th Congressional District plays an important role in our national energy portfolio, producing between one-tenth and one-twentieth of the country's entire natural gas supply on any given day.

Energy produced in PA-12 lowers energy costs, creates an energy-independent United States, and allows our allies to no longer be reliant on energy resources from countries that do not share our values.

Natural gas companies have helped with community revitalization and in creating a robust economy of downstream jobs. The present and future of PA-12 is bright because of the natural gas industry, and, for the benefit of my community, our State, and our Nation, I will continue to support its growth and expansion in Congress.

STOP ROBOCALLS

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

Mr. LIPINSKI. Madam Speaker, robocalls, just mentioning them is enough to make anyone's blood boil.

Robocalls interrupt our time with family and friends, scam people out of their hard-earned money while spoofing numbers to make calls look local, and even clog up the phone lines of hospital emergency rooms. In 2018, Americans, collectively, received 48 billion robocalls.

I cosponsored legislation earlier this year to stop robocalls, and the House voted yesterday to pass the final version, which we expect to be signed into law.

The TRACED Act strengthens penalties and extends the statute of limitations on violations; it requires phone companies to authenticate where calls are coming from and help customers easily block them at no extra charge; and it requires continued work by the Federal Government to combat emerging robocall methods.

This is a clear win for the American people and shows what we can do here when we work together.

VIRGINIA SUPPORTS THE SECOND AMENDMENT

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

Mr. RIGGLEMAN. Madam Speaker, 40 Virginia localities have declared themselves "Second Amendment sanctuaries," resolving to support the Constitution and stand against infringements on the Second Amendment.

Across my district, thousands of citizens are rallying outside the meetings of their local government to show their strong support for the rights of gun owners.

Virginia has always been a cradle of constitutional rights. There is no divide between our rural and urban populations. All of us want to defend our rights as citizens of the United States of America.

I represent the same district that James Madison represented in the first Congress. He understood America's

rights to bear arms when he wrote it into our Constitution.

I am a strong supporter of the Second Amendment, and I am proud to stand with the people who are speaking up for their constitutional rights and for the Commonwealth of Virginia.

James Madison would be proud. I know I am.

12 DAYS OF SALT

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

Ms. SHERRILL. Madam Speaker, on the second day of SALT, my constituents have said to me that they send more money to Washington and get back less than almost any other State in the country. The SALT cap compounds the attack on New Jersey, forcing our residents to send even more money to Washington without a return on that investment.

For every dollar New Jersey sent to Washington in 2017, we got back only 82 cents. That puts us in 49th place, almost dead last in State return on Federal tax dollars. And this was before the Federal Government stripped the full SALT deduction.

Meanwhile, States like Kentucky got back \$2.35 for every dollar they sent to Washington. That is nearly three times what New Jersey gets.

The 2017 tax bill unfairly targets States like mine that pay more than their fair share. We fund projects in Kentucky and do not see that same investment, say, on things like infrastructure, for example, in our State.

We need to restore the SALT deduction cap and keep money in the pockets of New Jerseyans so we can continue to power the Nation's economy.

CONGRATULATING SANGAMON COUNTY'S WILLIAMSVILLE HIGH SCHOOL

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

Mr. LAHOOD. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Sangamon County's Williamsville High School, who, last week, won the Class 3A Illinois State football championship, the school's first ever.

On Friday night at Huskie Stadium in DeKalb, Illinois, the Williamsville Bullets rallied late in the fourth quarter to win a thrilling 46-42 game against Byron High School. With just 3 minutes remaining and Byron leading 42-39, the Williamsville defense stonewalled Byron to force a turnover. The Bullets then marched down the field, and junior quarterback Conor McCormick fired a game-winning touchdown to secure the State title.

The Bullets' offense set a 3A championship record with 550 yards of total offense. Wide receiver Brandon Bishop set a record for receiving yards with

230, and quarterback Conor McCormick set the record with 335 passing yards and four touchdowns.

The Williamsville football team has made all of central Illinois proud with their accomplishments this season. The never-give-up spirit that embodied this team was on full display in their State championship, and their historic season is a testament to the hard work of these young men.

I congratulate Coach Aaron Kunz and the Williamsville High School Bullets.

□ 1530

HONORING ANGELA MCSHAN

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

Mr. VAN DREW. Madam Speaker, I would like to join the United States Coast Guard in welcoming the recently commissioned U.S. Coast Guard cutter *Angela McShan*. The ship is part of a new fleet of cutters that boasts short response times and larger vessels, which will help patrol the coast from south Jersey all the way down to the Caribbean.

This cutter was named after the late Master Chief Angela McShan, who served the Coast Guard for over 20 years, and she was the first Black woman to earn the title of master chief petty officer.

The cutter was commissioned with the help of McShan's seven brothers and sisters in boarding the cutter for the first time and raising the flag so the ship could set sail.

I am excited to see the U.S. Coast Guard Training Center Cape May flourish with the upgrade of the new cutter, and I am honored to have a hero like Angela McShan watching over our officers from heaven.

Madam Speaker, we are proud of Angela McShan. We are proud of the Coast Guard, both in the United States of America and in south Jersey.

REMEMBERING PEARL HARBOR

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

Mr. SPANO. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the lives of those who fought and those who died so valiantly during the attacks at Pearl Harbor. On December 7, 78 years ago, the unthinkable happened. Our Nation was attacked in one of the most horrific events we have ever endured on our own soil. That day that will live in infamy also compelled the United States to enter the second World War.

The bombs that destroyed the USS *Arizona*, 169 aircraft, and most of our Pacific fleet, rocked the Nation to its core. The attack killed almost 2,500 servicemembers plus 49 civilians and wounded 1,200 more. They were sons and daughters, they were brothers and sisters, and above all, they were heroes.

And today we stand with those who lost family and friends, and we stand with the heroes who have defended and those who continue to defend our freedoms today and our way of life. We must never forget, and we must always honor their sacrifice.

DEMOCRATS HAVE PLEDGED TO TAKE ACTION

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

Mr. MORELLE. Madam Speaker, in January, House Democrats pledged to get to work for the people and take action to uplift the lives of everyday Americans.

I am so proud of the progress we have made and the proposals we have advanced that would have real, meaningful impacts on our communities. Unfortunately, our partners in the United States Senate have abdicated their responsibility to do the same.

We have sent over 300 bipartisan bills to the Senate so far this year, and not one has been taken up for a vote. This includes legislation to keep our communities safer by enacting universal background checks on all gun sales, legislation that would raise the minimum wage, safeguard our elections, protect people with preexisting conditions, and ensure equal pay for equal work.

We were elected to serve the American people, and I will keep fighting alongside my colleagues in the House to advance legislation that improves the lives of everyone who calls our Nation home. I call upon the United States Senate to do the very same.

THE RIGHT TO VOTE IS SACRED

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

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4, the Voting Rights Advancement Act.

The right to vote is sacred and must not be infringed upon. Sadly, our Nation has a long and even bloody history of racial voter suppression, but lately that suppression has been supercharged by the terrible decision in *Shelby County v. Holder*. This case gutted key protections of the Voting Rights Act, allowing for States to prevent certain groups from accessing the ballot through voter ID laws, closing polling locations, and even purging voter rolls.

I will be pleased to vote in favor of H.R. 4, as it represents a major step toward ensuring every citizen has the ability to vote. H.R. 4 will create a new coverage formula for repeated voting rights violations in the last 25 years and establish practice-based preclearance to focus administrative or judiciary review narrowly on suspect voting practices.

With the House approving H.R. 4, we take a major step forward, and I urge prompt action by the other body.

PEACE PROCESS IN UKRAINE

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Speaker, next week, leaders from Ukraine, France, Germany, and Russia will meet to discuss a road forward to peace in Ukraine. President Zelensky was elected with a clear mandate to bring to an end Russia's illegal war on Ukraine.

The question we must ask is: Peace at what cost to liberty?

Russia illegally invaded Ukraine, already leading to the deaths of over 14,000 Ukrainians and the displacement of millions. The enemy of liberty seeks to undermine democratic institutions that have secured peace in Europe since the second World War ended.

During these sensitive negotiations, freedom lovers stand shoulder to shoulder with the Ukrainian people. America will not tolerate any nation that bullies Ukraine into a sham peace that only rewards Kremlin aggression.

We join with the Ukrainian people in welcoming a just peace in Ukraine. However, any peace agreement cannot provide legal cover for Russia's land grab. Peace can only come to Europe when Russia respects the integrity of Ukraine's borders.

Madam Speaker, liberty on the European Continent hangs in the balance. Today we must do what is right and stand with Ukraine's people so that tomorrow she will have a lasting peace and Europe, as well.

CONGRATULATING THE RIVER ROUGE FOOTBALL TEAM

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

Ms. TLAIB. Madam Speaker, I rise today to give a hearty congratulations to our Panthers, the River Rouge High School football team on winning their first ever state championship. Thirteenth District strong is so incredibly proud.

In a dramatic game, our River Rouge Panthers prevailed over setbacks early on to defeat a formidable opponent. This hard-earned victory is a testament to the countless hours of training put in by this dedicated team, as well as the support of its coaches and our parents.

As legendary basketball coach Phil Jackson once said, "The strength of the team is each individual member. The strength of each member is the team."

Please join me in recognizing our River Rouge High School football team, the Panthers, and Coach Corey Parker for their outstanding accomplishment.

Congratulations, Panthers.

ECONOMIC JUSTICE ISSUES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. WEXTON). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the

gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. TLAIB) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Ms. TLAIB. Madam Speaker, today, I am representing the Congressional Progressive Caucus in our Special Order so that we can push forward on a number of agendas, especially on economic justice issues. I am really proud to join many of my colleagues today as we talk about housing for all across the United States of America.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. OMAR).

Ms. OMAR. Madam Speaker, I rise today to discuss the basic and dire human right that so many of us take for granted, the right to a safe and stable home.

Last week, families across this country gathered around in their dining rooms to give thanks and break bread, but many families in my home district were not sitting around for a holiday dinner. Instead, they were facing an indescribable tragedy. The day before Thanksgiving, a fire broke out in a 25-story public housing building in the Cedar-Riverside neighborhood of Minneapolis where I grew up. Five people lost their lives. And more than a week later residents are still in the hospital recovering from their injuries.

After the brave men and women of the local fire department cleared the scene and controlled the blaze, we discovered an almost unbelievable reality. These homes were not equipped with sprinklers. You see, these buildings are so old that it is exempt from laws that require such lifesaving equipment.

And that isn't the only egregious safety issue that our public housing residents are forced to endure.

There has been a ban on building new public housing since the 1990s. In fact, the Cedar-Riverside building that sustained the fire was built in the 1960s. And the Federal Government has been underfunding the repair and maintenance needs of the homes for years. In Minnesota, the backlog of repair needs totals over \$300 million. So not only are these homes half a century old, they are practically being held together with little more than hope and masking tape.

Make no mistake, we, as lawmakers, bear responsibility for the deplorable conditions of our public housing and for the deplorable and unsafe conditions that millions of Americans are living in today. This is our fault. The Federal Government has all but abandoned public housing.

We cannot continue to pretend that we can't see the crumbling buildings in our districts. We can't continue to ignore the hundreds of thousands who experience homelessness because of waiting lists for housing assistance. And it goes beyond the homeless population.

Millions of Americans are living every single day in fear of eviction. Twelve million Americans are paying more than half of their income in rent, and about 6,300 people are evicted every single day.

How can we in Congress call ourselves leaders if we continue to ignore this crisis?

I, for one, refuse to continue down that path. It is time for a bold and progressive solution.

I will be introducing legislation that ensures every public housing unit in this country is equipped with sprinklers, so that we never see another devastating tragedy like the one that befell the residents of my district. And we will be demanding accountability from HUD, requiring the agency to report on exactly how many units are not fitted with sprinklers and how much money the agency needs to fix this glaring hazard. But that is not enough.

Last month I introduced Homes for All Act, which would make an historic investment of \$1 trillion in public housing and low-income housing and build a record 12 million new homes over the next 10 years.

My bill would also ensure that public housing residents are guaranteed access to important wraparound services like employment assistance, child care, and financial literacy courses.

And just as important, my bill would make sure that public housing funding is a mandatory part of our Federal budget, meaning that the government wouldn't be able to abandon these new homes or neglect their upkeep. Public housing would now be treated like any other important guaranteed source of assistance, like Social Security and Medicare.

While my legislation is bold, it is also absolutely necessary. Every human being has a right to a safe and affordable home. And without an historic investment in our public housing stock and greater accountability for the safety of our residents, we will continue to face tragedies like the ones that claimed the lives of five people in Cedar-Riverside last week. We cannot let that happen, and I will not let that happen.

Madam Speaker, I thank Congresswoman RASHIDA TLAIB for allowing this conversation to take place today.

Ms. TLAIB. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. GOMEZ).

Mr. GOMEZ. Madam Speaker, I thank the Congresswoman from Michigan for having this Special Order on such an important issue.

When you look at inequality in America, you have to start with housing, because inequality often is started by how much a person pays to house their family, to house their kids, to house their family members.

In order to solve for inequality, we have to solve the housing crisis. And in order to solve the housing crisis, we have to acknowledge and rectify America's shameful history of discriminatory housing practices.

Policies and practices like redlining, segregation, blockbusting, and steering that denied low-income people and communities of color access to homeownership and created the housing disparities that are still prevalent today.

□ 1545

In America, homeownership is how we build wealth, and it determines your family's likelihood of success.

In America, whether you rent or you own, where you live determines where your kids go to school.

In America, it often determines how far you commute to work.

In America, it often determines how far you are from a grocery store and healthy options for food for your family. It also determines what public services are available to you.

But, unfortunately, many low-income individuals and people of color have been denied this opportunity.

We still have an opportunity to make amends and rectify the inequalities that have persisted in low-income neighborhoods and communities of color.

The Tax Code is one of the most powerful tools we have. That is why I re-introduced the Rent Relief Act.

This bill aims to reduce the rent burden by creating a new refundable tax credit for families that are paying more than 30 percent of their income in rent and utilities because no family should be forced to choose between paying rent and meeting their basic needs. This would put more money in the pockets of families at a time when wages have remained stagnant and housing costs have increased.

This bill has the potential to transform lives, provide millions of the lowest income people with a breadth of opportunities, and provide opportunities to climb the economic ladder by redistributing the benefits of homeownership to the lowest income earners.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to cosponsor this important piece of legislation.

Ms. TLAIB. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ), my good colleague.

Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ. Madam Speaker, I thank Congresswoman TLAIB for hosting this Special Order hour on housing and our chair for presiding during this very critical conversation.

We are here today to talk about one of the most core, important issues facing the American people, which is housing.

Each and every year, it feels as though, as our wages remain stable or the same, rent is going up, and it becomes harder and harder to afford the very things that keep ourselves afloat and alive, whether it is healthcare, housing, or an education.

During the financial crisis of 2008, American households lost \$16 trillion in wealth. Many lost their homes and saw their savings and retirement funds depleted. More than half of all renters in America, over 21 million households, were rent-burdened in 2015, meaning that they spent 30 percent or more of their income on rent.

We are in one of the worst renter crises in a generation. At a time when our

country is at its wealthiest, in the city of New York, we are seeing populations of people who are homeless at the highest rates since the Great Depression. But there is another way.

When we start to legislate housing as a human right, we begin to change our priorities and move away from looking at housing as a for-profit commodity for speculation and toward something that should be guaranteed for all Americans at an affordable rate that can be accessible to all working people in America.

That is one of the reasons why I have introduced A Place to Prosper Act, which includes provisions like universal rent control, just cause evictions, a ban on income discrimination, access to counsel, improving the quality of the housing stock, and a disclosures requirement on corporate landlords to rein in bad actors.

Additionally, we also know that the area of housing and construction is one of the largest contributors to carbon emissions, which is why we have also introduced the Green New Deal for Public Housing Act. What that does is that it works and aims to decarbonize the entire public housing stock in the United States of America.

It is what must be done; it is in accordance with the science; and it changes the value system through which we approach housing away from the volatile boom-and-bust speculative environment and toward a secure and stable economic environment that treats housing as a right.

Ms. TLAIB. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER), my good colleague.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy in permitting me to speak on this and for organizing what I think is one of the most important discussions that this Congress needs to have.

Housing is fundamental. It has been the major source of wealth generation for millions of middle-class Americans and an even greater source of wealth accumulation for upper income Americans.

But, sadly, it has been a source of discrimination and widening income inequality because of decades of systematic discrimination by the Federal Government against people of color, especially African Americans.

I am embarrassed that in my community, returning World War II veterans were denied opportunities to live in neighborhoods where they could actually afford the loans. The redlining practices denied them an opportunity to be able to secure government-financed lending.

We had practices in the real estate industry that actively steered people away from certain neighborhoods. We had areas where people resisted allowing people of color to move in. The Federal Government did not enforce constitutional antidiscrimination provisions.

Madam Speaker, the consequences of decades of neglect, discrimination, and

underinvestment is visible today in most major American cities. It is obvious in my community, where we are seeing a homeless population that is persistent and growing.

We are seeing in communities large and small people who are rent-burdened, as my colleagues have already referenced, with half the people paying more than a third of their income, many of them over half, if they can qualify as renters at all.

The Federal Government has systematically reduced its modest housing footprint, not being involved in new housing construction for low-income and extremely low-income people.

There is no way, despite Ben Carson's mumbo jumbo, that those people can be self-sufficient, in terms of housing. They need direct government assistance.

The failure to have adequately housed them plays out in our streets. Inadequate housing has health consequences. In fact, we are watching now some of America's hospital systems realizing that fact and investing in housing opportunities and wrap-around services because people who are not adequately housed actually cost society far more.

We are watching steps that are being taken in the private sector to recognize that this is the quickest way to close that income inequality gap. It is the quickest way to strengthen communities. In fact, it has profound consequences for education.

Children who are housed not in concentrated poverty but in housing opportunities that integrate them into broader communities have much better performance in schools without increasing the number of teachers, without increasing the per capita spending per pupil. Where those children live is the most profound indicator of future academic success.

I have been troubled with this issue for years. This summer, I spent time developing a report on why the Federal Government needs to get back into the housing game. It is entitled "Locked Out: Reversing Federal Housing Failures and Unlocking Opportunity." It is available on my website.

Madam Speaker, I am deeply concerned that we finally recognize housing is a fundamental right. The United Nations recognized it as a fundamental human right in 1948, and we are a long way from that point.

We need to invest in reducing the shortage of 7 million affordable rental homes available to extremely low-income people. No State has an adequate supply of affordable homes.

I propose building 12 million new public housing units and fully funding all the maintenance need in the existing public housing stock rather than slowly starving the authorities in their ability to maintain an adequate housing stock.

I think it is past time to create a renter's tax credit to cover the difference between the rent and wages or

making Section 8 vouchers an entitlement program available for all who qualify.

Yes, it will be expensive, but we are already spending huge amounts of money subsidizing housing. The problem is that the subsidies go to people who need the help the least. The mortgage interest deduction provides most of the support for people at the upper income levels, people who already have housing. In countries around the world that don't even have a mortgage interest deduction, there is no great variation in homeownership rates.

We can adjust that now. There is an opportunity for us, and I have proposed equalizing the benefit of the mortgage interest deduction by converting it into a credit so that it treats people at various income levels equally.

I also think it is past time to eliminate a mortgage interest deduction for second homes and, instead, invest that money in helping people who don't have housing today.

It may seem to some that these are ambitious proposals, but I would suggest that the cost of past discrimination, the cost of inaction, costs us far more in terms of wasted human potential, increased law enforcement, increased health costs, and poor academic performance.

Madam Speaker, I deeply appreciate my colleagues coming forward with this discussion and working together on provisions that can make a difference.

We just had the Republicans pass the largest transfer of wealth in America's history, adding \$2 trillion to our national debt and doing nothing to deal with the housing crisis. In fact, it created housing burdens in States by wiping out the deduction for State and local income taxes, for instance.

I think it is time for us to stop paying for failure, to reassess our policies, to reverse decades of past discrimination, and to do things that will make a difference for American families.

Ms. TLAIB. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. EVANS), my good colleague.

Mr. EVANS. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman, my colleague from the great city of Detroit and from Michigan, for showing this leadership.

"None of us are home until all of us are home." This is the slogan of Project HOME, an organization in my district that empowers individuals to break the cycle of poverty and homelessness, starting with permanent supportive housing.

Safe, affordable housing is the basis of stability and well-being. Secure housing improves health outcomes, helps children perform better in school, and can break generational cycles of poverty. But given the skyrocketing cost of rent, which is outpacing incomes, secure housing is out of reach for many low-income families.

Lacking a fixed address makes it harder to land a job, enroll children in school, apply for assistance and benefits.

□ 1600

The affordable housing shortage is a crisis in my district and in many other cities and neighborhoods across the Nation.

I represent Philadelphia, a city which has a poverty rate of around 25 percent. Let me repeat that, a city with a poverty rate of about 25 percent. Most low-income renters spend at least half of their income on housing. This leaves no room for unexpected expenses such as medical bills, which can quickly send vulnerable families into housing inability, eviction, and, sometimes, homelessness.

We must increase funding for programs that help the most vulnerable, including children, people with disabilities, and seniors, such as homeless assistance grants and the housing choice voucher program.

Those living in poverty, including 400,000 in the city of Philadelphia, are struggling to find safe and affordable places to live. Over 40,000 families are on the Philadelphia Housing Authority waiting list—40,000 are on that list.

Most low-income renters in Philadelphia receive no government assistance with their housing costs, driving many to rely on alternative arrangements to secure shelter.

These are steps that we can take to address this growing crisis. We must invest in preserving existing public housing and improving health and safety through increased funding for the Public Housing Operating Fund and the Public Housing Capital Fund.

In the city of Philadelphia, the Philadelphia City Council recently passed a right to counsel law, providing attorneys for low-income families facing evictions.

But millions of Americans in other cities and communities face evictions every year. This lack of access to legal representation has led to unjust evictions. I am an original cosponsor of the Eviction Protection Act, which creates grants to provide legal representation to those facing eviction.

It is not an accident that two Members who stood up here are also members of the Ways and Means Committee, as I am. We all recognize that we can use the Tax Code to lift our neighborhoods and boost our stability in housing.

Yes, we can use the Tax Code. I am happy that my colleagues are from the Ways and Means Committee, and we should work together on that.

I support the expansion of the low-income housing tax credit—especially the credits for securing extremely low-income households—to bring capital to underserved regions.

Access to affordable housing is a right. It is time Congress acknowledges that fact. All Americans deserve quality homes—all Americans. None of us are home until all of us are home.

I want to stress that message: None of us are home until all of us are home.

Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman, again, from Detroit, Michigan,

for her leadership in bringing us together to talk about a subject that is very key to a lot of our survival. It is extremely essential that we have that opportunity, but it starts with leadership, and it starts today. We need to be relentless on this subject, and we need to be no nonsense.

Ms. TLAIB. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GARCIA), my good colleague.

Mr. GARCIA of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I thank Congresswoman TLAIB for bringing up this subject of the affordable housing shortage across our country. I want to speak about the affordable housing crisis that is unfolding across this country and affecting thousands of my constituents in the city of Chicago.

Throughout the Chicago area, there are just over 90,000 affordable, available rental homes, but the National Low Income Housing Coalition estimates that there are over 326,000 low-income renter households. That is right. Less than one in three households in Chicago have access to affordable housing.

The immense lack of housing is making it impossible for low-income communities to stay in our city. It is transforming my district, driving communities of color away from areas where they have lived for many, many decades.

According to the Chicago Community Trust, Chicago has lost more than 100,000 African American residents in the past 10 years alone. The Logan Square neighborhood in my district has lost more than 20,000 Latino residents and nearly 10,000 African Americans over the past 15 years.

Five years ago, Chicago's city council passed an ordinance encouraging transit-oriented development. I believe that improving transportation and mobility for our neighborhoods and tying that to affordable housing is critically important.

However, we know that development, when done incorrectly, can lead to gentrification, displacement, and racially inequitable outcomes. Since Chicago's ordinance passed, only one affordable housing development has been completed; another is getting off the ground.

I am planning to introduce legislation to incentivize equitable transit-oriented development, legislation to create Federal funding for affordable housing to be built near public transit so workers can get to and from jobs, school, and healthcare, as well as take advantage of the city's fine cultural amenities.

This bill will be a crucial step in addressing the enormous problems we are discussing today. If we can address the topics raised by the many speakers who are bringing home the urgency that Congress needs to act in this field of needed affordable housing, we can become a better country.

Madam Speaker, I thank Congresswoman TLAIB for taking the initiative and for hosting this discussion that can benefit our country.

Ms. TLAIB. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. PRESSLEY), my good colleague.

Ms. PRESSLEY. Madam Speaker, I thank Representative TLAIB for her leadership on this and so many social justice issues. I really appreciate her organizing this Special Order hour, and I hope that, in some ways, it assures the American people that we have not lost sight of them and that this Congress continues to lead and to legislate on those issues of care, concern, and consequence to the American people. I know this is the number one constituent call that my district office receives, and I am certainly not alone in that.

Housing First is not just an approach to ending homelessness; it is a fundamental truth that should guide everything we do in these Chambers. When we speak of our priorities, when we speak of the important work we hope to do here, housing must come first.

Housing is the foundation of everything, and, therefore, must be foundational to everything that we seek to accomplish here as a body. Housing is a critical determinant of health and wealth and must be the foundation of our fight for greater justice for all.

I also would like to reiterate some of the points made earlier regarding our young people learning.

Earlier today, we heard from some young people about many of the barriers and obstacles to their readiness to learn. Housing was chief amongst them. As we see our families destabilized by growing gentrification and displacement and more families experiencing homelessness, this is certainly a contributor and a barrier to their readiness to learn. It is traumatic to not have a home.

I want to thank my sister in service, Representative ILHAN OMAR, for providing us with a vision for the future of housing: housing as a right; housing as a guarantee; housing for all.

In cities across the country, including those in my district, the housing supply lacks both in quantity and quality. According to the National Low Income Housing Coalition, in my district, the Massachusetts Seventh, two-thirds of residents and renters and those at minimum wage must work at least 84 hours a week to afford a decent one-bedroom at-fair-market-rent apartment.

When housing is in such short and perpetually deteriorating supply, we must ask ourselves: Where do we expect people to go?

When housing prices continue to skyrocket and we are constantly redefining affordability to hide that reality, where can people go?

For decades, this Nation's public and affordable housing supply has been chronically underfunded. Any serious solution must match the scale of this unprecedented crisis.

States must act; cities must act; and the Federal Government must act. How

we choose to spend our money is a direct reflection of our values.

Representative OMAR's Homes for All Act invests a total of \$1 trillion into our Nation's affordable housing stock. I was proud to be an original cosponsor of Homes for All, just as I was proud to cosponsor Senator WARREN's American Housing and Economic Mobility Act.

However, it is the work of activists and agitators on the ground that has pushed this issue to the forefront. While there is still much to do, I am heartened by the efforts of my colleagues, and I associate myself with all of their thoughtful and impassioned comments and legislative proposals highlighted during this Special Order hour.

We must continue to mobilize, to organize, and to legislate until Homes for All is no longer a promise, but a guarantee.

Ms. TLAIB. Madam Speaker, I know from my district in Detroit and throughout the 11 other surrounding communities, for us, being the third poorest congressional district in the country, housing is critical, critical not only for economic stability, but also in providing a safe haven for many of our families across the district.

Poverty is complex. A number of factors, including State and Federal policy failures and racial and gender inequities, have resulted in so much increased poverty, especially among children. Adjusting poverty requires that deep public investment in housing and other infrastructure, healthcare access, and public school investment, coupled with criminal justice reform policies designed to repair a history of segregation and continued exploitation.

Less than a year, Madam Speaker, into its enactment, the opportunity zone program has already resulted in millions of dollars of wasteful spending and possible corruption.

From cities like Chicago and Baltimore to the city of Detroit, billionaires were able to divert public tax dollars through a tax break called the opportunity zone that was supposed to lead to access to housing for our most vulnerable in communities like mine.

Instead, Madam Speaker, what we heard from an investigative report—ProPublica published an article, titled: "How a Tax Break to Help the Poor Went to NBA Owner Dan Gilbert." The article contained disturbing details that suggest that opportunity zones that were in the Trump tax scam had designated census tracts that did not meet the legal criteria and that political donations and influence had overridden the law to reward donors with generous tax breaks supposedly intended to benefit the poor.

Madam Speaker, in the article, billionaire Dan Gilbert's Quicken Loans company donated \$750,000 to President Trump's inauguration fund, hosted Ivanka Trump in 2017 for a panel discussion, and last year Dan Gilbert watched the midterm election returns at the White House with President

Trump, who has called Gilbert "a great friend." In return, Madam Speaker, three census tracts in downtown Detroit where Gilbert owns valuable property were selected for these large tax breaks through the opportunity zones.

According to ProPublica, multiple studies have found that property values in those zones increased because of this tax break. At least one of those census tracts did not meet the poverty requirement for being an opportunity zone and appears to have been designated solely due to political influence.

So, if we are going to talk about housing justice, we are going to talk about impacting and helping ensure that housing is a human right, we also need to take out the corruption and the political influence.

Email exchanges revealed Quicken executives working in concert with the White House to designate tracts with Gilbert's investments as opportunity zones. Madam Speaker, Quicken Loans lobbyists were directly involved in the selection process at every level, lobbying the city, State, and Federal officials to include Gilbert's investment zones in the opportunity zone law.

□ 1615

So I am asking us as we stand for housing for all that we need to restore public trust in our Federal Government which has been eroded with the rules that have been applied unevenly here and seem to reward the wealthiest and the best-connected among us. It appears that a tax program supposedly designed to benefit the poorest among us is now being used to reward political donors and wealthy investors.

I have asked the Committee on Ways and Means to investigate the actions by billionaire Dan Gilbert, and I have also asked the Treasury to respond to some of those questions.

This is why instead of these tax breaks for the wealthy and for billionaire-led development, I have proposed the BOOST Act.

The BOOST Act would give 3 to \$6,000 to families making less than \$100,000. It would instantly lift up 45 percent of Americans living in poverty now. Sixty-four million children would be instantly uplifted out of poverty. The BOOST Act would be paid for by repealing the Trump tax scam. In there, Madam Speaker, you saw not only the opportunity zones, but a number of tax breaks for the wealthy that only benefited the folks who are corporate-led who have actually been tainting our process to get access to affordable housing in this Chamber.

So I ask my colleagues, as we propose many fixes to access affordable housing and to repair some of the historic segregation zoning laws and the continued exploitation among many of our neighbors, that we also make sure that we are ensured that corruption within our government is not expanding and that we are holding those accountable who are trying to taint that process.

So I really appreciate my colleagues, members of the Congressional Progressive Caucus, in standing strong for housing as a human right.

Many of the proposals you see forward, Madam Speaker, will only depend on whether or not we can implement it in a way that is just and is very democratic and, again, has really clear oversight. Things like the opportunity zone are not the direction that we need our country to go in, and I am looking forward to introducing legislation that would not only ask for repealing the opportunity zone but actually use it for land trust and community trust funds, things that will be rooted within communities and help those who, again, are seeing homeownership among communities of color decrease, seeing increases between 30 to 50 percent of their income going towards rent. I think the way we have to do it is all those goals, not only proposals, but also making sure that we are implementing it in a way that is just and fair.

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

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for the opportunity to speak, and I commend her for her stellar effort to bring justice to the housing circumstance in our country.

I am honored to say that I did visit her congressional district, and we had a field hearing that was quite successful. She truly is engaged and involved in making a difference in her community.

Madam Speaker, I was there in 2008 when we had the housing crisis. I remember when Secretary Paulson came before the committee. He was there in need of some funds for what were called toxic assets. He was there because the market was in a free fall. He was there because there was an imminent crisis that had to be contained.

I remember him asking for a large sum of money with few pages, probably less than 5 pages. He wanted us to infuse capital into a process that would allow us to purchase these toxic assets. He was indicating to us that this was an emergency. He did not ask for hundreds of millions of dollars. He did not ask for tens of billions of dollars. He requested hundreds of billions of dollars.

I do recall that I spoke to constituents, and being the judicious person that I was, I did pay attention to my constituents who encouraged me and insisted that I not bail out the big banks. That was the language that was used: Do not bail out the big banks, AL.

I was judicious. I listened to my constituents. When we took the vote on the floor to accord the sum of 700-some billions of dollars, I remember standing over in the door and looking at the vote. I could also see the stock market at the same time. As the bill was failing, the stock market was crashing. It was a day that I will never forget. I went back home, and I visited with my constituents.

The constituents said to me: AL, what is wrong with you? You did not vote to save my 401(k). You let the market fall. You could have voted to support us.

I learned an invaluable lesson that day. The lesson is this: there are times when you have to do what you know to be the best thing, even when your constituents might stand in opposition to it. That is the lesson that I carry with me to this day. I came back. We had a second vote, and I voted for the funds necessary to deal with the toxic assets.

One of the reasons why I was so concerned about this was because I understood what was happening. There were instruments that were in the marketplace that were not suitable for everyone. We had something called a 327 and a 228; 3 years, 2 years of a fixed rate, and then 27 years or 28 years of a variable rate. This was not suitable for everyone. We had no-doc loans, meaning no documents necessary, and you could walk in and work out some means by which you could acquire a loan, Madam Speaker. We had negative amortization, a process that allowed you to at some point continue to owe more than you initially borrowed.

We had something called the yield spread premium. The yield spread premium allowed the person who originated your loan to originate a loan for you for an amount in excess of what you qualified for. Here is how it worked: That person would check to see what you were eligible for as a rate. You could qualify for a loan at 5 percent, but at that time because of the yield spread premium, the person originating could come out and say, good news, I have a loan for you for 8 percent. You qualify for 5, you get a loan for 8 percent interest, and the person would never have to tell you that you qualified for the 5 percent. The money between 5 and 8 was called the spread, and the yield on that spread could be shared with the person who originated the loan and the lender, the yield spread premium.

Poor people, well, people who are of little means who acquired homes with these 327s and 228s, that I mentioned where the rate would go up and down, they lost homes. It is said that in the African American community a generation of wealth was lost—a generation. The community is still recovering from the 2008 downturn.

I believe that we do have to reconsider how we address housing in this country. There are some people who are born into poverty. They are not born into plenty. For those who are not born into poverty, it is not easy to work your way to plenty. So we have to have housing as a means by which they can acquire and accumulate wealth.

One of the things that I tried to do—and there are many things that can be done—is to use something called alternative credit scoring. This is where you will score a person's light bill, gas bill, water bill, phone bill, and cable bill

and use that information with the traditional credit to allow that person to have maybe the little additional help needed so as to acquire a loan. It is a pilot program. We have passed the bill out of committee. It is H.R. 123.

This piece of legislation will allow many, many persons with thin files and with little credit, because they haven't been in the credit market, to get a home. Many people who are paying now X number of dollars for rent will be able to acquire a home for X minus some amount, meaning less than what they are paying for rent, they will be able to acquire a home.

I am pleased to say that many of the prudential agencies are in agreement and are encouraging this. Just today we had a hearing with the Housing, Community Development and Insurance Subcommittee, and Mr. Montgomery, who is the head of FHFA, was there. I will be visiting with him. He and I agreed to have an appointment so that we can talk about these things and see what we can do to help with homeownership for persons who were not born in the suites of life and many who now find themselves living in the streets of life.

This is something that is an imperative. It is a moral imperative. It is something that we have to do because we want to have a just society, and a just society would afford an equal opportunity to all to have a place to call home. In the richest country in the world, every person ought to have a fair opportunity to have a place to call home.

I thank the gentlewoman for allowing me to share, and I encourage her to continue on her mission to bring justice to those who find themselves living in places that, quite frankly, most people in Congress would not live in under any circumstances, but, unfortunately, we are not doing enough to help others to be extricated from the circumstances of which we speak.

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

PRESCRIPTION DRUG PRICING

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

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Madam Speaker, what we are going to do today is actually sort of a little follow-up with a couple of other things sprinkled in here.

I want to walk through, once again, some of the numbers and some of the good things that have happened. I want to talk also about H.R. 3, which is a reference pricing bill that has gone through Ways and Means in regard to pharmaceuticals that actually I don't think anybody understands what the underlying mechanisms are on how Europe and those actually do set drug pricing and to understand the rationing that will be coming with that.

But, first off, what is the greatest threat to our society?

I am going to argue it is actually the coming mountain of debt. It is not Republican or Democrat, it is called demographics. There are 74 million of us who are baby boomers. 74 million baby boomers were born in an 18-year period, we have our earned entitlements coming, and we functionally have no cash in the bank for them. So this board is really, really important, and I can't believe I don't see it in everyone's office here.

This is a 30-year window. Let's actually just pull out Social Security and Medicare. Madam Speaker, you do realize that if you look at the Social Security and Medicare from the numbers, we have \$23 trillion in the bank. Now, this one is not inflation adjusted, so these are raw numbers, but \$23.1 trillion, if you want to be accurate, in the bank, but when we roll Social Security and Medicare in and their financing costs—the money has to be borrowed to keep the promises—we are functioning at \$103 trillion in debt.

□ 1630

It is math. It is not Republican or Democratic. It is demographics. We are getting older as a society.

Since 1971, our birthrates have been below replacement rates. We need to deal with the reality of math, but as this place now proceeds, we will make math partisan. But the math will always win.

It breaks my heart because there are things we can do policy-wise that make it work, that keep us under or right about that 95 percent debt-to-GDP, and we survive our demographic bubble. But we have people around here that say crazy things that have no basis in economics, no basis in the math, no basis in our demographics. The cruelty they are bringing down on our society and my 4-year-old daughter, destroying her future, is because of the unwillingness to own a calculator.

So, one more time, if we pull Social Security and Medicare out of our 30-year window, we have \$23 trillion in the bank. If we put them back in, we are \$103 trillion in debt in that 30-year window. Remember, just the growth of Social Security, Medicare, healthcare entitlements, just the growth every 5 years equals the entire Defense Department.

When you hear some of our brothers and sisters on the left come behind the microphone and say, "Well, if we would just reduce defense spending," you can wipe out all of defense spending, and in 5 years, you are back where you began.

That is the reality of our demographics. How many people have you heard come behind these microphones in the last year, other than myself and maybe one or two others who work on these things? It is silent because it is really hard to talk about. It is really difficult. It is scary. It is the single thing that destroys our economic vitality for the future. But once again, it would require owning a calculator.

It is lots of people's fault, but it is Congress' fault, but it is decades old.

Here is where most of that comes from. If you take some of the math for a couple that retires today—it is not their fault; this is just the math—they will have put about \$161,000 into Medicare. They are going to receive just shy of \$500,000 out. Take that, functionally, \$300,000-plus difference, multiply it by 74 million, and now you understand the driver of our debt.

You will hear people come behind the microphone and say, "Well, it is waste and fraud," or, "We don't tax rich people enough." Those are all absurd. The percentage of tax revenues as the percentage of GDP is within the margin. Waste and fraud, yes, we need to deal with it, but it would be a fraction of these numbers.

Remember, we are about to come up on the 2-year anniversary of tax reform. This last fiscal year, unlike every economist that the left brought to us out of the crazy—and I know that is mean, but it is true.

Things that were being said on this floor when we debated tax reform, reforming our system: "Oh, revenues are going to crash." "The world is coming to an end." "It is Armageddon."

We went up over 4 percent in what they call receipts growth last year. Our problem is that we spent dramatically more than that. I think our spending was approaching almost 7 percent growth because we had so many things added to spending. About half of that 7 percent is just, once again, demographics. But we grew revenues even with the tax reform slightly over 4 percent.

There should have been joy around here, if you think about where we are economically. You all saw the applications for unemployment today, 10,000 down from what the projection was.

Once again, we are demonstrating the labor markets are a miracle. They are remarkable. I don't think there is anyone living today who has lived in a time that is this economically stable, when you look at our labor markets, when you look at wage growth, the lack of inflation.

There should be joy on this floor, talking about the miracle of our brothers and sisters who were being written off just a couple years ago because they didn't have a high school education, didn't have a certain skill, were going to be part of the permanent underclass.

It turns out those folks who were willing to write off those brothers and sisters, those Americans, were wrong. That population—and I hate this term, but we use it—those lower quartiles of economics—education, skill sets—who were being written off, they have had the fastest movement of income. You saw the number, if anyone cares about these things.

Last year, a single woman, no partner in the house: 7.6 percent growth in wages. These are numbers that I can tell you from being on the Joint Economic Committee for years that every

economist we would bring in would look at us like we were out of our minds if we predicted numbers like that. Where is the joy?

The fact of the matter is there has been more progress in the last 24 months for our brothers and sisters who have physical issues, have had substance abuse issues, have had criminal records, these sorts of things, coming back into the labor force.

There is this thing called U-6 data, U-4 data, all these things. When you see the unemployment rate and all this information of workers who might be—we use the term "marginally attached" and haven't been looking, who quit looking, the number of those who are moving into the labor force that we barely give any credit for when we see the top-line number because the top-line number is those who are looking.

There is an economic miracle happening right now when you see the robustness, the stability of our labor markets. Shouldn't the debate on this floor be: It is working for our brothers and sisters who we have always said were poor or that we were writing off. Something is working for them. How do we keep doing more? How do we keep adopting the policies that are working and avoid the crazy policies of just a couple years ago that didn't work, that punished these populations?

These are the folks who had just a really crappy decade. They fell further behind every single year. There is some math out there, and it is not all put together. I am being maybe a little pathologically optimistic here, but there are some preliminary numbers that last fiscal year could be the very first year in modern times where income inequality did not grow and potentially shrank. It is not because wealthy people didn't make more money. It is because poor people made more money than they had before.

Where is the joy? Where is the discussion of how we do more of this?

It turns out, for all those out there who are busting their backsides, working, paying into programs like Social Security and Medicare, why aren't we being honest with them that the scale of the unfunded nature is devastating?

If you are a young person today, do understand that when you hit your peak earning years, your tax rate will have to be double today's just to maintain these basic earned benefits. There is a path, but that path requires a whole bunch of things.

It is going to be my very last board that I am going to put up because you have to have incredible economic robustness, and you have to have a tax system that maximizes economic vitality, an immigration system that maximizes economic vitality, a regulatory system that uses smart technologies to maximize labor force incentives, family formation incentives, technology adoption incentives, all these things. And there is a path to deal with this.

Then what happens this week is the discussion of H.R. 3, which is the drug

reference pricing model. Almost no one has read it or understood the actual mechanisms it is offering.

Why do I bring this up as part of an economic discussion? Part of the miracle we are about to live is that we are about to live in a time where technology, if we legalize it, is about to crash the price of healthcare.

Technology is something that looks like a big kazoo that you blow into that instantly tells you that you have the flu, instantly can update your medical records on your phone. If we make it legal, it can instantly order your antivirals.

When I talk about healthcare technology, it is a whole string of things that will keep us healthy. But the other side is that we are about to live in the time of miracles. The single-shot care for hemophilia, it is here. It is going to be really expensive, but hemophilia is also really expensive.

We should be talking about ways to have more of these disruptive pharmaceuticals that take care of hemophilia, ALS, Crohn's, cystic fibrosis, and sickle cell anemia. We are on the cusp of having the pharmaceuticals that either stabilize or cure these.

They are incredibly expensive. These are small populations, but remember, 5 percent of the population with chronic diseases is the majority of our healthcare spending.

If we go back to the slide here, the majority of what is about to hit us over the next 30 years is Medicare. It is healthcare spending.

What happens if you crash the price of healthcare? Well, one of the ways you do that is you cure people.

The Democrats are pushing a piece of legislation that sounds at first really good. "Hey, we are going to lower new drug prices by reaching out to a handful of European countries and getting their prices. Then you can't go more than that, or we are going to give you a 95 percent tax," which if you reverse it is a 1,950 percent tax.

Except, you have to understand, and I know this board is really hard to read, we are going to use the Great Britain model. What is a year of you being healthy worth? It is an honest question because that is what is about to be imported into the country. For you, your family, your child, what are you willing to believe is the value of a year of health? If you are in Great Britain, their model, their formula, is \$38,000.

If this breakthrough pharmaceutical would make you healthy for 1 more year and costs more than \$38,000, it is not purchased. It is not part of the formulary. That is what the Democrats are saying we need to import into this country.

So understand that the Democrats are about to say a year of you being healthy is not worth \$38,001. I don't think they know that. I don't think anyone who has read it understood how this handful of European countries builds their pricing mechanisms, but they do it by scarcity.

They basically say, “Hey, I know this would cure you for the next year, but you are out of luck. It is over \$38,000 here in Great Britain, so you are on your own.”

At a certain level, this is just incredibly cruel. How could you look someone in the eyes and say: “I value your life at \$38,000 for a year of you being healthy.” But that is the cruelty that is being discussed.

At first, it sounds really wonderful: “Hey, we are going to lower drug prices by using reference pricing.” But the fact of the matter is, how do you tell Americans that what this means is not only are you not going to be able to have these things that keep you healthy anymore because they are going to be outside the price window, but the other thing is there was a major report put together early this week that also said a substantial number of the drugs, like 100-plus, that are in the pipeline, that are about to cure our brothers and sisters who are part of that 5 percent of the chronic conditions that is the majority of our healthcare spending, those cures are going to stop because they are really expensive, really risky, really hard to put together?

The vast majority of them fail, so they sort of roll the dice and say: “If we succeed, we get a fairly decent payday, but it is going to pay for a whole lot of failed drug trials.”

We are about to make a policy decision as a country: “We are not going to cure you. You get to suffer.”

The pharmaceutical industry, for all the frustrations, they will go back to what they were doing a couple of decades ago, saying they are just going to do a derivative on an existing drug, so, therefore, they have very little research costs. They already know what their profit margin is. It is nice and safe to do.

The things the Republicans did in this Congress, where we did the CURES Act a few years ago, where we created a pipeline to cure people, that pipeline is about to get crushed.

You have to understand the cruelty of this. This is just math. This is what other countries do on their formula.

If you really wanted to crash the price of pharmaceuticals, it turns out, yes, there is a whole list of things that are bipartisan: the way you deal with the capital that is used for the investments, the way you do the patents, the way you allow competing types of biologics and others come to market.

But there is another crazy thought experiment here that almost no one has ever talked about. Do you realize that half the pharmaceuticals that will be picked up today, so half the pharmaceuticals someone is going through a drive-through for or walking into their pharmacy for right now, half of them will not be used or will not be used properly? Just part of the thought experiment.

They will not be used or will not be used properly. That is going to cost the country about half a trillion dollars

this year. It is 16 percent of the total U.S. healthcare expenditures because people don’t take their prescribed pharmaceuticals properly, and they get sick and die.

It turns out we have all sorts of things we could do today, but it requires being creative. Let’s face it, this is an absolute creativity-free as well as a math-free zone.

The little bottle that has the top that tells you when grandma has opened it so that you know she is taking her pharmaceuticals that keep her alive, we have that technology. It is not very expensive. It changes drug efficacy usage because you know when you took it.

How many of you know someone that has multiple pharmaceuticals they take, and they have to take them at certain parts of the day? We now have little distribution devices. There are several of them on the market that drop the pills, tell you the time, let you know if you don’t pick them up. It rings your phone, rings the family’s phone, if they are not picked up.

□ 1645

It turns out there are technology things that could actually change almost a half a trillion dollars of expenses a year. This is dramatically bigger than blowing up the cures that are coming, but it requires some creativity to understand that half of the pharmaceuticals that are being picked up today will not be taken or will not be taken properly.

Another proposal—and do it more as a thought experiment: For really high-value pharmaceuticals, go look in your own personal medicine cabinet right now. How many of them are still sitting in there? They are just getting old. You did not take them. They are just sitting there.

Why don’t we package those high-value ones in a double-layer blister pack or in a pod that keeps them sterile and allow you to return them? Maybe there are folks in our society who those really expensive pharmaceuticals, if they were returned and could be redistributed, they would still be sterile.

There are creative ideas where you could have this massive disruption in the price that we as Americans put out in our drug costs. But it requires some creativity instead of the arrogance of we are basically going to blow up your future. Because that is what is being proposed to us.

But this number is stunning, if I came to you and said, if you could change the way pharmaceuticals are used and have the efficacy of proper use, it is 16 percent of all the healthcare expenditures of this country.

I threw this slide in as more back to: Remember how we were just talking about Medicare and, functionally, that is the ultimate driver of our future debt and, unless we have a disruption in healthcare costs—not debates about

how we finance, but disruption in the cost. Let me give you a single example of what the investment in cures means.

I know this chart is almost impossible to read, but the simple point is about 30 percent of Medicare spending is going to be diabetes. A single cure—now, diabetes is complex. We know it is more than the production of insulin. There are autoimmune responses. There is 1 and 2. It is complex, but do the thought experiment with me.

If you cured diabetes tomorrow, almost 30 percent of that unfunded liability of Medicare goes away. That is why it is so incredibly important we are investing in these cures that H.R. 3 is about to destroy.

We always either start or end with this slide. We are trying to make a simple point that, if we can get the policy correct here, we can have an amazing future. The United States can have an amazing future.

But we have spent almost the year here—2019, we have, functionally, done nothing.

Do you remember all the promises of we are going to work bipartisan because we have a Republican Senate and then, obviously, the left, the Democrats, control the House here? We are going to work together. We are going to do all these creative things together. And we have done none of it.

We have spent lots of time on impeachment. We have pushed out a handful of bills that were just almost crazy in their policy sets to satiate the radicalized face of the Democrats.

I am sorry. I know that is mean, but it is true.

So let’s take a step backwards and pull out our calculators and understand, once again, that 30-year window, \$103 trillion of debt—if you actually normalize it to inflation adjusted. Okay. So it is, at today’s discount rate—I am not sure. It would probably be somewhere in the \$83 trillion of debt, inflation adjusted.

So here is our argument: Get the things that grow the economy right. We have demonstrated getting the Tax Code right has produced a miracle of economic growth in the way of labor participation. Our brothers and sisters, people, are working. And it turns out those have cascade effects in everything from health to there will be falls in substance abuse use. We see great things happening.

But with economic growth, we have to get immigration correct. We have to get trade correct. We have to get the way we regulate, using technology. Instead of a 1938 model of fill out lots of paperwork and shove it in a file cabinet, and when you screw up, we pull out the file cabinet so we can sue you, using crowdsource technology where we know, if you screw up, we catch you instantly and we can fix it right then.

There are amazing changes right here.

Population stability: How do you encourage families? How do you build an immigration system that actually is

more talent-based so you maximize economic growth so we can keep our economic promises?

How do you encourage people to be in the labor force?

One of the very odd things we see in the data is that December, a year ago, suddenly we saw in the data statistics millennial females moving into the labor force at substantial numbers but millennial males still substantially underperforming. Why? Is this the opioid crisis? Are there other factors?

We need to know those sorts of things because, it turns out, when we have entire quartiles of our population who are underperforming in the labor market, it has really bad societal cascade effects.

So let's work on policies that get as many folks who are interested. Whether you be retirement age or that millennial male, what do we have to do as a society to encourage, to prod, to push for you to be in the labor force? Because that is important not only to you as an individual, but it is really important to the country's economic stability.

Technology disruption: We just talked about the curative drugs that are coming. We also can talk about the sensors and the other things that are going to allow us to stay healthy. How do we update the laws so that thing like that flu kazoo isn't illegal?

There is a reason you didn't go to Blockbuster Video last weekend. Technology changes. We need to make sure our law sets are sympathetic to the changes that can reduce our prices in healthcare, to protect the environment and so many other things.

Yet we are decades behind in the way we write laws here and understanding how to future-proof those laws so, when we have disruptive technologies—and anyone who is really interested in this, pull out your phone. Go to a search engine, and go look up “MIT ambient air capture” and look at the miracle they have.

If what they have published is correct on, now, their price per ton—they believe they can pull CO₂ right out of the air or do it right over a smokestack. If those numbers are correct, we now have a major change in CO₂ emissions in the world because of our ability now, at amazing prices, to be able to pull it almost right out of the air.

These technologies are here. Why aren't we here talking about them on the floor, and how to encourage more of it and how to get it rolled out in society, not only here, but across the world? Because, if you actually care about global warming—or climate change or whatever the current pop term is—it turns out there are amazing technology disruptions that are here. The only problem is they don't allow you to control other people's lives; they just solve the problem. And are we about solving the problem or just the control freaks who are often the Members of this body?

And then other things: The earned entitlements. You have earned your

Social Security. You have earned your Medicare. Are there things we can do in those benefits to encourage you to stay healthier; to, if you feel like it, work; to actually, instead of taking your benefits, say how long would you like—if we gave you a spiff, would you wait?

There is tinkering you can do here that actually makes the programs more sound. And if you do it all together, we believe we have a model that provides an economic future where we are not destroyed by the growing debt.

But there is no single answer. It is going to have to be almost a holistic approach of lots of types of policies woven together, and every single one of them needs to be about the reality of our demographics.

And now the experiment I will ask you all to engage in: Watch the floor this week and see how many people will ever come behind these microphones and talk about the economic growth and survival of this country because of what is about to happen, the debt that is about to crush us and the fact that we are not talking about it. Instead, we are busy, basically, doing levels of absurdity around here.

The cruelty you have just also subjected my 4-year-old daughter to—and her economic future—you should all be ashamed of yourselves, ourselves, myself, because there is a path. The problem is this path doesn't ideologically satiate those who have just gone so extreme.

But the math is real, the math works, and the math, Madam Speaker, always wins.

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

IMMIGRATION POLICY

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

Mr. GROTHMAN. Madam Speaker, obviously, most of the newspapers, insofar as people still read newspapers, most of the TV shows in the last month have focused on the impeachment hearings. And we all know that, at the end of the day, impeachment or no impeachment, President Trump is not going to be removed in the next year.

So the question is: Why are we spending so much time on impeachment?

I have felt, in the long-term future of America, the most significant thing going on right now is what is going on with immigration policy in the United States; and as long as this impeachment hearing has taken the top of the page in the newspaper, immigration is at the bottom of the page.

I believe one of the primary reasons for keeping immigration from the public is they don't want the public to know what is going on in immigration or what isn't going on in Congress with regard to immigration.

At its worst, we allowed over 140,000 people in this country in May. President Trump has been asking for help in this crisis, and he has gotten no—or virtually no help from Congress. Nevertheless, things that President Trump has done on his own have reduced that figure, if only temporarily.

I mention again, 145,000 people caught and processed in May and probably over another 10,000 people not even processed. That number has gone down to around 45,000 in September, and we believe it will be even lower in October. This is largely because of things that President Trump has done on his own.

He has negotiated with the Mexican Government—to a certain extent, under threat of tariffs—to put Mexican troops on the southern border.

The Mexican Government is patrolling the interior of its country for people trying to work their way north, and President Trump has reached agreements with the triangle countries of Central America, the countries of Guatemala, El Salvador, and Honduras, and they are currently taking people coming from farther south who need asylum.

President Trump has also—we wish he was doing more here, but he began building a wall, and we are working our way toward adding another 450 miles of wall by the end of next year. This is a significant improvement toward what it should be, but we are still well short of where we want to be.

What should Congress be doing, or what should we be focusing on while Congress is spending time debating impeachment?

First of all, we have a shortage of detention beds. So, when ICE is trying to remove people from this country, there are a lack of beds to place people in. There is no reason why, given the amount of money we are spending here, that should not be taken care of.

There have been requests for another 5,000 people in the Border Patrol, and there are still, unquestionably, people streaming across this border every month who aren't even counted because we are not taking care of them.

□ 1700

But there are other things that can be done as well. There is the Trafficking Victims Protection Act.

Some people talk about children being separated from their parents. This is something that Congress can solve on its own.

Right now, if children try to come here, single children from Mexico and Canada, they are returned to their parents to make their families whole. In a loophole in the law, if children come here from countries other than Canada and Mexico, we are bound to keep them and separate them from their families.

Congress should act, and the same law that applies to Mexico and Canada should apply to Venezuela or Honduras or Guatemala. We have no business allowing the current law to continue in

which people are coming here while their parents are in another country.

We have the Flores settlement in which, right now, people have to be released after being detained for 20 days. Given the slowness of our court system, it is not unusual for people to have to be released prior to the time when a hearing takes place. Again, Congress should act and spend time on that rather than continue to spend time on impeachment.

We continue to have a problem with sanctuary cities in which, when we want to remove people even from incarceration types of facilities or from jails, particularly from jails, sanctuary municipalities are not allowing us to remove people, even criminal people.

Congress should act, and Congress has not acted, so that we do not allow these sanctuary cities to forbid access to the jails for ICE to remove people from this country.

Another thing that should be done is something should be done about the credible fear standard and when people are allowed in this country and when people are not allowed in this country. But, again, Congress has refused to act.

I want to point out that we can do all these things without being anti-immigrant.

And something that hasn't been noticed in the most recent year: Over 800,000 new people were sworn into this country, and President Trump is doing nothing to reduce that figure. As a matter of fact, that 830,000 figure is well over the 700,000 figure of the relatively recent past.

President Trump is a friend of legal immigration, but we have to stop being a friend of illegal immigration.

In other things that encourage people to come here, Secretary Carson is going to bat and trying to keep our limited, low-income housing stock available for our own citizens and not people who are here illegally. It would be good if Congress stepped up to the plate and said we are going to put our homeless veterans ahead of people who are in this country illegally.

President Trump is also trying to put work requirements in the SNAP program. And let's be honest: If we have a program giving away free food without a work requirement, that is an inducement for people from other countries to come here.

Congress should, again, convene and bring bills to the floor that put a work requirement with the SNAP benefit. A work requirement with a SNAP benefit, making it a less advantageous welfare program, would stop sending the message for the rest of the world to come into the country.

So, in summary, there are a variety of things that have to be done and that Congress should be acting on and that the mainstream media and even the conservative media should be paying attention to because they are going to affect the future of this country for the next 10 or 20 or 30 years, unlike the impeachment inquiries which we know

are going nowhere, although the impeachment inquiries are keeping other things off the page.

We need more detention beds.

We have to change the credible fear standard so that less people are able to come in this country without doing something, without having a genuine fear.

We have to change the 20 days in the Flores settlement so we are not required to release people in the country.

And above all, we have to change the Trafficking Victims Protection Act so that we can remove children from this country and send them back to their parents in Central America.

I don't know why, with so many people in this institution purporting to claim that they want families together, we do not amend our current laws and do with other countries what we already do with Mexico and Canada, and that is tell an unaccompanied minor: You belong with your parents. We are not going to separate you from your parents.

However, Congress is not acting. And I think one of the reasons they are able to get away with not acting on this is because the papers are filled with impeachment, impeachment, impeachment all day long.

So, in summary, I hope we pay attention to the number of people coming in this country.

I hope we congratulate President Trump on the things he was able to do without Congress doing anything, congratulate him on the reduction of—I will play with my mind here a little bit—reduction of over 70 percent, about 75 percent reduction in the number of people who are processed in this country compared to 4 or 5 months ago.

But I also think we have to pay attention to the things that we are not finishing at this time, and I hope the media and the American public does not take its eye off the immigration ball while we focus on the impeachment hearing.

And I really hate to say it, but I do believe one of the reasons why some people want to keep impeachment in the news is, as long as impeachment dominates the news, we are not talking about Congress' neglect in doing what they should do to secure our border and to make sure that the people coming here are people coming here for legal green cards, legal work visas, and, eventually, to be sworn in as legal citizens.

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

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Robert F. Reeves, Deputy Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 5277. An act to amend section 442 of title 18, United States Code, to exempt certain interests in mutual funds, unit investment trusts, employee benefit plans, and re-

tirement plans from conflict of interest limitations for the Government Publishing Office.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Cheryl L. Johnson, Clerk of the House, reported that on December 4, 2019, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills:

H.R. 887. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 877 East 1200 South in Orem, Utah, as the "Jerry C. Washburn Post Office Building".

H.R. 1252. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 6531 Van Nuys Boulevard in Van Nuys, California, as the "Marilyn Monroe Post Office".

H.R. 1253. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 13507 Van Nuys Boulevard in Pacoima, California, as the "Ritchie Valens Post Office Building".

H.R. 1526. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 200 Israel Road Southeast in Tumwater, Washington, as the "Eva G. Hewitt Post Office".

H.R. 1844. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 66 Grove Court in Elgin, Illinois, as the "Corporal Alex Martinez Memorial Post Office Building".

H.R. 1972. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1100 West Kent Avenue in Missoula, Montana, as the "Jeannette Rankin Post Office Building".

H.R. 2151. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 7722 South Main Street in Pine Plains, New York, as the "Senior Chief Petty Officer Shannon M. Kent Post Office".

H.R. 2325. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 100 Calle Alondra in San Juan, Puerto Rico, as the "65th Infantry Regiment Post Office Building".

H.R. 2334. To designate the Department of Veterans Affairs community-based outpatient clinic in Odessa, Texas, as the "Wilson and Young Medal of Honor VA Clinic".

H.R. 2451. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 575 Dexter Street in Central Falls, Rhode Island, as the "Elizabeth Buffum Chace Post Office".

H.R. 3144. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 8520 Michigan Avenue in Whittier, California, as the "Jose Ramos Post Office Building".

H.R. 3314. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1750 McCulloch Boulevard North in Lake Havasu City, Arizona, as the "Lake Havasu City Combat Veterans Memorial Post Office Building".

Cheryl L. Johnson, Clerk of the House, further reported that on December 5, 2019, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill:

H.R. 5277. To amend section 442 of title 18, United States Code, to exempt certain interests in mutual funds, unit investment trusts, employee benefit plans, and retirement plans from conflict of interest limitations for the Government Publishing Office.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 7 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, December 6, 2019, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

3187. A letter from the Director, Issuances Staff, Food Safety and Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Publication Method for Lists of Foreign Countries Eligible To Export Meat, Poultry, or Egg Products to the United States [Docket No.: FSIS-2018-0027] (RIN: 0583-AD72) received December 2, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3188. A letter from the Acting Principal Director, Defense Pricing and Contracting, Defense Acquisition Regulations Systems, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Repeal of Temporary Statutory Authorities (DFARS Case 2019-D040) [Docket: DARS-2019-0066] (RIN: 0750-AK86) received December 3, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Armed Services.

3189. A letter from the Senior Legal Advisor for Regulatory Affairs, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — IMARA Calculation Under the Terrorism Risk Insurance Program (RIN: 1505-AC62) received December 3, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

3190. A letter from the Director, Office of Legislative Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Regulatory Capital Rule: Capital Simplification for Qualifying Community Banking Organizations (RIN: 3064-AE91) received December 3, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

3191. A letter from the Deputy Chief, Disability Rights Office, Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Misuse of Internet Protocol (IP) Captioned Telephone Service [CG Docket No.: 13-24]; Telecommunications Relay Services and Speech-to-Speech Services for Individuals with Hearing and Speech Disabilities [CG Docket No.: 03-123] received December 2, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3192. A letter from the Chief, Pricing Policy Division, Wireline Competition Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Reform of Certain Part 61 Tariff Rules [WC Docket No.: 18-276]; Petitions for Limited Waiver of Rule 61.74(a) [WC Docket No.: 17-308] received December 2, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3193. A letter from the Deputy Bureau Chief, Wireline Competition Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Bridging the Digital Divide for Low-Income Consumers [WC Docket No.: 17-287]; Lifeline and Link Up Reform and Modernization [WC Docket No.: 11-42]; Telecommunications Carriers Eli-

gible for Universal Service Support [WC Docket No.: 09-197] received December 2, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3194. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 18-083, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3195. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 19-066, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3196. A letter from the Federal Liaison Officer, Patent and Trademark Office, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — International Trademark Classification Changes [Docket No.: PTO-T-2019-0036] (RIN: 0651-AD44) received December 2, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3197. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2019-0483; Product Identifier 2019-NM-053 AD; Amendment 39-19795; AD 2019-23-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 2, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3198. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Fokker Services B.V. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2019-0666; Product Identifier 2019-NM-086-AD; Amendment 39-19792; AD 2019-22-13] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 2, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3199. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Textron Aviation Inc. (Type Certificate Previously Held by Beechcraft Corporation) Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2019-0959; Product Identifier 2019-CE-051-AD; Amendment 39-19804; AD 2019-23-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 2, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3200. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2019-0323; Product Identifier 2019-NM-026-AD; Amendment 39-19785; AD 2019-22-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 2, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3201. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; General Electric Company Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2019-0894; Product Identifier 2019-NE-32-AD; Amendment 39-19798; AD 2019-21-51] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 2, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3202. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's notice of proposed rulemaking — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Defense and Space S.A. (Formerly Known as Construcciones Aeronauticas, S.A.) Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2019-0869; Product Identifier 2019-NM-162-AD] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 2, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3203. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2019-0400; Product Identifier 2019-NM-022-AD; Amendment 39-19776; AD 2019-21-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 2, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3204. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2019-0258; Product Identifier 2018-NM-134-AD; Amendment 39-19783; AD 2019-22-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 2, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3205. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Pratt & Whitney Canada Corp. Turbo-shaft Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0739; Product Identifier 2015-NE-07-AD; Amendment 39-19782; AD 2019-22-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 2, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3206. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31280; Amdt. No.: 3877] received December 2, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3207. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31281; Amdt. No.: 3878] received December 2, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3208. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment and Amendment of Area Navigation (RNAV) Routes; Southeastern United States [Docket No.: FAA-2019-0124; Airspace Docket No.: 18-ASO-18] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received December 2, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3209. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E

Airspace; Tomahawk, WI [Docket No.: FAA-2019-0651; Airspace Docket No.: 19-AGL-24] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received December 2, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3210. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2019-0611; Product Identifier 2019-NM-095-AD; Amendment 39-19793; AD 2019-22-14] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 2, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3211. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2019-0667; Product Identifier 2019-NM-085-AD; Amendment 39-19791; AD 2019-22-12] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 2, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3212. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment, Revocation, and Establishment of Air Traffic Service (ATS) Routes; Western United States [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0221; Airspace Docket No.: 17-ANM-24] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received December 2, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

Mr. GRIJALVA: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 2405. A bill to reauthorize and amend the National Sea Grant College Program Act, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 116-323). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky:

H.R. 5305. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study to assess the suitability and feasibility of designating certain land as the Kentucky Wildlands National Heritage Area, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. LARSON of Connecticut (for himself and Mr. BUCHANAN):

H.R. 5306. A bill to amend title XI of the Social Security Act to clarify the mailing requirement relating to social security account statements; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. SEWELL of Alabama:

H.R. 5307. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 115 Nicol Avenue in Thomasville, Alabama, as the "Postmaster Robert Ingram Sr. Post Office"; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. RYAN (for himself, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. JACKSON LEE, and Mrs. HAYES):

H.R. 5308. A bill to amend the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 and the Richard B Russell National School Lunch Act to eliminate reduced price breakfasts and lunches and to require that the income guidelines for determining eligibility for free breakfasts and free lunches be 200 percent of the poverty level, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RICHMOND (for himself, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. COHEN, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. BLUNT ROCHES-TER, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. EVANS, Mrs. HAYES, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mr. LEWIS, Ms. MOORE, Ms. OMAR, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. RUSH, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. VEASEY, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, and Ms. WILSON of Florida):

H.R. 5309. A bill to prohibit discrimination based on an individual's texture or style of hair; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Education and Labor, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WALTZ (for himself and Ms. TORRES SMALL of New Mexico):

H.R. 5310. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Defense to prescribe regulations to allow emergency response providers to use mobile commissaries or exchange store deployed to an area covered by a declaration of a major disaster or emergency under the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HUFFMAN:

H.R. 5311. A bill to amend the Cooperative Forestry Assistance Act of 1978 to renew the National Urban and Community Forestry Advisory Council and to amend the Act of October 14, 1980 to remove the limitation on the transfer of amounts available under the reforestation trust fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee (for himself and Mr. COURTNEY):

H.R. 5312. A bill to authorize the creation of a commission to develop voluntary accessibility guidelines for electronic instructional materials and related technologies used in postsecondary education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MORELLE (for himself and Mr. WENSTRUP):

H.R. 5313. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow for certain residential rental property to be depreciated over a 30-year period; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts (for herself, Mr. MCKINLEY, Ms. SLOTKIN, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. CISNEROS, and Mr. STIVERS):

H.R. 5314. A bill to enable registered apprenticeship programs to better serve veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. BEATTY (for herself, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. HECK, Mr. GREEN of Texas, and Mr. CLEAVER):

H.R. 5315. A bill to amend the Financial Institutions Reform, Recovery, and Enforce-

ment Act of 1989 to establish a Financial Agent Mentor-Protégé Program within the Department of the Treasury, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. COX of California (for himself, Mr. COSTA, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. HARDER of California, and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H.R. 5316. A bill to provide for the restoration of the original carrying capacity of canals impacted by land subsidence, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mrs. FLETCHER:

H.R. 5317. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 315 Addicks Howell Road in Houston, Texas, as the "Deputy Sandeep Singh Dhaliwal Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois (for himself, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. TLAIB, and Ms. NORTON):

H.R. 5318. A bill to amend certain banking laws to establish requirements for bank mergers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. HECK (for himself, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. COLE, Ms. HAALAND, Mr. YOUNG, Ms. MOORE, and Ms. GABBARD):

H.R. 5319. A bill to reauthorize the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act of 1996, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana:

H.R. 5320. A bill to require States and units of local government receiving funds under grant programs operated by the Department of Justice, which use such funds for pretrial services programs, to submit to the Attorney General a report relating to such program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. MCBATH (for herself and Mr. CARTER of Georgia):

H.R. 5321. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to expand, enhance, and improve public health data systems, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MEEKS (for himself, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. CLAY, and Mrs. BEATTY):

H.R. 5322. A bill to establish or modify requirements relating to minority depository institutions, community development financial institutions, and impact banks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on Small Business, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. O'HALLERAN (for himself, Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas, Ms. HAALAND, and Mr. LUJÁN):

H.R. 5323. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to expand supportive services for Native American aging programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself, Mr. BANKS, Mrs. DAVIS of California, and Mr. CISNEROS):

H.R. 5324. 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; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. PRESSLEY:

H.R. 5325. A bill to reduce exclusionary discipline practices in schools, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. SÁNCHEZ (for herself and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY):

H.R. 5326. A bill to amend titles XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act to prohibit skilled nursing facilities and nursing facilities from using pre-dispute arbitration agreements with respect to residents of those facilities under the Medicare and Medicaid programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. SHALALA (for herself and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ):

H.R. 5327. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to end the immigrant visa backlog, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. SPEIER (for herself, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. RUSH, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. SLOTKIN, and Ms. DEAN):

H.R. 5328. A bill to require certain information be reported with respect to principal investigators who have discriminated, including harassed, on the basis of sex (including gender identity, sexual orientation, pregnancy, childbirth, medical conditions related to pregnancy and childbirth, parental status, and sex stereotype), and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor, and in addition to the Committees on Oversight and Reform, and Science, Space, and Technology, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. STEUBE:

H.R. 5329. A bill to require that the Federal Government procure from the private sector the goods and services necessary for the operations and management of certain Government agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Ms. TLAIB:

H.R. 5330. A bill to amend the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act to provide a timetable for verification of medical debt and to increase the efficiency of credit markets with more perfect information, to prohibit consumer reporting agencies from issuing consumer reports containing information about debts related to medically necessary procedure, about and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. COSTA (for himself, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Ms. FUDGE, and Mr. MARSHALL):

H. Res. 742. A resolution recognizing the continued success of the Food for Peace Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SCHNEIDER (for himself, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. KAPTR, Mr. PANETTA, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. TONKO, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. RUSH, Ms. MOORE, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. CASTEN of Illinois, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. DELBENE, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mrs. DAVIS of Cali-

fornia, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. WELCH, Mr. POCAN, Mrs. TORRES of California, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HECK, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. MORELLE, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. COOPER, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. CISNEROS, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. CORREA, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. STANTON, Mr. CASE, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. MCEACHIN, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. KILMER, Ms. UNDERWOOD, Mr. KEATING, Mr. NEGUSE, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LEVIN of California, Mr. BEYER, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. PAPPAS, Ms. MENG, Mr. COSTA, Ms. BASS, Mr. COHEN, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. CRIST, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. SOTO, Mr. DEFAZIO, Miss RICE of New York, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. DELGADO, Mr. COX of California, Mr. KIND, Mrs. HAYES, Mr. GALLEGGO, Mrs. AXNE, Mr. CLAY, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. FRANKEL, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. RYAN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. PETERS, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. SCHRIER, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. ROUDA, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL, Mrs. FLETCHER, Ms. FINKENAUER, Mr. MALINOWSKI, Ms. STEVENS, Ms. HAALAND, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. NEAL, Mr. NADLER, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. LOEBACK, Mr. EVANS, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. BERA, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. TITUS, Mr. SIREN, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Ms. WATERS, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. NORCROSS, Ms. FUDGE, and Ms. SEWELL of Alabama):

H. Res. 743. A resolution expressing strong disapproval of the President's formal notification to the United Nations of his intent to withdraw the United States from the Paris Agreement; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Missouri (for himself, Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. WALTZ, Mr. GUEST, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. HICE of Georgia, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. WRIGHT, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. KEVIN HERN of Oklahoma, Mr. RIGGLEMAN, Mr. ARRINGTON, Mr. BANKS, Mr. WALKER, Mr. YOH, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. BABIN, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. LONG, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. MARSHALL, and Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia):

H. Res. 744. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the Senate should amend its rules to require a sitting United States Senator actively seeking election to the Presidency of the United States to recuse himself or herself

from the impeachment trial of an incumbent President of the United States who is serving his or her first term in office; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

147. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Texas, relative to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 59, respectfully urging the president of the United States to designate a state funeral for the last surviving Medal of Honor recipient from World War II; which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

148. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Texas, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 74, respectfully urging the United States Congress to enact H.R. 613/S. 165, the TRICARE Reserve Select Improvement Act; which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

149. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Texas, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 19, respectfully urging the United States Congress to repeal the Government Pension Offset and the Windfall Elimination Provision of the Social Security Act; which was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky:

H.R. 5305.

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

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. LARSON of Connecticut:

H.R. 5306.

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

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the U.S. Constitution: "The Congress shall have the Power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof."

By Ms. SEWELL of Alabama:

H.R. 5307.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 7

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 5308.

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

Article 1, Section 8: "To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof."

By Mr. RICHMOND:

H.R. 5309.

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

This bill is introduced pursuant to the powers granted to Congress under the General Welfare Clause (Art. 1 Sec. 8 Cl. 1), the Commerce Clause (Art. 1 Sec. 8 Cl. 3), and the Necessary and Proper Clause (Art. 1 Sec. 8 Cl. 18).

Further, this statement of constitutional authority is made for the sole purpose of compliance with clause 7 of Rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives and shall have no bearing on judicial review of the accompanying bill.

By Mr. WALTZ:

H.R. 5310.

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

Article I, Section 8, which provides Congress the power "to provide for the common Defence" and "to make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces".

By Mr. HUFFMAN:

H.R. 5311.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1: The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee:

H.R. 5312.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. MORELLE:

H.R. 5313.

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

Article I, Section 8, clause 18

By Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts:

H.R. 5314.

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

Article I Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mrs. BEATTY:

H.R. 5315.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3, "To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes."

By Mr. COX of California:

H.R. 5316.

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

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

By Mrs. FLETCHER:

H.R. 5317.

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

Clause 7 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois:

H.R. 5318.

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

Article I, Section VIII, Clause III

By Mr. HECK:

H.R. 5319.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution: "The Congress shall have power . . . To regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian Tribes."

By Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana:

H.R. 5320.

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

U.S.C. Article I, Section 8

By Mrs. MCBATH:

H.R. 5321.

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

Necessary and Proper Clause: The Congress shall have Power . . . To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. MEEKS:

H.R. 5322.

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

Article I

By Mr. O'HALLERAN:

H.R. 5323.

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

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. PETERS:

H.R. 5324.

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

Article I, Section 8

By Ms. PRESSLEY:

H.R. 5325.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

"To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof."

By Ms. SANCHEZ:

H.R. 5326.

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

Article I Section 8

By Ms. SHALALA:

H.R. 5327.

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

Article I, Section 8, clause 4 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. SPEIER:

H.R. 5328.

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

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. STEUBE:

H.R. 5329.

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

Article 1, Section 8

The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

To borrow money on the credit of the United States;

To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes;

To establish a uniform Rule of Naturalization, and uniform Laws on the subject of Bankruptcies throughout the United States;

To coin Money, regulate the Value thereof, and of foreign Coin, and fix the Standard of Weights and Measures;

To provide for the Punishment of counterfeiting the Securities and current Coin of the United States;

To establish Post Offices and Post Roads;

To promote the Progress of Science and useful Arts, by securing for limited Times to Authors and Inventors the exclusive Right to their respective Writings and Discoveries;

To constitute Tribunals inferior to the supreme Court;

and Offenses against the Law of Nations;

To declare War, grant Letters of Marque and Reprisal, and make Rules concerning Captures on Land and Water;

To raise and support Armies, but no Appropriation of Money to that Use shall be for a longer Term than two Years;

To provide and maintain a Navy;

To make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces;

To provide for calling forth the Militia to execute the Laws of the Union, suppress Insurrections and repel Invasions;

To provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining, the Militia, and for governing such Part of them as may be employed in the Service of the United States, reserving to the States respectively, the Appointment of the Officers, and the Authority of training the Militia according to the discipline prescribed by Congress;

To exercise exclusive Legislation in all Cases whatsoever, over such District (not exceeding ten Miles square) as may, by Cession of particular States, and the acceptance of Congress, become the Seat of the Government of the United States, and to exercise like Authority over all Places purchased by the Consent of the Legislature of the State in which the Same shall be, for the Erection of Forts, Magazines, Arsenals, dock-Yards, and other needful Buildings; And

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Ms. TLALIB:

H.R. 5330.

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

Article I, Section 8, clause 3

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 3: Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 20: Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio.

H.R. 40: Ms. SHALALA.

H.R. 186: Ms. UNDERWOOD.

H.R. 218: Mr. KELLER.

H.R. 372: Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. STANTON, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. BASS, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. CLEAVER, and Mr. SWALWELL of California.

H.R. 413: Mrs. AXNE.

H.R. 600: Mr. STANTON.

H.R. 763: Mr. BERA.

H.R. 779: Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee.

H.R. 849: Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. NEGUSE.

H.R. 912: Ms. FINKENAUER.

H.R. 934: Mrs. MILLER.

H.R. 935: Mr. FORTENBERRY.

H.R. 1049: Ms. MCCOLLUM and Mr. KHANNA.

H.R. 1108: Mr. GOMEZ and Mr. CASTRO of Texas.

H.R. 1126: Mr. NEGUSE.

H.R. 1154: Mr. MCADAMS.

H.R. 1159: Mr. POSEY.

H.R. 1171: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.

H.R. 1175: Mrs. MCBATH.

H.R. 1179: Mr. BYRNE.

H.R. 1185: Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 1228: Mr. CÁRDENAS and Mr. POSEY.

H.R. 1240: Ms. BONAMICI.

H.R. 1367: Mr. TONKO, Ms. SHALALA, Mr. CLAY, and Mr. KENNEDY.

H.R. 1380: Mr. DOGGETT and Mr. VARGAS.

H.R. 1418: Mr. KHANNA.

H.R. 1441: Mr. LOUDERMILK.

H.R. 1530: Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH.

H.R. 1570: Mr. LAMB, Ms. SHALALA, and Mr. HOLDING.

- H.R. 1642: Mr. KATKO.
H.R. 1679: Mr. RICHMOND.
H.R. 1694: Ms. TLAIK.
H.R. 1695: Mrs. AXNE and Mrs. LEE of Nevada.
H.R. 1713: Mr. HUFFMAN, Mrs. FLETCHER, Mr. RASKIN, and Ms. CLARKE of New York.
H.R. 1765: Mr. TRONE and Ms. SPANBERGER.
H.R. 1766: Mr. CUNNINGHAM and Mr. COSTA.
H.R. 1767: Mr. KIM.
H.R. 1769: Ms. FINKENAUER.
H.R. 1801: Mr. NEGUSE.
H.R. 1878: Mr. LAMB and Ms. SPEIER.
H.R. 1882: Mr. LAWSON of Florida.
H.R. 1917: Mrs. HARTZLER.
H.R. 1948: Mr. COSTA, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana, and Ms. HOULAHAN.
H.R. 1987: Mr. KIM.
H.R. 2073: Ms. UNDERWOOD and Mr. BARR.
H.R. 2074: Mr. GOTTHEIMER.
H.R. 2117: Mr. COX of California.
H.R. 2339: Ms. SÁNCHEZ.
H.R. 2377: Ms. UNDERWOOD.
H.R. 2382: Mr. TIPTON.
H.R. 2405: Mr. STAUBER.
H.R. 2420: Ms. ADAMS and Ms. FINKENAUER.
H.R. 2466: Ms. SHALALA.
H.R. 2474: Ms. SEWELL of Alabama.
H.R. 2491: Mr. CONNOLLY and Mr. CORREA.
H.R. 2586: Mr. KHANNA.
H.R. 2616: Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 2623: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 2700: Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina.
H.R. 2747: Ms. SLOTKIN.
H.R. 2771: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
H.R. 2788: Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma.
H.R. 2808: Mr. KILDEE.
H.R. 2842: Mr. TRONE.
H.R. 2895: Mr. BROOKS of Alabama.
H.R. 2896: Mr. PANETTA and Mr. VISCLOSKEY.
H.R. 2912: Ms. SLOTKIN and Mrs. AXNE.
H.R. 2953: Mr. COLE.
H.R. 2970: Mrs. AXNE.
H.R. 2975: Mr. NEAL.
H.R. 3073: Mrs. HAYES.
H.R. 3077: Mr. GREEN of Tennessee and Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 3107: Ms. HOULAHAN, Mr. KELLER, Mr. STEUBE, and Mr. LARSEN of Washington.
H.R. 3157: Ms. HAALAND.
H.R. 3219: Mr. BACON.
H.R. 3220: Mr. NEGUSE.
H.R. 3225: Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 3235: Mr. WELCH.
H.R. 3241: Mr. SCHWEIKERT.
H.R. 3302: Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma.
H.R. 3451: Mr. CONNOLLY.
H.R. 3452: Mr. CONNOLLY.
H.R. 3497: Mr. MURPHY of North Carolina.
H.R. 3534: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
H.R. 3559: Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 3582: Mr. KENNEDY and Mr. RASKIN.
H.R. 3584: Mr. LEWIS and Mrs. AXNE.
H.R. 3632: Mr. EMMER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. HECK, and Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 3685: Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 3711: Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 3742: Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. EVANS, Mr. SABLAN, and Mr. HURD of Texas.
H.R. 3789: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 3794: Mr. LAMBORN and Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
H.R. 3816: Mr. BALDERSON.
H.R. 3824: Ms. KELLY of Illinois.
H.R. 3851: Mr. LAMB, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, and Ms. WILD.
H.R. 3884: Mr. LOWENTHAL.
H.R. 3912: Ms. MENG.
H.R. 3975: Mr. COX of California.
H.R. 3980: Mr. BUCSHON.
H.R. 4090: Mr. KEVIN HERN of Oklahoma.
H.R. 4101: Mr. TED LIEU of California.
H.R. 4117: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.
H.R. 4193: Mr. STAUBER and Mrs. AXNE.
H.R. 4227: Mr. WELCH, Mr. WRIGHT, Mr. VAN DREW, Mrs. RODGERS of Washington, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. ESHOO, and Mr. BALDERSON.
H.R. 4228: Mr. MEEKS and Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.
H.R. 4229: Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. VAN DREW, Mr. WRIGHT, Mr. BALDERSON, and Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.
H.R. 4280: Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 4331: Mr. COSTA and Mr. PHILLIPS.
H.R. 4388: Mr. COSTA.
H.R. 4397: Ms. STEVENS and Mr. PERLMUTTER.
H.R. 4429: Mrs. MILLER.
H.R. 4436: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
H.R. 4438: Mr. KENNEDY.
H.R. 4468: Mr. MOOLENAAR and Mrs. BEATTY.
H.R. 4482: Mrs. LURIA.
H.R. 4489: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H.R. 4540: Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. CORREA, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. TITUS, and Mr. CARBAJAL.
H.R. 4624: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
H.R. 4672: Mr. CALVERT, Mr. HUNTER, and Mr. NUNES.
H.R. 4674: Mr. PERLMUTTER, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, and Mr. SMITH of Washington.
H.R. 4681: Mr. RYAN.
H.R. 4691: Ms. WILD.
H.R. 4712: Mr. TONKO.
H.R. 4804: Mr. RASKIN, Mr. QUIGLEY, and Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 4807: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 4817: Mr. TIPTON and Mr. RUTHERFORD.
H.R. 4836: Mr. NEGUSE.
H.R. 4868: Mrs. HARTZLER.
H.R. 4874: Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 4890: Mrs. HAYES.
H.R. 4894: Mr. COOPER.
H.R. 4897: Mr. COLE.
H.R. 4900: Mr. COMER.
H.R. 4928: Mr. SMITH of Washington.
H.R. 4940: Mr. ROY and Mr. CONAWAY.
H.R. 4941: Mr. HECK.
H.R. 4945: Mr. LAMB.
H.R. 4957: Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico and Ms. HAALAND.
H.R. 4980: Mr. HIGGINS of New York and Mrs. TORRES of California.
H.R. 4986: Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 5010: Mr. LEVIN of Michigan.
H.R. 5036: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 5041: Mr. HORSFORD, Mrs. HAYES, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. SCANLON, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESSTER, Mr. RUSH, Mr. HARDER of California, and Ms. UNDERWOOD.
H.R. 5048: Mr. DEFazio.
H.R. 5050: Ms. TLAIB and Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 5056: Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma.
H.R. 5078: Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma.
H.R. 5092: Mr. COLE and Mr. HARDER of California.
H.R. 5104: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 5119: Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 5139: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.
H.R. 5166: Mr. KILDEE.
H.R. 5173: Mr. BYRNE.
H.R. 5175: Mr. ROUZER and Mr. SMUCKER.
H.R. 5176: Ms. JACKSON LEE.
H.R. 5180: Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 5185: Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. PANETTA, and Mr. NEGUSE.
H.R. 5191: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 5205: Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 5230: Mr. KHANNA, Mr. HARDER of California, Mrs. HAYES, and Mr. VAN DREW.
H.R. 5243: Mr. SERRANO.
H.R. 5245: Ms. SLOTKIN.
H.R. 5246: Ms. JUDY CHU of California.
H.R. 5267: Mr. HECK and Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 5269: Mr. KIND.
H.R. 5299: Mr. MOULTON, Mr. ESPAILLAT, and Ms. NORTON.
H.J. Res. 2: Mrs. MCBATH.
H.J. Res. 22: Mr. KELLER.
H. Res. 69: Mr. CASTRO of Texas.
H. Res. 220: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.
H. Res. 223: Mr. VELA.
H. Res. 255: Mr. COURTNEY and Mr. WATKINS.
H. Res. 277: Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. VARGAS, and Mr. DEUTCH.
H. Res. 349: Mr. BACON and Mr. COX of California.
H. Res. 399: Mrs. MCBATH.
H. Res. 421: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H. Res. 452: Mr. COX of California, Mr. PAPPAS, Mr. WRIGHT, and Mr. MALINOWSKI.
H. Res. 467: Mr. LANGEVIN and Mr. KILMER.
H. Res. 527: Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. ROUDA, and Ms. PORTER.
H. Res. 641: Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, and Mrs. TORRES of California.
H. Res. 672: Mr. GUEST, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. COOK, Mr. COHEN, and Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.
H. Res. 678: Mrs. HARTZLER and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H. Res. 682: Mr. COSTA.
H. Res. 705: Mr. MEEKS and Mrs. AXNE.
H. Res. 734: Mr. HILL of Arkansas, Mr. KELLER, Mrs. HARTZLER, and Mr. COLE.
H. Res. 736: Mr. ARRINGTON, Mr. MAST, Mr. ABRAHAM, and Mr. FULCHER.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

68. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the County Commissioners of Gaines County, TX, relative to a Resolution respectfully asking the leadership of the United States Senate and the United States House of Representatives to fully support and vote to ratify the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement; which was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 165

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, DECEMBER 5, 2019

No. 194

Senate

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. GRASSLEY).

PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

Majestic God, Your name fills the Earth. In spite of our challenges, You continue to rule with Your love, wisdom, and power. Grant that our lawmakers may not forget the many dangers, toils, and snares You have already brought our Nation through.

Lord, give our Senators the wisdom to know that You continue to direct the steps of the faithful and that we have nothing to fear. Spirit of God, arise within our hearts and prepare us for the task of this day. Surprise us again with Your ability to transform dark yesterdays into bright tomorrows, doing for us more than we can ask or imagine.

We pray in Your great Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH). The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to address my colleagues for 1½ minutes as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

WORLD BANK

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, I believe I have developed a reputation among my colleagues, and hopefully among my constituents, for transparency in the issue of the public's

business should be public. That applies to how the World Bank loans U.S. dollars. The World Bank is right now trying to sneak through a new policy that offends me.

I received word that the World Bank is planning to vote right now, as I speak, on a new country partnership framework with China. That framework commits the World Bank to providing China with billions of dollars in loans indefinitely. What is odd about this is that China is now the world's second largest economy and its per capita income is well above the levels at which countries are supposed to graduate from needing World Bank assistance. In other words, China should stand on their own two feet without help from the American taxpayers or even indirectly through the World Bank.

It happens that our country is the World Bank's largest contributor, and the spending bill that funds the World Bank includes a provision for a big capital increase from the American taxpayers to the World Bank. With this legislation pending, we in the Congress have an opportunity to weigh in and we should take that opportunity to make sure that American taxpayer dollars don't go to China, particularly when China is taking their own money and investing in the Belt and Road Initiative to get influence around several countries on the face of the Earth.

I will have more to say later on this topic.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

BUSINESS BEFORE THE SENATE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, for weeks now, the Republicans have been asking the Democrats to take off their impeachment blinders and let Congress legislate for the American people. We have argued that American families deserve better than this partisan paralysis, where the Democrats literally obsess over impeachment and obstruct everything else.

This very morning, for example, the Speaker gave a speech on national television to push forward her rushed and partisan impeachment, with not one word on the outstanding legislation the American people actually need—nothing on the USMCA or the NDAA or funding for our Armed Forces. It is all impeachment, all the time. Only in this town, only in Washington, does anybody think it is OK for our Armed Forces to go unfunded and for a major trade deal to go unpassed, because the Democrats are too busy hosting a panel of law professors to criticize President Trump on television instead of being busy on the things the American people actually need us to address.

The Kentuckians I represent cannot believe our military commanders are being denied certainty, our men and women in uniform are being denied stable funding, and 176,000 new American jobs are being held up all because the Democratic leadership thinks there is more political advantage in obstruction than in doing their jobs. Well, the servicemembers and personnel in the Kentucky National Guard and at Fort Campbell, Fort Knox, and the Blue Grass Army Depot aren't going to simply stop doing their jobs. No, they are counting on us to pass critical defense legislation that reforms housing and spousal employment programs, that invests in construction, readiness, and

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



Printed on recycled paper.

S6863

modernization, and that locks in—listen to this—the largest pay raise in a decade.

These bills touch every single State. Of course, there are major national and international issues at stake, as well, but the Democrats are still holding the NDAA hostage for a partisan wish list that is meant to appease trial lawyers, public sector unions, and their own far-left base. They are holding up the NDAA over unrelated, nongermane, leftwing wish-list items.

Meanwhile, the Speaker and the Democratic leader are withholding their assent from important bipartisan provisions like the Caesar Syria Civilian Protection Act, which has previously passed both Houses and has been modified to resolve all concerns by the committees of jurisdiction. Unlike the Democratic leader's rhetoric on Syria in recent weeks, this bill would actually do something to stand up for the Syrian people and hold Assad accountable. So I hope the Democratic leader will allow this important demonstration of our support for the Syrian people to go forward.

In the meantime, as if to underscore that the Democrats' top priority is performance art for coastal elites and not the people's business, I understand the Speaker of the House spent part of this week in Madrid, talking about climate change. She took an international flight to discuss carbon emissions. So the Speaker was in Spain, lamenting President Trump's decision to pull us out of the Paris Agreement. Maybe she pitched her conference's Green New Deal—its socialist plan to hurt our economy for American families—while bigger emitters like China go roaring right by.

As an aside, over the past 15 years, the United States' carbon emissions have actually fallen significantly. We appear to be on track for another decline in 2019. Meanwhile, Paris Agreement signatories, like China and India, continue to emit more and more every year. China already emits, roughly, twice as much as the United States, and it is increasing every year.

Kentucky and many other States know exactly what happens when Washington Democrats ignore these facts and decide America needs to take on unilateral economic pain for no meaningful change in global emissions. We are still trying to recover from the Democrats' last "War on Coal." We certainly don't need the Speaker of the House to promise the Europeans that she is going to start a new one. So working Americans and their families are not well served by the Democrats' political performance art. What they really need are results.

The only path to results is bipartisan legislation, and, fortunately, it is a well-trodden one. There are 58 consecutive annual defense authorizations to prove it. Always in the past we have been able to overcome these partisan differences and go forward. There is a bipartisan-bicameral agreement that

the Speaker and the Democratic leader signed just a few months ago to help them find their way back to the table, but the agreement needs to be honored. I hope they do so sometime soon.

NOMINATIONS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, on another matter, while we wait for our Democratic colleagues to let this legislation move forward, the Senate has used the time to confirm more of President Trump's impressive nominees for the Federal courts.

Some of my friends across the aisle complain that we devote too much time to nominations. First, I would like to remind everyone that district judges are the kinds of nominations that, historically, have sailed right through the Senate in big groups by voice votes. If our Democratic colleagues want to spend less time voting on district judges, they should take it up with the Democratic leader, who is forcing us to take cloture vote after cloture vote. As of this morning, we have taken cloture votes on 81 district judge nominees.

By this point in President Obama's Presidency, we had taken one cloture vote on a district judge nominee. Let me say that again. As of this morning, we have taken cloture votes on 81 district judges. By this point in President Obama's Presidency, we had taken one cloture vote on a district judge nominee—just one.

At the comparable point in the five Presidencies preceding President Obama's, combined, we had not taken a single cloture vote on a district judge's nomination—not one. Yet, 3 years into the Trump Presidency, there have been 81 cloture votes and counting just on district judges. So there is your answer on floor time.

More broadly, I want to take a moment to help clarify why I and millions of other Americans care so much about having Federal judges who believe in the radical notion that words matter and that a judge's job is to follow the law and the Constitution.

Take, for example, the subject of religious freedom. The liberty of conscience and the freedom to live out our faiths has been a foundational principle from the Republic's earliest days. Many of the first Europeans who arrived in the New World came here after having fled religious persecution.

James Madison wrote that religion "must be left to the conviction and conscience of every man; and it is the right of every man to exercise it as these may dictate."

Samuel Adams said in the summer of 1776 that America would be the "last asylum" for "freedom of thought and the right of private judgment."

Let me contrast the Founders' understanding with a couple of current events. Last month, New York State convinced a district judge to throw out the Trump administration's conscience protection rule for healthcare pro-

viders. This straightforward rule ensured that healthcare workers could not be forced to perform or assist with medical procedures that profoundly violated their religious beliefs. Yet the radical Democrats in New York could not abide by this basic protection for people of faith. Instead, they wanted to force Christians and other people of faith who work in healthcare to either assist in procedures like abortion or lose their jobs—so much for freedom of conscience.

New York's behavior is part of a disturbing trend. Powerful interests on the left want to shrink freedom of religion until it means freedom to go to church for an hour on Sundays as long as it doesn't impact the rest of your life. That shrunken interpretation is nothing like what our Founders intended, and, candidly, I am not sure how much longer the modern Democratic Party will even believe in that.

A few months ago, a Democrat who is running for President told CNN that the government should take away the tax-exempt status of churches and religious institutions that disagree with leftwing positions. He was not some fringe candidate. He was a guy whom the Democrats and the mainstream media had likened to John F. Kennedy. He was openly suggesting the Federal Government should punish churches if liberals don't like their social views—how appalling.

These disturbing signs have not been limited to the courts or to the Democratic campaign trail. Absurd anti-religious arguments have appeared right here in the Senate. In the last several years, some of our Democratic colleagues have tried, literally, to impose religious tests on nominees for Federal office. Just take the "no religious test" clause and the First Amendment and throw them right out the window. Get rid of them.

Judge Brian Buescher, now a district judge in Nebraska, was attacked by two Democrats on the Committee on the Judiciary for being a faithful Catholic and a member of the mainstream, worldwide Catholic group the Knights of Columbus. He was attacked for being a member of the Knights of Columbus? In written questions, one Senator called standard Catholic teachings "extreme positions" and asked if he would dial down his personal faith practice if confirmed. That happened in the Committee on the Judiciary of this Senate.

As our colleague Senator SASSE observed at the time, the Democrats were transparently implying that Brian's religious beliefs and his affiliation with his Catholic, religious, fraternal organization might make him unfit for service. It was plainly unconstitutional.

Judge Amy Coney Barrett, now a circuit judge on the Seventh Circuit, was likewise subjected to a religious test during her confirmation hearing. One Democratic Senator literally asked: Do you consider yourself an orthodox

Catholic? She was asked that in the Committee on the Judiciary.

Another offered this bizarre and ominous remark: "The dogma lives loudly within you, and that's a concern."

So, look, these warning signs on religious freedom are literally popping up everywhere the modern political left rears its head.

Religious freedom in America has never—never—meant and will never mean solely the freedom to worship privately. It has never meant and will never mean the ability to practice only a subset of faiths acceptable to some subset of politicians. What it means is the right to live your life according to the dictates of your faith and your conscience, free from government coercion.

If those statements strike anybody in this Chamber as remotely controversial, that is exactly why President Trump, Senate Republicans, and millions of Americans are focused on confirming Federal judges who will apply our Constitution as it was originally written.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to resume consideration of the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Richard Ernest Myers II, of North Carolina, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of North Carolina.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

FOSTERING UNDERGRADUATE TALENT BY UNLOCKING RESOURCES FOR EDUCATION ACT

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. Madam President, first, I thank the Democratic leader for the opportunity to move forward on this unanimous consent.

As in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 212, H.R. 2486.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 2486) to reauthorize mandatory funding programs for historically Black col-

leges and universities and other minority-serving institutions.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Alexander-Murray amendment at the desk be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 1255), in the nature of a substitute, was agreed to, as follows:

(Purpose: In the nature of a substitute.)

(The amendment is printed in today's RECORD under "Text of Amendments.")

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

The bill was read the third time.

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. Madam President, I know of no further debate on the bill, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate?

Hearing none, the bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill, as amended, pass?

The bill (H.R. 2486), as amended, was passed.

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senators from South Carolina, Tennessee, Washington State, and Alabama be allowed to speak for brief moments on the great job they have done and that I be given back my leadership time at 10:50.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Madam President, on behalf of all of us, I want to thank the Democratic leader for his courtesy and his support on this. He and Senator McConnell have made it possible for us to do this.

I am going to limit my remarks to a couple of minutes, and then Senator Murray and then Senator Scott, Senator Coons, Senator Jones are here, and we will finish by 10:50.

Madam President, it is hard to think of a piece of legislation that would have a more lasting impact upon minority students in America than the bill that the Senate just passed.

I believe, in doing so, we have improved the provision in the House bill that was sent to us. That is what we did; we amended a House bill that we are now sending back to them. We have been working with leaders in the House to make sure that our bill is something

the House can accept and pass. We hope that will happen in the next couple of weeks, and here is the result of it happening: No. 1, a big step for historically Black colleges and minority institutions—permanent funding at the level of \$255 million a year for those institutions that serve up to 2 million minority students. That is No. 1.

The second big step is one that Senator Murray and I and our committee, Senator Jones, Senator Bennet, Senator King, and many others have been working on for 5 years to simplify the form that students use to apply for Federal aid for college. Twenty million families fill out what is called the FAFSA, a Federal aid form, every year; then we have students who borrow more than \$100 billion a year. What we have done in this bill is reduce the complexity of filing that FAFSA form by saying to students: You don't have to give your Federal tax information to the government twice. We will take the up to 22 questions that are a part of the 108-question FAFSA, and we will eliminate them, and if the student gives his or her express consent, the Internal Revenue Service will answer those questions for the student.

I can't tell you how many times students, parents, college presidents, Federal aid counselors have told me that the application and the verification of this information has discouraged low-income students from coming to college.

Five and one-half million of the twenty million students who fill out these forms have the accuracy of those forms questioned. This will eliminate that for most of the students because they will have to give that information to the government only once.

I want to thank Senator Murray especially for her work on this. We work together on the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee in the Senate, but Senator Coons, Senator Scott, Senator Richard Burr of North Carolina—which has the largest number of historically Black colleges—and Senator Jones of Alabama have also been crucial with their support.

I yield the floor to Senator Murray.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, HBCUs, Tribal colleges, and other minority-serving institutions—or MSIs—are an essential part of our entire higher education system, and those institutions serve nearly 6 million undergraduate students, a large majority of whom are students of color or Native students.

Funding for those critical institutions should never be up for debate, and now, because of this, it will not be. I am so glad we have reached a bipartisan deal that will permanently fund HBCUs and MSIs.

I know many of our colleagues worked very hard on this, but I especially want to thank Senator Jones for his leadership in pushing to make sure this got done, as well as my partner

Senator ALEXANDER, and, of course, Senators COONS, SCOTT, and BURR.

I am also pleased that this legislation streamlines Federal student aid for more than 20 million students applying for aid and nearly 8 million borrowers.

Our Nation's outdated and overly complicated financial aid system is forcing students and borrowers to jump through too many hoops to access Federal financial aid and verify their tax returns, which they have already filled out, and to get help if they are struggling to pay their student loans.

The FAFSA Act, which has been included in this bill, allows data to be securely shared between the IRS and the Department of Education, making it easier for students to fill out the FAFSA and pay their loans.

This bill will strengthen privacy protections and how students and borrowers navigate their financial aid through a streamlined, more efficient process.

This bill is also thanks to Jeff Appel, an integral member of Federal Student Aid who recently passed away. I am grateful for his contribution, and I know that he will be sorely missed.

There is one more way in which this agreement we have reached is important. This proves once again that we can work across the aisle and get things done when we all stay focused squarely on what is best for students.

We have a lot of work ahead of us to make higher education in our country more affordable and accessible and to hold schools accountable for student outcomes and ensure student safety on campus. I am hopeful that we can build on this bipartisan progress we have seen so far as we continue working together to reauthorize the Higher Education Act in a comprehensive way.

Again, I want to thank all of my colleagues for their work on this, and I look forward to more to come.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. Madam President, to avoid the risk of being redundant, I want to put a little skin on the bones as relates to what this act really means to college students, particularly those college students entering into the process for the very first time and their families.

What it means is simply this: Simplification means more education for a lot more students, and that is good news. We oftentimes talk about the importance of keeping the American dream alive and keeping it well. This will provide significant opportunities for low-income students to get through the process very quickly.

In South Carolina we have eight HBCUs. The economic impact of those graduates is around \$5 billion of lifetime earnings. This bill makes that more achievable, more attainable, and keeps the American Dream alive and well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. JONES. Madam President, I am rising today with just, for lack of a better term, an incredible amount of hope and excitement—something we don't always see on the Senate floor these days. We go through so many routine measures. We go through so many political speeches. But today is truly a day of hope and excitement and optimism because we are on the verge of a significant moment for our Nation's historically Black colleges and universities and all minority-serving institutions. I frankly hope that in our partisan world we are living in and in our partisan America, people across this country are tuning in right now or at least will follow what is happening on the floor of the Senate today, where a bipartisan coalition has come together for a significant and important segment of our population that deserves the same economic and educational opportunities as everyone else.

Fourteen months ago, I came to this Chamber to introduce a permanent extension, an increase of funding for these important institutions of education. Nearly half of all the funding they receive was set to run out on September 30, 2019. We secured a quarter of the Senate as cosponsors of the bill, and we laid out an ambitious proposal.

In the new Congress, with the clock ticking down toward the deadline, we offered a more modest but bipartisan and paid-for plan to avert the looming fiscal cliff. But our goal and the goal of everyone here and the goal of all of those, including my friend Senator ALEXANDER, was to always reach the ultimate goal of permanent funding, a permanent solution for these important institutions.

All told, these schools serve 6 million students across the country. They are often the foundation upon which families begin to build generational wealth—not just one person who goes to college but generational wealth in communities that have long faced systematic barriers to doing so. They create good, sustainable jobs. They are part of the very foundation of our higher education system in this country and in my State in particular.

With all the due respect to my friend Senator MURRAY from Washington, there is a little controversy about who has the most HBCUs. I would claim that Alabama does with 14, but that is for debate on another day. But we can all agree that supporting these schools and the students they serve is not a partisan issue. I think we can all agree on that. I think we have shown that we can agree that funding should never become a political football. We have all been working toward the same goal.

To say the least, I am so deeply relieved that today we forged this bipartisan compromise that will allow these schools the funding and the certainty they need to go forward and continue fulfilling their important mission.

I sincerely especially want to thank my colleagues on the HELP Committee

and Chairman ALEXANDER and Ranking Member MURRAY in particular for their leadership and willingness to reach across the aisle and find the common ground for the better good of this community. I also want to thank my friend Senator SCOTT from South Carolina for joining me on what we have done over the last couple of years to introduce the FUTURE Act and to push it forward.

I believe—and I have said this for so long—that we have so much more in common than we have that divides us. This is just one example. It is why I hope folks across the country are looking and see that we can come together and we can be unified.

I am grateful today because in addition to the permanent funding of HBCUs and minority-serving institutions, this agreement, as the Senator from Tennessee said, includes a long overdue, first big step toward simplifying the FAFSA application.

Even with a law degree, I can tell you that with my kids, trying to do that made me pull out what little bit of hair I have left. I didn't need to do that. It is not just a frustrating process; it can be so intimidating that students or their parents just walk away. In Alabama alone, kids walked away from millions of dollars of Federal financial aid and grants, not just loans. The FAFSA as it is today can be a huge barrier for students who want to go to college.

The proposal we have on the table now will help save taxpayers and make the FAFSA process less painful by cutting up to 22 questions from the form. It lays the groundwork for a broader FAFSA reform that Senator ALEXANDER and I have been working on to cut even further to between 17 to 30 questions.

But getting across the finish line today is not just about renewing funding or cutting redtape. At their core, these issues are about opening doors of opportunity for young people who have talent and motivation to succeed in college and in life, but they have not necessarily had the financial means or the family connections to do so. This is about making sure we empower every young person in this country to reach their full potential and then pay it forward for future generations. That is what gives me hope standing here today. It is what makes me excited today.

Again, I want to thank my colleagues for the incredible effort—Senators ALEXANDER and MURRAY in particular. Our hearts have always been in the right place. We have always moved the ball forward knowing that the long-term goal was to help these families for generations to come.

Thank you, Madam President.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. COONS. Madam President, today is about a moment of hope. Today is about a moment of genuine bipartisan ship made possible by the discipline

and determined leadership of Senators ALEXANDER of Tennessee and MURRAY of Washington State.

I rise to join my friend and colleague, the Senator from Alabama, who has just given remarks following the Senator from South Carolina. At a moment when what most Americans see on their televisions is partisan division and dysfunction in the Senate and the House, I just want to remind all of us that we can get good, important, and significant things done together, as just happened on the floor a few moments ago.

For generations, American families have worked and saved and strived to send their children to college, but for a long time, our Nation's original sin—the sin of slavery and racism—has left a long shadow and a stain on access to the critical opportunity of higher education. In much of our Nation, for decades, African Americans were denied entry to most of our colleges and universities and still today face unreasonably high barriers to higher education. The establishment of historically Black colleges and universities, HBCUs, and other minority-serving institutions of higher learning has been a critical answer to that tragic history of discrimination.

Men and women who founded HBCUs refused to accept a system of higher education that denied opportunity to African Americans, and over decades, HBCUs have risen to become some of our Nation's finest academic institutions. They have educated hundreds of thousands of young men and women who have gone on to do incredible things and to be some of our Nation's greatest leaders.

That is why all of us who have come on the floor today, Republicans and Democrats, have acted to make a permanent commitment to supporting HBCUs and minority-serving institutions with Federal funding. We have agreed to make permanent \$255 million in annual funding for HBCUs.

I am particularly excited about this legislation because my home State of Delaware is home to one of the finest public HBCUs in the country, Delaware State University. Founded in 1891, it is one of the country's premier land grant universities. Over the last 125 years, it has emerged as one of our Nation's premier HBCUs, graduating some of my State's best accountants, business leaders, researchers, scientists, teachers, social workers, and much more.

My friend Dr. Wilma Mishoe, the University's first female president, will end her impressive tenure this month and be succeeded by Provost Dr. Tony Allen, who will continue the upwardly rising trajectory of the Hornets of Delaware State University.

Their research programs are important drivers for innovation in a State with a long history of invention. It is home to the Delaware Center for Neuroscience Research, a partnership of institutions working to advance our understanding of our brains and how we

form thoughts, memories, and feelings that may help unlock the key to addiction and other challenges our country faces. It is also home to OSCAR, the Optical Science Center for Applied Research, which is helping speed the detection of disease, supporting our soldiers in detecting threats, and even equipping the NASA Mars rovers with improved sensors. Delaware State has been the lead institution on grants from NASA, NSF, and NIH in just the last few years.

We are very proud of Delaware State. The funding stream last year provided \$380,000 in critically needed funding for STEM, faculty, research, and students.

Let me last reference something that my colleagues have also spoken to: the streamlining of the free application for Federal student aid, or FAFSA, which impacts 20 million American families.

I spent a long time—roughly 20 years of my life—actively involved in the national “I Have a Dream” Foundation, which provides college-access opportunities for young people from families with no means or experience of attending higher education. I myself sat with dozens of young Delawareans and struggled as we finished the FAFSA form for them. This long-worked-for solution that Senators Alexander and Murray have advanced streamlining this form from 108 questions to 22 is a critical first step that will make a lasting difference for access to education all over our Nation.

I am so grateful for the opportunity to join this bipartisan coalition and look forward to even more progress in the months and years ahead.

Thank you.

With that, I yield the floor.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, first, let me thank my colleagues from South Carolina, Tennessee, Washington State, Alabama, and Delaware for their hard work on this very important issue. I appreciated their words, and I think far more appreciated even than their eloquent words is the fact that we are getting this done, finally. I am so glad for it.

Let me just add my words of support for the FUTURE Act. A few minutes ago, as I mentioned, we passed the FUTURE Act by unanimous consent. I am so glad and grateful that the Senate came together today to give these institutions and the students they serve the certainty needed to continue focusing on their important mission.

In America, we believe in ladders up. People should have to climb those ladders. No one is going to put them up on a pedestal. But there should be the ladders there so that if somebody wants to work hard, they are given fair opportunity and barriers—sometimes barriers based on bigotry and discrimination—do not stand in their way.

One of the best ladders-up we have in America is our HBCUs. HBCUs make up 3 percent of colleges and univer-

sities, but they produce 27 percent of African-American students with bachelor degrees in STEM fields, 80 percent of African-American judges, 40 percent of African-American engineers, 50 percent of African-American lawyers, and 40 percent of African-American colleagues here in the Congress are HBCU graduates. So this is one fine ladder-up, as are our other institutions that spend much time helping Hispanic Americans and Native Americans as well.

We need these ladders. They are part of America. We should help them whenever we can. Tribal colleges and universities serving Black, Hispanic, and Native American populations serve more than 130,000 American Indians and Alaska Natives, the most underserved group in higher education. Hispanic-serving institutions have grown by nearly 40 percent since 2009, helping the Latino community make big inroads in college enrollment and completion. They now enroll 66 percent of all Hispanic undergraduates but account for only 15 percent of nonprofit colleges.

So all three of these types of institutions—the HBCUs, the colleges and universities serving American Indians and Alaska Natives, and Hispanic-serving institutions—are amazing ladders up. They are essential for making higher education accessible, affordable, and attainable for all Americans; essential for having that bright Sun—the American dream—actually shine on people instead of it being some words that are meaningless to them.

This is a very fine moment, and I want to thank all of those who put this all together and made it happen. We can celebrate. Most of the things that pass by UC around here—or many of them—are really kind of small and narrow. This is not. This is very important. And my salute to those who made it happen, whom I mentioned earlier.

IMPEACHMENT

Madam President, now on a less happy subject, this morning the Speaker of the House instructed House committee chairs to begin drafting articles of impeachment against the President of the United States. That is a very solemn duty and solemn undertaking. The Speaker's decision comes after the House Intelligence Committee reported that its inquiry had “uncovered a months-long effort by President Trump to use the powers of his office to solicit foreign interference on his behalf in the 2020 election.”

We know Russia interfered on Trump's behalf in 2016, and now he is trying to make it happen again, this time by trying to push Ukraine.

The charges against the President are extremely serious. No belittling of these charges will hold any water. The charge to use foreign interference on behalf of a candidate in the 2020 elections is dramatic and awful stuff.

These charges concern our national security. They concern the sanctity of our elections and the potential corruption of our Nation's foreign policy for

personal political interests of the President of the United States. The gravity of those charges demands that Senators, if Articles of Impeachment are served to us, to put country over party and examine the evidence without prejudice or partisanship, which is why it is so disheartening, confounding, and deeply disappointing that, at this historic moment, I heard the Republican leader criticizing in such strident terms the process of the impeachment inquiry in the House for being too short and not including enough witnesses or due process for the President.

I respond on two counts. First, the Republican leader is simply wrong to suggest that the House process has been anything but deliberate, even-handed, and serious. Speaker PELOSI, the House Intelligence Committee, and the House Judiciary Committee are proceeding exactly how the Constitution prescribes. But, second, it is the height of hypocrisy to criticize the House process for being too short and not including enough witnesses when the Trump administration is the one blocking witnesses from testifying.

What hypocrisy? How can a leader even say it with a straight face? Will this febrile obeisance to President Trump never cease? Are they so afraid of him and his bullying that they can't admit the obvious truth and twist themselves in pretzel knots to make arguments that are so spurious? It is the height of hypocrisy to criticize the House for not including enough opportunities for the President to make his defense when the President is refusing to participate. It is the height of hypocrisy to say that there are not enough witnesses when we don't hear a peep out of the Republicans urging the President to allow the witnesses that the House wanted to come forward.

This hyperventilation about the length of the House process and the number of witnesses is simply ridiculous. The Trump administration is responsible for those things, not House Democrats. Everyone knows that. Everyone knows they have gone to court to block witnesses and documents.

I remind my colleagues, if the Articles of Impeachment are indeed passed by the House, Leader MCCONNELL and Senate Republicans must work with Democrats to set the parameters of a fair and impartial trial. Every Member of the Senate should support a fair process. The House is running a fair process now. We must do the same in the Senate if it comes to that.

All week, I have been urging my Senate Republican colleagues not to spread or even speculate about the dangerous myth that Ukraine—not just Putin—interfered in the 2016 elections. The myth was invented by Putin's intelligence services to deflect blame away from Putin while driving a wedge between the United States and Ukraine, one of Putin's top goals. When certain Senate Republicans are parroting Putin's talking points, we have a serious problem.

Hopefully, the overwhelming criticisms of the Members who did that this week have convinced them to stop and back off in the Republicans' absurd denial of fact and total defense of President Trump, even when it is obvious that he is not telling the truth. We have reached a low moment, and maybe the lowest of all was the mounting of Putin's conspiracy theory about Ukraine.

Now, another insidious conspiracy theory was doused with cold water this morning. The truth comes out, Republicans, sooner or later. Another theory was doused with cold water when it was reported that Attorney General Barr's handpicked prosecutor had reportedly found no evidence that the FBI probe into the Trump campaign was a setup. Republicans in the House, conservative media personalities, FOX News, and other blind partisan loyalists to the President have long conjured and peddled these deep-state conspiracy theories without evidence.

The Attorney General is even using the resources of the Justice Department—which could be exposing Chinese Communist Party's spies or tracking would-be radical terrorists or fighting opioids or tackling ransomware attacks on cities across the country—to investigate the origins of the 2016 probe. Attorney General Barr's actions are presumably in the hopes of turning up evidence to support these far-fetched theories.

Well, too bad, Republicans. Too bad, hard right. The Attorney General's handpicked prosecutor found no evidence to these conspiracy theories, that the investigation of President Trump was started with evil and political intent. The only evidence we have is that the outlandish loyalist theories peddled by President Trump and his allies to defend this administration are totally baseless.

BORDER SECURITY

Now, on another note, airport face scans, this morning, it was reported that the Trump administration will propose a rule to require U.S. citizens to have their faces scanned whenever they enter or leave the United States. This sounds like something out of China. Currently, all U.S. citizens are allowed to opt out of facial scans when entering or exiting the country. Now, the Trump administration is poised to remove that option and make facial scans mandatory for all travelers, including U.S. citizens.

I have significant concerns about what this policy would mean for the privacy of every American citizen. Just last year, a cyber attack of CBP compromised the personal information—in this case, it was license plates—and facial data of just under 100,000 people. Imagine if DHS were required to retain the facial data of every American who travels in and out of the country.

There are, of course, legitimate questions about whether the Federal Government is legally allowed to collect and store this data. Those questions

must be answered before—not after—the Trump administration moves forward with its new rules. On something as serious as this, Congress should debate this issue.

Regardless, I see no reason why the current opt-out policy must change, and I will work with privacy advocates in the Senate, like my friend Senator MARKEY, to legislatively prevent the administration from moving forward.

TRACED ACT

Another issue, robocalls, the House of Representatives yesterday passed bipartisan legislation to crack down on the tens of billions of robocalls that plague Americans every year. All of us are bothered by these darn robocalls. They come at the worst times, and they are on and on. You can't even shut them off.

Last year alone, Americans were battered by 48 billion—billion—robocalls. That is 150 calls per person, per year. Robocalls are annoying. They are persistent, and beyond that, many of them are dangerous to consumers. Foreign companies can make thousands of calls with a push of a button and can charge Americans simply for picking up the call. Can you believe that? Many are designed to scam elderly Americans. We have heard about elderly Americans who are frightened and send their life savings to these criminal callers. Many of the calls target institutions like hospitals and slow down important businesses.

The TRACED Act passed by the Senate in May and recently amended and passed by the House requires phone companies to block robocalls without charging consumers and will give the Justice Department and the FCC better tools to prosecute scammers who prey on unsuspecting—many elderly—Americans. I am proud to be a cosponsor of the original Senate bill. I pushed hard to move it forward. The Senate should now take action on the amended and expanded robocall legislation from the House and pass it before the year is out.

As we saw with the recent legislation to the democratic protests in Hong Kong, when there is bipartisan consensus on an issue, we can move swiftly to enact bipartisan legislation. These moments, unfortunately, are far too rare under Leader MCCONNELL, who has avoided the consideration of legislation on the floor, even when it has bipartisan support, but I hope as we enter the final few weeks of the year, Leader MCCONNELL will address the issue of robocalls and send this bipartisan to the President's desk.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCOTT of Florida). The Senator from Texas.

APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I know the American people, when they see what is happening in Washington, think that we fight all the time and we disagree about everything, but let me

just agree with my friend, the democratic leader, on the issue of the nuisance of robocalls.

But as important as that is to our quality of life and to protecting vulnerable seniors and others who may be misled by some of these deceptive calls, some of the most basic functions of the Federal Government have not been fulfilled, like appropriating the money that is necessary to support our men and women in uniform. The bipartisan spending caps bill that we agreed to in August has been walked back by our Democratic friends, and we find ourselves with a lot of uncertainty here at the end of the year in terms of what the future may hold in terms of our ability to actually get anything done, things like pass a highway bill. That is one thing that Republicans and Democrats can all agree on, is our disdain for traffic and congestion.

That is one thing we can work on together. We could work together to bring down drug prices, particularly the out-of-pocket costs for consumers with high deductibles and high co-pays. We could pass USMCA, the U.S.-Mexico-Canada Trade Agreement. All of these enjoy broad bipartisan support, but unfortunately, they are now all held captive by this impeachment mania which has stricken the House of Representatives, and it is scheduled to come over here to the Senate probably around the first of the year, depending on the schedule that Speaker PELOSI keeps in the House.

IMPEACHMENT

So while there are plenty of good ideas out there about things that we can work on together on a bipartisan basis, we all know that the Senate and the Congress has limited bandwidth. We can't do everything we want to do. We need to prioritize. I would hope that our priorities would be the American people's priorities and not the political priorities here of partisans in Washington, DC, but unfortunately, it looks to me like the partisans are winning and the people are losing. We need to keep fighting against that. But that is where we are right now, particularly with Speaker PELOSI's announcement this morning that the House is now going to proceed to draft Articles of Impeachment, something that has only been done four times in our Nation's history. This will be the fourth time.

We know what the outcome is likely to be with the 67-vote threshold here in the Senate, and I think all of us in America listened or have been exposed to anyway the various arguments on both sides of the question, but I don't really, frankly, expect anything new to come out of this. A lot of this is rehashed over and over again ad nauseam in order to justify a partisan impeachment process less than 1 year before the next general election. I would think we would be a little bit cautious about 535 Members of Congress working here in the Nation's Capital reversing the decision made by more than 60 million Americans in the last Presidential

election. That is a very sobering and serious matter indeed, but, unfortunately, I don't see this issue getting the kind of sober and serious consideration that the Founders contemplated or that the American people deserve.

AMERICAN ENERGY

Mr. President, on another topic, a number of our colleagues here in Washington have undertaken a radical approach when it comes to providing the energy that our country needs. As a matter of fact, if you think about it, it is because of the energy being produced by the oil and gas industry here in America today that the average price of gasoline is now probably roughly \$2.50 per gallon.

In Austin, TX, where I live, you can drive from the airport to my home, and you can see gas prices at \$2.15 a gallon. It is cheap relative to the historical prices. And you think about what that means in terms of consumers, regular, everyday working folks and families. It means they are able to spend money on other things that are important to them in their lives and not spend all of their income on filling up their gas tank. That is a huge, huge gift to the American people and consumers, but rather than focus on the benefits of what our innovative and entrepreneurial industry has done, we know that some of our friends here in Washington want to reorder the world in their own image. They say the goal is to completely eliminate the most affordable and reliable sources of energy. For what? Well, in pursuit of net zero emissions. I will talk more about that in a moment.

We remember earlier this year they introduced the Green New Deal—arguably the most extreme energy and climate proposal this country has ever seen. The Green New Deal is chock-full of utopian ideas but completely devoid of any pragmatic plans to implement any of its pie-in-the-sky proposals. It puts a range of unrealistic environmental and socialist policies under one big green umbrella with an unaffordably high pricetag.

The best evidence of how extreme this proposal is, is when it came up for a vote in the Senate. Not a single Senator voted for it—that includes all of the cosponsors of the proposal. That is not exactly a profile in courage, to tell the American people this is the solution to our environmental and energy problems, and then when it comes up for a vote, you run and hide. Nobody voted for it. If this proposal were not so terrifying, it would be a terribly bad joke.

While that may be the most extreme proposal we have seen, it is not the only one. We know some of our Democratic colleagues in the House have tried to impose government mandates. That means more regulation, more taxation, more control by Washington, all in an effort to achieve net zero emissions by the year 2050. In some ways, 2050 seems like a long way off, and in other ways it doesn't seem a long way

off, but in pursuit of programs that would address a problem in 2050, how about let's take care of the business that is sitting here right before us today first. We seem to have lost any sense of urgency in our most important priorities, like funding the government and funding the military.

On top of that, a number of our Democratic friends who are running for President claim we should ban fracking. I would really like to ask them if they even know what that is or how it works.

Some of them have said they also want to ban the export of crude oil. This month, for the first time in 70 years, America became a net exporter of oil. I will talk more about that in a moment.

Some are saying they even want to go so far as to ban the use of natural gas. Natural gas has been responsible for taking formerly coal-fired powerplants and putting them into a cleaner energy source, which has actually reduced emissions by a substantial amount, but, no, in pursuit of their pie-in-the-sky utopian dreams, the ideologues want to eliminate something that has been a very substantial improvement in terms of the reduction of emissions while providing affordable energy.

I think it is safe to say that we all agree—Republicans, Democrats, Independents, everybody—we should do what we can to protect our environment. In fact, we live here. We breathe the air. We drink the water. We should all be equally concerned about the environment.

I really think some of these proposals are nothing more than virtue signaling. They are not a solution to a problem. All of these folks are trying to paint the energy industry as the enemy in the process. Every good story needs a villain, and our friends on the left believe the energy industry that has provided that cheap gasoline so people can drive to work, take their kids to school, or go about their business is really the enemy, not our friend. Well, it is just not the case.

By the rhetoric you are hearing, you would think oil and gas companies have bankrupted the country, ruined our international alliances, and sent the entire globe into an energy famine. Well, that is not true. It is just the opposite of truth.

When you talk about global energy security, American oil and gas has reversed the tide of the energy landscape in our favor and supported our friends and allies around the world in important ways.

Our colleagues proposing these unworkable and unaffordable mandates would be wise to look at how the global energy landscape has changed over the last half century and consider the broader consequences of their proposal.

To understand the importance of American energy on the world stage, we need to rewind just a bit to the 1970s. At that time, the vast majority

of the world's oil and gas came from the Middle East, giving these nations a great deal of power. In fact, you may remember back in 1980 President Jimmy Carter announced something called the Carter Doctrine. He said if any foreign power would block the flow of oil through the Straits of Hormuz, it would be an act of war. That is what Jimmy Carter said in 1980, such was our reliance on imported energy from the Middle East. Our country dealt with this situation, and we addressed it responsibly and effectively.

We know another indication of our dependence on imported energy is when the United States supported our friend and ally Israel in the Yom Kippur war of 1973. OPEC, the organization of petroleum exported countries, primarily Middle East countries, banned the sale of crude oil to the United States. Those who are old enough to remember, remember that prices quadrupled, some States banned neon signs to cut down on energy use because they were worried about the energy that would be necessary to create that electricity, and a number of towns asked for citizens not to even put up Christmas lights. This was because our source of oil and gas was cut off from the Middle East, such was our dependence. Despite strong domestic production, we were still relying heavily on imports. Once that supply was cut off, we were caught flat-footed.

The Arab oil embargo brought to light the risk of our energy independence and underscored the need for America to do something about it. There was a consensus—has been a consensus—that we needed to grow our supplies here at home so we were less dependent on imports. So less than 2 years later, Congress, thinking we were doing a good thing, put a ban on export on American crude because we thought we needed it here and didn't want to export it abroad.

Over the next four decades, a lot has changed. Advancements in the energy sector, including hydraulic fracturing and horizontal drilling, have dramatically increased the production of American energy. As I said, for the first time in 70 years, America has become a net exporter of oil. That is how dramatically this has turned around.

In the process, we have achieved our goal of reducing our reliance on imported energy from dangerous and unsettled regions of the world, like the Middle East, but pretty soon we found ourselves sitting on a gold mine, and it became clear it was time to lift the export ban. In 2015, after 40 years of no exports, that is what Congress did. We did so because we believed, No. 1, we had more than we could use here in America, but we also believed this would be a huge boon to our economy. That was part of the equation. Just as we were able to reduce our reliance on oil from unreliable and unstable regions of the world, we knew that by exporting the oil that America produced, we could help other countries—our

friends and allies around the world—that were dangerously dependent on sources of energy from countries like Russia that is all too ready to use energy as a weapon. They say: Do what we say, and we will keep the energy and gas flowing. Do something we don't like, and we will shut you down.

In the not-so-distant past, many of our allies in Europe looked to Iran and Russia for their energy needs, and the Baltic States, all NATO allies, relied almost exclusively on Russia for their oil, gas, and electricity. Seven European countries depended on Russia for 80 percent of their gas, and on the whole, one-third of the gas Europe consumed came from Russia.

When our allies are looking to our adversaries for basic needs like heating, electricity, and fuel, that is a real problem. It is a strategic vulnerability not only for those countries but also for the United States.

Our friend John McCain had quite a sense of humor—those of us who knew him during his lifetime. He aptly described Russia as a gas station masquerading as a country. Russia's ability to export that energy to other countries was the lifeline for their country. I think Senator McCain hit the nail on the head, especially when Russia uses that energy as a weapon.

As I alluded, in 2009, we saw the vulnerability this created when Russia effectively turned the lights off in Ukraine. For almost 3 weeks, they shut down the energy supply. This affected at least 10 countries in Europe whose natural gas traveled through Ukraine.

Just as the United States realized how dangerous our foreign oil reliance was, our allies began to understand the implications of their dependency as well. Many of our friends in Europe have been working to diversify their energy supply, which is a good thing, and build strategic gas interconnectors between countries reliant on Russia for natural gas. Getting a diversity of sources is an insurance policy for those countries so Russia can't just cut off their energy supply.

Supplying our friends around the world with American oil and gas not only strengthens our security but it alleviates the power our adversaries, like Russia, hold in important regions of the world, like Europe.

In addition to increasing global security, American oil and gas has allowed us to provide affordable, plentiful, and reliable energy to countries struggling to provide power for their own citizens.

If you think about it, low-cost energy coming from America has the potential to be the greatest poverty reduction program in memory. For example, when I first traveled to India in 2004—if you drive from Delhi, the capital, to Agra, where the Taj Mahal is, you will drive across vast areas where the population is very poor. Huge swaths of that population lack access to things to cook their food with or electricity to light their homes. So what do they do? Well, they burn cow dung; they burn

coal; they burn wood pellets or other high-emission fuel sources. By America agreeing to export the energy we have here—the cleaner energy we have here—we are agreeing to help one of our closest friends and partners in the world and, in the process, help Prime Minister Modi and the leadership there lift more Indians out of this grinding poverty and relying on things like cow dung simply to cook their food.

Last year, we doubled the amount of LNG exported to India, and I dare say that the sky is the limit.

I think many of our Democratic colleagues should reflect back on the lessons of history before advocating a return to the 1970s when it comes to the way we approach American energy. I understand the importance of innovation in the energy sector to lower emissions, and I am all in, but rather than another government program, higher taxes, more regulation, or surrendering control of our freedom to Washington, DC, why don't we let the innovators, the entrepreneurs, come up with solutions? That is what has happened when it comes to American oil and gas. They came up with the answer, not Washington, DC, and we are all benefiting from the results.

When it comes to innovation, I have introduced legislation—and a number of our other colleagues have, too—to increase research dollars going into ways to lower emissions by looking at alternative ways to deal with energy production, like electricity. For example, there is a small natural gas-fired powerplant in La Porte, TX—which I visited with our friend Senator COLLINS from Maine—that emits zero carbon dioxide. That is a boon to the environment, and I think it also provides a solution to the oil and gas industry because what they do is pipe the CO₂ off the back end, and they use it to inject into the ground in the oilfields, so they produce more oil and gas. It is called secondary recovery.

Here at home, it is easy to take dependable energy for granted. We do it all the time. We don't worry about having the energy to cook our dinner at night or refill our cars' gas tanks. We take that all for granted. But the truth is, in countless countries in the world and for the majority of the world, it is a completely different story.

For our friends who advocate these utopian ideas like the Green New Deal, I don't begrudge their desire to improve the environment, but I would ask them to be more pragmatic when it comes to trying to solve the problem. I would ask them: Are you really trying to solve a problem? If you are, we want to work with you to reduce emissions, but if your goal is to pursue some fantasy that will not work and we can't afford, count me out. If you want to solve the problem, count me in.

American energy is simply powering the world. It is strengthening global security and lifting millions of people out of poverty. We need to continue to harness the power of one of our country's greatest national assets.

I will conclude there. I will continue to share some of my thoughts on the importance of American energy on the Senate floor. It is a topic bigger than one floor speech, and it will hopefully remind and encourage all of the Members of the Senate to work toward energy abundance and help keep energy affordable, which will improve the standard of living and the quality of the lives of all Americans.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

REMEMBERING LAUREN BRUNER

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, on September 10, just a few months ago, Lauren Bruner, a veteran of Pearl Harbor, December 7, 1941, passed away. Mr. Bruner wasn't just any veteran. He was a veteran who served on the USS *Arizona* during the attack that morning.

On Saturday, December 7, millions of Americans across the country will pay tribute to the attack at Pearl Harbor National Memorial to commemorate what happened that morning, which brought the United States fully into the Second World War. Aboard the USS *Arizona* were 1,512 officers, sailors, and marines. The attack that day on December 7 killed 1,177 of them, and 335 brave people survived that morning. Lauren Bruner, who passed away September 10, was one of four who were on that ship that December morning in 1941 who have survived.

Lauren Bruner passed away at the age of 98, and on this Saturday, his ashes will be interred at the USS *Arizona* to join his shipmates—those who were lost that morning and others who have joined their fellow sailors, marines, and officers since.

Three men remain that are veterans of that war from the USS *Arizona*: Lou Conter, 98 years old; Ken Potts, 98 years old; and Donald Stratton, 97 years old from Colorado Springs, CO. Ken Potts and Don Stratton will join together for most likely the last time this Saturday as they will watch a live video feed of the ceremony at Pearl Harbor at the USS *Arizona* Memorial to view the interment of their shipmate, Lauren Bruner, at the USS *Arizona*.

The Senate was able to play a small role in recognizing what brought Don Stratton, Lauren Bruner, and the others together. You see, on that morning, when their ship was bombed, Lauren Bruner had been shot in the leg and Donald Stratton was on fire. The two of them and four of their other shipmates were on a control tower as the ship was on fire when a rope appeared. It was a line from the USS *Vestal*, a ship next to the USS *Arizona*. A line was thrown from a sailor named Joe George. They tied to the tower and were able to shimmy across 70 feet from the burning USS *Arizona*—while they were on fire—to the USS *Vestal*, to their safety.

Lauren Bruner had 70 percent of his body burned and was shot in the leg. Don Stratton suffered burns and spent a year in the hospital as a result. He

went back into the service to continue the rest of the war.

This Chamber in Congress helped make sure that the gentleman who threw that rope, that lifeline from the USS *Vestal* to the USS *Arizona*, received final recognition for his act of heroism. Joe George went for decades without recognition for his act of bravery to save these six sailors. He was able to receive just a couple of years ago, on December 7, 2017, the Bronze Star, in recognition of his acts.

December 7, 2017, also marked the last time that Donald Stratton was able to join the memorial service to commemorate December 7, Pearl Harbor. I have this picture here that I will show of Donald Stratton, who again this weekend will be joining Ken Potts as Lauren Bruner is interred to join the other men and women who lost their lives that morning.

This is an opportunity for us to once again say thank you to the 2,403 people overall at Pearl Harbor who were killed, to the people who survived, who went on to fight the Second World War, and our veterans today who live and continue to live a legacy that was given to them that December 7 morning.

On Saturday, as we join our families and do weekend work, I hope we will take a little bit of time to reflect once again on a dark chapter in American history that led to a great American century, to be thankful to the men and women who served our country, to the men and women who fight for our Nation each and every day, to the people like Ken Potts and Lou Conter and Donald Stratton, who continue to remind us each and every moment why this Nation is worth fighting for.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

TAX REFORM

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to talk about the importance of passing the expired tax credit provisions for many small businesses and industries that support families and help revitalize economic, depressed communities, and those that are underserved.

We all know that 2 years ago, the Republicans and President Trump enacted a \$2 trillion tax break for large corporations, and there was a lot of lobbying here that went in to getting that legislation passed. Yet, when it comes to these provisions, which are just about tax certainty in the Tax Code that has been there for decades that really needs to be reauthorized, Congress is not getting the job done, and we need to come to terms now about why it is so important to help small businesses have tax certainty in the code, to help families and communities, and to get this provision done by December 31.

We all know how important it is that these individuals, green energy companies, economic development, and many other aspects of the Tax Code are being

basically held hostage—since, I believe, 2017—by Congress's inattention to this issue. Our Tax Code is most effective when we have certainty, predictability, and when we have made decisions out of Congress that we think we do want to incent and motivate investment.

Renewables are a large source of private sector infrastructure investment, and the clean energy tax credits have allowed industry to scale and invest in technologies that have brought prices down in wind by 68 percent and solar prices by 88 percent. We have seen unbelievable growth in the energy sector because of our investments in the green energy tax credits.

Another example is the biodiesel tax credit that I worked on with Chairman GRASSLEY for years. That particular tax credit and its uncertainty and Congress's failure to act and give predictability have led to more than 10 biodiesel plants being closed so far, and there could be many more closed if we fail to act before December 31.

This means a loss of jobs and a loss of production of fuel. It means the loss of economic benefit to regions, and it means an impact to soybean and other sectors that have been a part of this growing economy. We need to act before more plants close.

I am very concerned about a particular facility in Grays Harbor, WA. While it may employ only 37 people at this point in time, Grays Harbor is an important point in the Washington State economy, located on our coast, and has many great attributes positioned for the future of trade. Not only do I want to see biodiesel grow, I want to see biodiesel exports grow. I think it is shortsighted that Congress can't get its act together to give people predictability and certainty about the Tax Code.

Let's talk about some other examples that are not just about clean energy—for example, the medical expense deduction. These deductions give taxpayers certainty on deductions for high out-of-pocket medical costs, and these are things that allow people to deduct qualified expenses that exceed 7½ percent of their gross income through 2018. This year, the threshold increased to 10 percent of adjusted gross income. If we are not going to give people certainty, it is going to be more dollars out of their pockets.

Another example is the mortgage debt forgiveness. When you lose your home, you should not have to pay taxes on your mortgage debt. That is what is going to happen if we don't give people certainty in the Tax Code. Without this provision, if your house is foreclosed on and the remaining debt forgiveness is in bankruptcy, the amount you would have to pay is the same amount you would have to owe instead of being forgiven.

So, to me, that inability to not have that mortgage debt deduction—it is just wrong that Congress can't get its act together. If you are going to get your act together and pass a major bill

for corporations, you should at least give small businesses and individual taxpayers the certainty they deserve in the Tax Code.

These provisions have been in the Tax Code for a long, long time. This is not like a surprise. It is not as if we haven't done this before. But instead of taking care of today's Tax Code before December 31, people are off making grandiose discussions.

I get it that some people on this side of the aisle would like to change and make corrections to the Tax Code, and other people on our side of the aisle would like to make a \$100 billion investment in child tax credit. Look, I am appreciative of that discussion, but quit waging that battle, and do our day job, and take the Tax Code and the expiring provisions, and give taxpayers certainty by the 31st of this month.

Another example is that the expired provisions would help address the high cost of higher education by allowing students and families to deduct up to \$4,000 for tuition and other high education costs. With total student loan debt of \$1.5 trillion and average student debt of over \$31,000, provisions like these on deductibility are very important.

On employment and economic development, nearly 26 percent of the provisions that are expiring are related to incentivizing employment investment in lower income communities.

The new markets tax credit. There is probably not a Member in the Senate who has not had a jurisdiction in their State use the new markets tax credit as one of the most effective economic development and community tools. This credit encourages private investments in low-income communities. Since the program was enacted in 2000, the new markets tax credit has delivered over \$95 billion in project financing to more than 6,000 projects and created over 1 million jobs.

Why can't we have certainty on the new markets tax credit by December 31 of this year? There is no reason.

The new markets tax credits expire, and where are we going to be on building affordable housing, healthcare facilities, community clinics, research and technology incubators, and mixed-use commercial programs? I see no reason why we can't get this job done. I have been working with Senators CARDIN and BLUNT on a bill that would make this program permanent, and, hopefully, we wouldn't have to go through this routine every year.

But take another example. The work opportunity tax credit has been an incredibly effective tool in helping individuals, including veterans, to find gainful employment. The work opportunity tax credit provides up to \$2,400 for hiring a certified person, including veterans and people receiving SNAP and TANF benefits. We know this program works. In my State, for each person certified to receive the tax credit, there is a net savings of \$17,700 in Federal subsidies. Where is the voice for

people who say: Let's give a tax credit and put people to work and actually reduce Federal subsidies? Oh, we are letting it expire again and giving uncertainty in the Tax Code.

Why? I am not sure because people are too busy posturing in a big debate instead of getting our basic tax extender homework done. Let's not continue to fail. Let's get out here and give these work opportunity tax credits the predictability people would like to see. In 2013, Washington had over 26,000 individuals certified with the tax credit, helping them find employment, and that represented a total of \$42 million in savings.

All of these issues I am talking about—investments in our communities, investments in tax credits that give businesses certainties so that they can continue to drive down costs, investments in low-income communities, investments to help retrain and get people off the subsidies—why can't we get this done? I hope that people will understand that these small businesses and these families don't have people running through the halls to lobby for them as they did on the big corporate tax break, but I guarantee you, they deserve the tax certainty. They deserve the predictability.

Yes, we can continue to debate the last big tax bill all through 2020. I guarantee you that we will spend a lot of time talking about it, and each side can raise their voice and wage their battle. But do not fail to get this basic job done that we keep failing to do—literally, not giving these businesses and individuals certainty, I think, since 2017. People keep thinking you are going to make it retroactive for 3 years. No, stop. Get this job done and give the certainty to small businesses and underserved communities that they deserve. Help them to succeed just like you helped big corporations.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

NOMINATION OF RICHARD ERNEST MYERS II

Mr. TILLIS. Mr. President, I rise along with Senator BURR to urge our colleagues to support the confirmation of Professor Richard Myers to serve as a district court judge for the Eastern District of North Carolina.

President Trump has nominated an eminently qualified and principled individual to serve in the Eastern District. In his career, Professor Myers has worked as a journalist, a prosecutor, and a professor. Each step Professor Myers has taken in his professional career has prepared him for this role. From the newsroom to the courtroom to the classroom, Professor Myers has shown his commitment to the principles of truth, of justice, and of wisdom. I cannot imagine a more solid foundation upon which to place the responsibility of a district court judgeship than that of Professor Myers, which he has exhibited throughout his career.

Professor Myers is a first generation college graduate who has close ties to

Wilmington, where he has chosen to locate his chambers. Once confirmed, Professor Myers will hold court in Wilmington, the same city where he was raised, where he went to college, and where he was a journalist. North Carolinians are lucky to have someone like Professor Myers with his caliber and his sense of duty to represent us in the Eastern District of North Carolina.

I urge all of my colleagues to vote for Judge Myers', or soon-to-be Judge Myers', confirmation when it comes up later today.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. BURR. Mr. President, I also rise today to voice my strong support for the President's nomination of Professor Richard Myers to serve as a judge in the Eastern District of North Carolina. I might add for my colleagues that it is the longest court vacancy in the history of our court system. Professor Myers was reported out of committee on a strong bipartisan vote on October 31. I am pleased that the Senate will today consider his nomination.

I want to give my colleagues some additional insight into a man whom we are asking them to vote on and that goes beyond his stellar legal credentials. The first thing I want my colleagues to know is that Professor Myers embodies a work ethic and diligence that we deserve in all of our judges. As an immigrant of Kingston, Jamaica, Professor Myers is a first-generation college student in his family. He worked his way through his undergraduate degree at the University of Wilmington, and after college he pursued a career in journalism. He worked for the Wilmington Morning Star. It was his investigative reporting that gave him the desire to earn his law degree. He graduated magna cum laude at the University of North Carolina School of Law and began a legal career as a clerk for Judge David Sentelle of the DC Circuit Court of Appeals.

Second, Professor Myers will be a judge who understands the value of public service, having made a career change from practicing at a prestigious private firm to contributing to our Nation's justice system following the attacks of September 11, 2001. He said that his change in career "was something I felt that I could do and that I owed to a country that had been really good to my family."

He did this first in the Central District of California and then in the Eastern District of North Carolina. Professor Myers then took a different path of service at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, instructing the next generation of lawyers to be people who, in his own words, "do the right thing every day."

If confirmed, Professor Myers will serve on the Eastern District of North Carolina and, as Senator TILLIS said, will hold court in Wilmington. Ironically, this court is currently meeting

in the building that once housed the Wilmington Morning Star, his first job as a reporter. However, when considering Professor Myers' story, it seems fitting that someone with the character, work ethic, and servant's approach to life will be returning to the building of his first post-college job wearing the robe of a Federal judge. I have faith in Professor Myers' ability to do the right thing every day in this critically important role, and I am grateful for the opportunity to speak on his behalf to our colleagues. This is well-deserving, and he will be an incredibly effective serving judge in our district court system. I urge my colleagues to support him unanimously.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BURR. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. FISCHER). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Myers nomination?

Mr. BURR. Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN), the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE), and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) would have voted "yea."

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 68, nays 21, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 383 Ex.]

YEAS—68

Alexander	Cassidy	Enzi
Barrasso	Collins	Ernst
Blackburn	Coons	Feinstein
Blunt	Cornyn	Fischer
Boozman	Cotton	Gardner
Braun	Cramer	Graham
Burr	Crapo	Grassley
Capito	Cruz	Hassan
Cardin	Daines	Hawley
Carper	Duckworth	Hoeven
Casey	Durbin	Hyde-Smith

Inhofe	Murphy	Shaheen
Johnson	Peters	Shelby
Jones	Portman	Sinema
Kaine	Reed	Sullivan
Kennedy	Risch	Tester
King	Roberts	Thune
Lankford	Romney	Tillis
Leahy	Rosen	Toomey
Lee	Rubio	Warner
Manchin	Sasse	Wicker
McConnell	Scott (FL)	Young
McSally	Scott (SC)	

NAYS—21

Baldwin	Heinrich	Schumer
Bennet	Hirono	Smith
Blumenthal	Markey	Stabenow
Brown	Menendez	Udall
Cantwell	Merkley	Van Hollen
Cortez Masto	Murray	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Schatz	Wyden

NOT VOTING—11

Booker	Moran	Rounds
Harris	Murkowski	Sanders
Isakson	Paul	Warren
Klobuchar	Perdue	

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Lydon nomination, Calendar No. 489, be made pending.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Sherri A. Lydon, of South Carolina, to be United States District Judge for the District of South Carolina.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Lydon nomination?

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN), the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE), and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) would have voted "yea."

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 76, nays 13, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 384 Ex.]

YEAS—76

Alexander	Feinstein	Reed
Baldwin	Fischer	Risch
Barrasso	Gardner	Roberts
Blackburn	Graham	Romney
Blunt	Grassley	Rosen
Boozman	Hassan	Rubio
Braun	Hawley	Sasse
Burr	Heinrich	Scott (FL)
Capito	Hoeven	Scott (SC)
Cardin	Hyde-Smith	Shaheen
Carper	Inhofe	Shelby
Casey	Johnson	Sinema
Cassidy	Jones	Stabenow
Collins	Kaine	Sullivan
Coons	Kennedy	Tester
Cornyn	King	Thune
Cortez Masto	Lankford	Tillis
Cotton	Leahy	Toomey
Cramer	Lee	Udall
Crapo	Manchin	Warner
Cruz	McConnell	Whitehouse
Daines	McSally	Wicker
Duckworth	Menendez	Wyden
Durbin	Murphy	Young
Enzi	Peters	
Ernst	Portman	

NAYS—13

Bennet	Hirono	Schumer
Blumenthal	Markey	Smith
Brown	Merkley	Van Hollen
Cantwell	Murray	
Gillibrand	Schatz	

NOT VOTING—11

Booker	Moran	Rounds
Harris	Murkowski	Sanders
Isakson	Paul	Warren
Klobuchar	Perdue	

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motions to reconsider are considered made and laid upon the table, and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's actions.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the Duncan nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Robert M. Duncan, of Kentucky, to be a Governor of the United States Postal Service for a term expiring December 8, 2025. (Reappointment)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. RES. 150

Mr. MENENDEZ. Madam President, I come to the floor again to seek unanimous consent for a resolution that commemorates the Armenian genocide.

In October, the House of Representatives passed a version of this resolution by a vote of 405 to 11—405 to 11. This vote was historic, and I applaud the bipartisan courage of those in the House to stand up for what is right.

For those here in the Senate who would consider objecting to this request, I urge you to think long and hard about what it means for your reputation, what it means for history, and what it means for the Senate as an institution. History is watching, and it will not look kindly on those who object to recognizing genocide.

In recent speeches before the Senate, I have laid out the case for why we must move forward on this resolution.

The simple threshold question for this body comes to this: Do we recognize a clear case of genocide when it happens, or do we let a country like Turkey determine our own views, determine our own sense of history, determine our own moral obligation, and determine the public record—a Turkey that today is committing atrocities against the Kurds in Syria, a Turkey that has teamed up with Russia and the Kremlin in purchasing the S-400 air defense system and just recently used it against an American F-16 to see if it works, and a Turkey that works to block forward movement in NATO on key national security objectives of the United States?

At what point do we say enough is enough? At what point do we simply move forward and acknowledge the truth? The truth is that the Armenian genocide happened. It is a fact. To deny that is to deny one of the monstrous acts of history. This denial is a stain on the Senate and our country. We have an opportunity to right that wrong and put the U.S. Senate on the right side of history.

Let's again review some of that history here today. More than 104 years ago, the Ottoman Empire launched a systemic campaign to exterminate the Armenian population through killings, forced deportations, starvation, and other brutal matters. How do we know this? How do we know this? Because U.S. diplomats were there. They wrote it down and sent it back to the State Department in Washington.

Henry Morgenthau, the U.S. Ambassador to the Ottoman Empire from 1913 to 1916, wrote this in his memoir:

When the Turkish authorities gave the orders for these deportations, they were merely giving the death warrant to a whole race; they understood this well, and, in their conversations with me, they made no particular attempt to conceal this fact. . . . I am confident that the whole history of the human race contains no such horrible episode as this. The great massacres and persecutions of the past seem almost insignificant when compared to the sufferings of the Armenian race in 1915.

That is what Henry Morgenthau said. On June 5, 1915, the U.S. consul in Aleppo, Jesse Jackson, wrote to Ambassador Morgenthau, saying:

There is a living stream of Armenians pouring into Aleppo from the surrounding towns and villages.

The [Ottoman] Government has been appealed to by various prominent people and even by those in authority to put an end to these conditions, under the representations that it can only lead to the greatest blame and reproach, but all to no avail. It is without doubt a carefully planned scheme to thoroughly extinguish the Armenian race.

On July 24, 1915, in a report to Ambassador Morgenthau, the U.S. consul in Harput, Leslie Davis, stated: "Any doubt that may have been expressed in previous reports as to the Government's intention in sending away the Armenians have been removed. . . . It has been no secret that the plan was to destroy the Armenian race as a race. . . . Everything was apparently planned months ago.

In an October 1, 1916 telegram to Secretary of State Robert Lansing, U.S. Charge d'Affaires Hoffman Philip wrote, "The Department is in receipt of ample details demonstrating the horrors of the anti-Armenian campaign. For many months past I have felt that the most efficacious method of dealing with the situation from an international standpoint would be to flatly threaten to withdraw our Diplomatic Representative from a country where such barbarous methods are not only tolerated but actually carried out by order of the existing government."

And finally, Abram I. Elkus, who served as the United States Ambassador to the Ottoman Empire from 1916-17, telegraphed the Secretary of State on October 17, 1916, stating "In order to avoid opprobrium of the civilized world, which the continuation of massacres [of the Armenians] would arouse, Turkish officials have now adopted and are executing the unchecked policy of extermination through starvation, exhaustion, and brutality of treatment hardly surpassed even in Turkish history."

That continues to verify that these diplomats saw the truth with their own eyes and communicated back to their superiors in Washington. They did their job, and the historical record proves it. Now it is up to individual U.S. Senators to do your job.

The Government of Turkey has funded lobbyists willing to trumpet lies and make excuses for these atrocities. The Turkish Government and its sympathizers have advocated for restrictive laws on expression and against legislation that recognizes the Armenian genocide. They will stop at nothing to bury the truth. I hope that individual Senators will not once again fall for it.

Any apprehension, any trepidation on the part of Senators who believe this resolution will somehow do irreparable harm to our relationship with Turkey is simply unfounded. Twenty-seven countries have recognized the genocide in one form or another. Some saw trade increases in Turkey following their recognition. Twelve members of NATO have recognized the genocide. They still work with Turkey on defense issues. They still have embassies in Ankara. Their relationships were not irreparably harmed. Belgium, Canada, the Czech Republic, France, Germany, Greece, Italy, Lithuania, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Poland, and the Slovak Republic all did the right thing.

I say to my friends and colleagues that genocide is genocide. Senators in this body should have the simple courage to say it plainly, say it clearly, and say it without reservation.

In every session of Congress since 2006, I have introduced or cosponsored resolutions affirming the facts of the Armenian genocide. When I was chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, I was proud to preside over the passage of an Armenian genocide resolution out of the committee.

The work continues here today. If we are not successful this afternoon, I know we are not going to stop until we are. I am not going to stop until I go through every single Senator who is willing to come to the floor and issue an objection on behalf of the administration because I think Armenian Americans need to know who stands in support of recognizing the genocide and who opposes it.

I thank Senator CRUZ for joining me in this effort. He has been stalwart with me in this bipartisan resolution. I thank the 27 additional Senators who have been willing to stand up for a true, clear-eyed vision: Senators VAN HOLLEN, RUBIO, STABENOW, GARDNER, MARKEY, CORNYN, WARREN, ROMNEY, PETERS, PORTMAN, FEINSTEIN, WYDEN, DUCKWORTH, REED, SCHUMER, UDALL, HARRIS, WHITEHOUSE, SANDERS, KLOBUCHAR, CARDIN, BOOKER, CASEY, BENNET, ROSEN, BROWN, and CORTEZ MASTO. I thank them all.

Before I ask unanimous consent, I yield to my colleague from Texas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG). The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, I am proud to join with my colleague from New Jersey today in urging the Senate to take up and pass the bipartisan Menendez-Cruz resolution affirming U.S. recognition of the Armenian genocide.

From 1915 to 1923, the Ottoman Empire carried out a forced deportation of nearly 2 million Armenians, of whom 1.5 million were killed. It was an atrocious genocide. That it happened is a fact and an undeniable reality. In fact, the very word "genocide," which literally means the killing of an entire people, was coined by Raphael Lemkin to describe the horrific nature of the Ottoman Empire's calculated extermination of the Armenians.

We must never be silenced in response to atrocities. Over 100 years ago, the world was silent as the Armenian people suffered and were murdered, and many people today are still unaware of what happened.

With this resolution, we are saying that it is the policy of the United States of America to commemorate the Armenian genocide through official recognition and remembrance. We have a moral duty to acknowledge what happened to 1.5 million innocent souls. It is the right thing to do.

I certainly understand the concerns of some of my colleagues who worry that this resolution could irreversibly poison the U.S.-Turkey relationship and push Turkey into the arms of Russia, but I don't believe those concerns have any sound basis.

As my colleague from New Jersey pointed out, 12 NATO nations have similarly recognized the Armenian genocide. Yes, Turkey is a NATO ally, but allies can speak the truth to each other. We should never be afraid to tell the truth, and alliances grounded in lies are themselves unsustainable. Additionally, in the coming days, the Foreign Relations Committee will be

marking up an enormous package of sanctions on Turkey.

The horse has left the barn. There is no good reason for the administration to object to this resolution, and the effect of doing so is to deny recognition of this chilling moment of history.

Let me close by echoing the optimism the Senator from New Jersey expressed. We may well see an objection here today, as we did when Senator MENENDEZ and I previously came to the Senate floor and sought to pass this just a couple of weeks ago, but I believe that in the coming days and weeks, we will get this passed and that this objection, I hope, will be only temporary. I look forward to the day—hopefully very, very soon—when all 100 Senators, Democrats and Republicans, are united in simply speaking the truth, recognizing the genocide that occurred, and making perfectly clear that America stands against genocide.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Texas for his eloquent statement and for his forthrightness on this issue.

As in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate Foreign Relations Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 150 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration. I further ask that the resolution be agreed to, that the preamble be agreed to, and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I don't think there is a single Member of the U.S. Senate who doesn't have serious concerns about Turkey's behavior both historically and currently. In fact, I support the spirit of this resolution. I suspect 99 of my colleagues do. At the right time, we may pass it, as Senator CRUZ has stated; however, I don't think this is the right time. If there is a right time, this certainly isn't it. It is largely because just hours ago, our President returned from the NATO summit in London with NATO leaders, where this was a topic of discussion with the leadership from Turkey—this being the acknowledgement of genocide, as well as the purchase of the S-400.

I want to have a clear readout of the President's interaction and discussion with President Erdogan and our delegation's negotiations with Turkey before adopting this resolution. I don't think we can take the risk of undermining the complex and ongoing diplomatic efforts which are in our national security interests as a country.

I, too, want to be on the right side of history. I believe we will be on the right side of history, but these negotia-

tions that the President is currently in are a part of getting on the right side of history.

I appreciate the ongoing conversations and still hope we will be able to overcome the challenges in the bilateral relationship with Turkey. We know what these challenges are, and we all share the goal of seeing them appropriately addressed, but there is no good alternative right now. In my view, adoption of this resolution today is unnecessary and might very well undermine that diplomatic effort at a key time.

I do not intend to continuously object to this resolution, but I believe it is appropriate for me to do so at this time, so I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, once again, I am deeply disappointed. This is the third time a Republican Senator has come to the floor to object to the genocide resolution—the recognition of the genocide resolution. There is never a good time. There is never a good time. In my view, there is always the right time, however, to recognize genocide as genocide.

My colleague from North Dakota actually sponsored H. Res. 220, the Armenian genocide resolution, affirming “the proper commemoration and consistent condemnation of the Armenian Genocide will strengthen our international standing in preventing modern-day genocides” when he was a Member of the House of Representatives. He was right then. He was right then. The time was right then, and the time is right now.

President Erdogan was here in the United States a couple of weeks ago. There was a meeting at the White House. A few of my colleagues had the privilege of joining the President expressing their discontent. Erdogan was given options—a way out of the dilemma that Turkey has put themselves in with the S-400. Basically, they were told either return to Russia and destroy them in our presence and/or give them to us, which, of course, Russia will never allow that to happen, for us to have their technology.

There was a deadline. It was yesterday. I waited until today to make sure that in fact we wouldn't intercede in any way with that possibility. Turkey, in the interim, while this is going on, they used the S-400 to fire at an F-16 to see if they could take it down. Really? Really?

So this premise that there was a meeting in NATO—well, there was a meeting in Washington, and then there was a meeting in NATO. They still haven't done anything on the S-400. They still haven't exercised any of the options that have been given to them.

I just want my colleagues to know that I intend to come once a week to the Senate floor, and all those who want to be listed on the wrong side of history, they have the option of doing

so. I am not going to cease until we do what is morally and principally right, and that is to recognize the Armenian genocide as a host of other nations have done as well.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

JUDICIAL NOMINATIONS

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I serve on the Senate Judiciary Committee, as a member of the Bar Association of Delaware, and a Member of the U.S. Senate. I am concerned about the transformation of our Federal judiciary under this current administration. I am particularly concerned about rising issues around qualification and competency. Let me speak to that, if I might, for a few minutes.

This Senate is doing precious little in terms of legislating, but we are moving at a breakneck pace to confirm President Trump's judicial nominees—roughly, 150 so far. During the entire 8 years of the previous administration, 55 circuit court judges were confirmed. Nearly that same number have been confirmed in just 3 years of the Trump administration—48. Nearly one in seven of all U.S. district court judges currently serving have been appointed by President Trump.

I am deeply concerned about the quality of some of these nominations. Some have never taken a deposition, argued a motion, let alone tried a case in court. The American Bar Association, the professional association of lawyers, has ranked nine of President Trump's nominees as “not qualified,” which is an exceptionally unusual and striking step for them to take.

This isn't about whether the President's nominees are conservative or not. I understand that elections have consequences and that a Republican President will more often than not nominate conservative judges. I have, in some cases, joined my Democratic colleagues in supporting qualified nominees put forward by the administration who have won support from their home State Senators and advanced through a bipartisan judicial nomination and confirmation process in our committee, but let's be clear. I will not stand by while this administration ramps through nominees who are not just Republican and not just conservative but demonstrably unqualified.

I can't support nominees with deeply concerning records about their commitment to justice and to advancing a commonsense jurisprudence. I am not going to set a standard any lower than what has been required in previous administrations to serve on the Federal bench for many, many years.

We have heard in this Chamber and around this country that the quality of the Federal bench and the capabilities and the experience and the values and the judgment of those who serve on Federal benches across this country is an absolutely essential piece of our Constitution and our ordered liberty.

The cases that come before Federal courts are too important to tolerate incompetence, inexperience, or bias in the Federal judiciary.

Why does this matter both in terms of the process and the substance? The President has put forward nominees who, in my view, would take us backward on civil rights and voting rights, on women's access to healthcare, on laws that protect consumers and workers, and on the environment. Their decisions impact every American. Equally concerning is that Trump's nominees don't reflect the diversity of our Nation. We want litigants to go into a court and be able to have their day in court and be confident that the judge before them represents the breadth and range of America.

So far, of the 55 circuit court nominees confirmed, only 11 have been women, and they have been even less racially diverse. Of all of President Trump's nominees, 87 percent are White and 78 percent are men. I think the judiciary should reflect the diversity of the American people and have strong records and a wealth of experience. Sadly, that is not the case for several we have considered, and let me briefly speak to two.

President Trump's nominee to serve on the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals, who was recently confirmed, Lawrence VanDyke, raised serious concerns about his work ethic and his temperament. He was rated "not qualified" by the ABA based on concerns about his lack of knowledge of basic procedural rules and his commitment to being truthful. Six retired justices of the Montana Supreme Court questioned his fitness when he ran for the Supreme Court in Montana and expressed concerns about his partisanship and the possibility of corporate influence. He is opposed to basic civil rights and civil liberties for the LGBTQ community and made a range of statements that I think would be disqualifying under any circumstance.

Sarah Pitlyk, who this Senate just confirmed this week to a lifetime seat on the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Missouri, has never tried a case, either criminal or civil, has never taken a deposition, has never examined a witness, and has never argued a motion in Federal or State court. The ABA unanimously rated her as "unqualified" for a lifetime seat in the Federal judiciary.

We can and we should do better than this. Of the entire bar of the State of Missouri, I am certain there are qualified, capable, and seasoned conservatives who could have been nominated for that seat in the entire Ninth Circuit. In particular, the State for which Mr. VanDyke was nominated, there are certainly abundant opportunities to choose qualified nominees. We can and we should do better than this.

In my State of Delaware, my senior Senator, TOM CARPER, and I worked together to help form a bipartisan judicial nominating committee to fill two

vacancies on our district court. We felt strongly we had to reach out to the White House and work with them to identify consensus nominees who would be the best candidates we could best support and whom the President could nominate. Ultimately, we had a very productive process, and the President nominated Maryellen Noreika and Colm Connolly, whom we both returned positive blue slips for. They ultimately have been confirmed by this Senate, seated, and now serve in our district court. This is how the process should work.

We should be able to consult back and forth between the executive and legislative until we find competent, capable, and qualified judges of whom we can all be proud of. The Senate should not be a rubberstamp for this administration, regardless of the quality of nominees that get sent forward.

I will continue to oppose President Trump's nominees who are undeserving of a seat on the Federal bench and unqualified to serve. It is, in my view, our responsibility to guard against the politicization of the Federal judiciary, and we should work together, not to tear down and destroy the traditions and rules of this Senate but to find ways to strengthen and sustain them. That is how we will move qualified and consensus nominees forward and protect the independent judiciary on which our very democracy rests.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRIBUTE TO JOHNNY ISAKSON

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I come to the floor today because I missed an important occasion in the Senate. We had a celebration recently of one of our more beloved Members, Senator JOHNNY ISAKSON of Georgia.

There wasn't much that could keep me away from that, but there was no Senator going to Madrid to the conference of the parties to consider the Paris Climate Agreement. Speaker PELOSI asked me to come on her House delegation so that it was bicameral. As I think most people in this body know, I am pretty animated on that subject and couldn't say no. There are not many other things that could have kept me away.

I want to come now and make up a little bit for being absent that day and express my gratitude for JOHNNY's friendship to me over the years. I had the pleasure of going with him to the D-day anniversary on a codel that he led with his usual graciousness and patriotism. He was kind enough to join quite early on the bipartisan Senate Oceans Caucus I started and has been a very helpful part of that endeavor.

We have worked together on ways to improve healthcare planning for people who are in the late stage of illness to make sure that they get the care that they want and don't get a lot of care that they don't want and so that they have a chance to have their dignity and desire to be at home respected.

We have long been adherent of a biennial budget, and I am delighted that the bipartisan bill that Senator ENZI and I have put together will create a biennial budget. I am not sure we will be able to get that done before Senator ISAKSON leaves, but one way or the other, his interest in biennial budgeting will live on, I hope, successfully when we pass that.

We had a parity question about children's mental health hospitals that weren't getting counted and, therefore, weren't getting access to funding for the medical interns who come, and JOHNNY helped me fix that. It helped, I am sure, hospitals in Georgia, but it was particularly helpful to me for our Children's Hospital in Rhode Island.

We have a lot of Rhode Islanders who were killed in the Lebanon Marine barracks bombing, and there has been litigation against Iran for its responsibility for those deaths. It is not easy to collect a judgment on a foreign government, and JOHNNY has been very helpful to me in our joint efforts on Iran terror victims' judgments, helping us let the lawyers collect against assets of the Government of Iran.

Then, we regularly have done National Mentoring Month resolutions together.

But for all the things we have done together, that is not what I am going to miss about Senator JOHNNY ISAKSON. He is just one of the most decent, kind, good people who I have come across anywhere in my life and, certainly, one of the most decent and kind Members of the Senate.

With my very sincere apologies, JOHNNY, for missing the correct day, I hope you will understand how much it mattered to me to be elsewhere and why I had to be there. I come to the floor now, belatedly, to wish you all my very best with great affection and great respect.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote on the soon-to-be-pending nomination be called up.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Duncan nomination?

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN), the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE), and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) would have voted "yea."

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 89, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 385 Ex.]

YEAS—89

Alexander	Feinstein	Portman
Baldwin	Fischer	Reed
Barrasso	Gardner	Risch
Bennet	Gillibrand	Roberts
Blackburn	Graham	Romney
Blumenthal	Grassley	Rosen
Blunt	Hassan	Rubio
Boozman	Hawley	Sasse
Braun	Heinrich	Schatz
Brown	Hirono	Schumer
Burr	Hoeven	Scott (FL)
Cantwell	Hyde-Smith	Scott (SC)
Capito	Inhofe	Shaheen
Cardin	Johnson	Shelby
Carper	Jones	Sinema
Casey	Kaine	Smith
Cassidy	Kennedy	Stabenow
Collins	King	Sullivan
Coons	Lankford	Tester
Cornyn	Leahy	Thune
Cortez Masto	Lee	Tillis
Cotton	Manchin	Toomey
Cramer	Markey	Udall
Crapo	McConnell	Van Hollen
Cruz	McSally	Warner
Daines	Menendez	Whitehouse
Duckworth	Merkley	Wicker
Durbin	Murphy	Wyden
Enzi	Murray	Young
Ernst	Peters	

NOT VOTING—11

Booker	Moran	Rounds
Harris	Murkowski	Sanders
Isakson	Paul	Warren
Klobuchar	Perdue	

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table, and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 533.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

The clerk will report the nomination. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill clerk read the nomination of Patrick J. Bumatay, of California, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Patrick J. Bumatay, of California, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit.

Mitch McConnell, Tom Cotton, John Boozman, Mike Crapo, Thom Tillis, Chuck Grassley, Jerry Moran, Kevin Cramer, John Barrasso, Mike Braun, Joni Ernst, Pat Roberts, John Cornyn, Roy Blunt, John Thune, Lindsey Graham, Roger F. Wicker.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 534.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Lawrence VanDyke, of Nevada, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Lawrence VanDyke, of Nevada, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit.

Mitch McConnell, Tom Cotton, John Boozman, Mike Crapo, Thom Tillis, Chuck Grassley, Jerry Moran, Kevin Cramer, John Barrasso, Mike Braun, Joni Ernst, Pat Roberts, John Cornyn, Roy Blunt, John Thune, Lindsey Graham, Roger F. Wicker.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 530.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of John Joseph Sullivan, of Maryland, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Russian Federation.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of John Joseph Sullivan, of Maryland, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Russian Federation.

Mitch McConnell, Thom Tillis, Richard Burr, Pat Roberts, John Cornyn, John Hoeven, Cindy Hyde-Smith, Roger F. Wicker, Marco Rubio, John Boozman, James E. Risch, John Barrasso, John Thune, Roy Blunt, Lamar Alexander, Mike Braun, Shelley Moore Capito.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 543.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Stephen Hahn, of Texas, to be Commissioner of Food and Drugs, Department of Health and Human Services.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Stephen Hahn, of Texas, to be Commissioner of Food and Drugs, Department of Health and Human Services.

Mitch McConnell, Thom Tillis, Richard Burr, Pat Roberts, John Cornyn, John Hoeven, Cindy Hyde-Smith, Roger F. Wicker, James Lankford, John Boozman, James E. Risch, John Barrasso, John Thune, Roy Blunt, Lamar Alexander, Mike Braun, Shelley Moore Capito.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 452.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Aurelia Skipwith, of Indiana, to be Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Aurelia Skipwith, of Indiana, to be Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service.

Mitch McConnell, Thom Tillis, Richard Burr, Pat Roberts, John Cornyn, John Hoeven, Cindy Hyde-Smith, Roger F. Wicker, Marco Rubio, John Boozman, James E. Risch, John Barrasso, John Thune, Roy Blunt, Lamar Alexander, Mike Braun, Shelley Moore Capito.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum calls for the cloture motions be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator for Louisiana.

5G

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, last week, of course, was Thanksgiving, a day that we all set aside in America to count our blessings. As we do that, we always say to ourselves: Gee, we really ought to be thankful every day of the year for the many blessings that have been bestowed upon us.

I know I say that to myself. So I thought today, for a few minutes, I would mention two things that I am especially thankful for, even though this isn't Thanksgiving, but it is another day that the Lord has blessed us with.

The first thing—and there are many things that I am thankful for, but the first thing I am thankful for that I want to mention today is the many public servants who care for and protect American taxpayer money.

I want to highlight one in particular: the Chairman of our FCC, Mr. Ajit Pai. Let me explain why I am thankful for this public servant—one among many who get up every day and work hard to protect taxpayer money. About 2 weeks ago, the Chairman of the FCC, over many obstacles, announced that he was going to hold a public auction for the C-band.

Why is that important?

We all have a cell phone now, and many of us have iPads and computers. The internet has changed our world and changed our lives. It has made it more complicated, of course, but on balance, I think the internet has been good for our lives.

We are about to move into a new phase of telecommunications called 5G. It stands for fifth generation. It is really an extraordinarily fast internet. It can carry huge amounts of data. The ingenuity of the American people takes my breath away.

I am pretty impressed with 4G, and 5G is going to be 100 times faster. It is going to make things possible like telemedicine, where a specialist in a field of surgery through robotics and now an incredibly fast internet can operate on a sick patient 1,000 miles away and save his or her life, thanks to 5G. We will be able to hook up all of our devices through 5G, saving time. It will give us more precious time to spend with our family. There will be driverless cars. Maybe I will not see them in my lifetime, but our assistants and our pages in the Senate will see them in their lifetime.

I could go on, but the point is, to make 5G possible, a lot of people have to work together. So 5G is made possible through the airwaves. When internet devices talk to each other, data in the form of radio waves—the scientists call them electromagnetic radiation—these radio waves go through the airwaves from one device to another.

We have all sorts of different airwaves. It is called spectrum. We have airwaves for radios and TVs. Well, 5G can be used in a number of different

airwaves or different parts of the spectrum. But one part of the spectrum, one part of the airwaves, is just perfect for 5G. It is called the C-band. That part of the airwaves is able to carry these 5G radio waves in a manner that can cover a huge geographical area but also carry lots of data.

It is called the C-band, and it is perfect for 5G. It is perfect. It is not too hot, not too cold. It is just right.

Some swamp creatures, both in government and out, came that close—that close—to getting control of the C-band, which is owned by the American people. Led by three foreign satellite companies, they had almost convinced the powers that be to give them the C-band—just give it to them—and let them decide who is going to get to use that C-band for 5G.

Oh, and, by the way, in picking the telecommunication companies that would get to use the C-band that was going to be given to them for free by the powers that be, these foreign companies were going to get to keep the money—about \$60 billion. That is just the upfront money—\$60 billion. That would build 7,000 miles of interstate in this country.

Not only would the companies get the \$60 billion, they would get to decide who could use the C-band, and they were that close. But the Chairman of the FCC stopped it. He is going to recommend next week—and I hope the rest of the FCC goes along with it. I am going to be there to watch. He recommended and is going to recommend that we have a public auction.

Doing a public auction is nothing new for the FCC. The FCC auctions off different airwaves all the time. In fact, the FCC in the last 25 years has held right around 100—I think it is 93—public auctions where anybody who wants to, any company that wants to—competition, moral good—can come in and bid on that part of the airwaves.

The good people at the FCC have brought in to the American taxpayer about \$123 billion in the last 25 years by auctioning off these airwaves and giving everybody a fair chance in a fully transparent way in front of God and country. That is the way it ought to be.

But a lot of swamp creatures were pushing hard for this private sale. The American taxpayer not only would have lost \$60 billion, they would have lost control of the C-band, which, according to the Communications Act, doesn't belong to me, doesn't belong to the businesses; it belongs to the American people.

We can't let our guard down. I have learned in my short 3 years here that those swamp creatures—if they can't get in the front door, they are going to try the side door, and if they can't make it through the side door, they are going to try the back door. We have a lot of money at stake here, so we have to remain vigilant.

I want to thank Ajit Pai for standing up. He made the right people mad.

That is easy to talk about, but it is hard to do. It takes courage, and he did it, and I wanted to single him out.

The second thing I want to say I am thankful for, among so many things, is this: I am so thankful for our neighbors to the North—Canada. I have visited Canada so many times. I am so proud to call them friends. There are 37 million people in Canada, some of the finest people that God ever put breath in.

We have fought together in wars. We have fought for freedom that we all take for granted. We trade with each other. I mean, the country is just a wonderful country with extraordinarily friendly, decent, and God-fearing people.

Our leaders squabble sometimes. That is just the way life is. Sometimes good friends have disagreements. We are having a few little disagreements right now. But on this beautiful Thursday, I just wanted to come and say how thankful I am that Canada is our friend and how honored I am to call them friends and how grateful I am for all 37 million of the fine men, women, and children in that great country.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

WORLD BANK

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I come to the floor this afternoon to discuss two issues: one dealing with the World Bank and another one dealing with the Department of Defense's inability to get clean audits.

Today the World Bank is releasing its country partnership framework with China. Reportedly, this includes \$1 billion to \$1.5 billion of loans to China per year and \$800 million to \$1 billion in private sector investment.

Keep in mind that the World Bank was created to help economic development in the world's poorest countries. China is now the world's second largest economy after the United States. Also, the United States is the World Bank's largest contributor. I think many Americans would question why so many American tax dollars are going to support low-interest loans in China.

In China, there is a large and growing body of evidence of human rights abuses in Xinxiang, including mass internment camps. Reports indicate that these camps are centers for social control and political indoctrination. Chinese authorities reportedly mistreat or even torture detainees, while requiring them to engage in forced labor and to renounce their religion and their culture. Yet the World Bank has supported a program called Technical and Vocational Education and Training Project in Xinxiang Province.

This is wording very close to what the Chinese Communist Party

euphemistically calls its internment camps. Plus, one reporter has uncovered documents that these schools purchased barbed wire, tear gas, and body armor using other funds—and, of course, funds are fungible.

Institutions like the World Bank have a great responsibility to further assess critical human rights risk and religious freedom, such as those exhibited in Xinxiang in any region where it lends money.

The World Bank's own social framework standards state that when assessing social risk and impacts, the Bank must assess threats to human security and impacts on the health, safety, and well-being of workers and project-affected communities. The Bank and other such institutions cannot adequately assess a project's full impact without monitoring and examining reports of widespread human rights abuses in any local area.

On November 16, the New York Times published leaked Chinese records indicating a coordinated effort going back years, directed by General Secretary Xi, to detain hundreds of thousands of Uighurs, Kazakhs, and other Muslims in internment camps and to unleash the tools of "dictatorship" on the Xinxiang Muslim population. Given these repeated reports about repression in Xinxiang that date back even years, it is hard to see how any project in that region could meet the Bank's social framework standards. There needs to be a periodic internal review of risk assessment mechanisms to ensure that they are appropriately calibrated to capture changing risk profiles.

I question whether the Bank's oversight processes are adequate, given its own assessments saw no issue with these intern camps that go by the professional name of Technical and Vocational Education and Training Project—and I am referring particularly to those in Xinxiang Province.

In a statement on August 29, the World Bank stated that it had conducted supervision missions twice a year since the project started and that these missions included a review of social safeguards and a monitoring and evaluation review. The World Bank found "no evidence from subsequent reviews that funds were diverted, misused, or used for activities not in line with project objectives or World Bank policies and procedures."

However, just last month, the Bank raised the environmental and social risk ratings from moderate—the second lowest level—to substantial and then to high—the highest level. It is very disappointing that very little happened in upgrading the risk assessments on this project until after congressional attention, even with an internal whistleblower raising the matter. This seems like a failed process to me when routine audits and a whistleblower complaint do not catch anything, despite increasingly concerning reports in the media about mistreatment and abuse.

I have written a letter to the Bank President, Malpass, asking questions about these systemic concerns. Moreover, I questioned why a country like China, whose economy has far surpassed the threshold at which it is supposed to graduate from rural bank funding, is now and forever still taking loans.

The World Bank was created for a very worthwhile purpose—to help poor countries that cannot, on their own efforts, assess capital markets.

Both China and Russia today have well surpassed the World Bank's graduation threshold and have access to capital markets. Yet American taxpayers are called on to do more. Yet China then continues to borrow, on average, \$2 billion a year from the World Bank, making it one of the Bank's top borrowers—the second largest economy in the world and one of the Bank's top borrowers.

Countries like China or Russia that have seen the most economic progress should not seek to maintain access to the Bank's preferential lending rates and technical support. Moreover, these are our two major geopolitical foes.

I have previously highlighted China's intellectual property theft and foreign influence activities at American universities as just an example of other things I looked at in the case of China.

Russia's illegal occupation of territory in Georgia and Ukraine and its "active measures" against democracies, including the U.S. democracy, make it effectively an outlawed state. Meanwhile, China does substantial foreign lending of its own, which it uses as a tool of geopolitical influence over other countries.

Now, just think, through the World Bank, they get U.S. taxpayer dollars, and then the country is still so rich that they can lend to many other nations around the world to increase the geopolitical influence of China, and that country's lending does not follow international development finance standards, nor does China disclose the amounts or terms for loans that it offers.

Through the Belt and Road Initiative in China—this initiative is a process where they invest in other countries to have Chinese influence in these other countries—this Belt and Road Initiative in China has raised concerns about debt sustainability in recipient countries. They can invest money in these countries, and then they have an agreement that if the loan isn't paid, then China takes over, enhancing their influence—a lot of it for military purposes.

A March 2018 report from the Center for Global Development assessed the current debt vulnerabilities of the countries I just referred to, identified as potential Belt and Road Initiative borrowers. Out of the 23 countries determined to be vulnerable to debt distress, the center identified 8 countries "where Belt and Road Initiative appears to create the potential for debt

sustainability problems, and where China is a dominant creditor in the key position to address these problems.”

The World Bank, again using American tax dollars, should not be lending to wealthy countries that violate the human rights of their citizens and attempt to dominate weaker countries through their loans, whether it is done for military reasons or for economic reasons.

The State-Foreign Operations appropriations bill contains funding and authorization for a large capital increase for the World Bank. In other words, what I just said—the Senate is going to be facing this issue. I have developed an amendment to this bill that would insert language requiring the U.S. representative to the World Bank to work to defeat any project in a country that has reached the World Bank’s own “graduation threshold” and, secondly, that is designated by the State Department as a “country of particular concern for religious freedom” or is on the watch list for such designation. Both of those would include China and Russia at this point. Countries with broadly documented violations of international norms, human rights, and religious freedoms should not be given the privilege of accessing preferential loans that then limit access to other countries in need.

In other words, the second largest economy in the world—China—by getting loans from the World Bank at the same time they violate the human rights of their people—developing countries that need the loans and resources are not getting them because they are going to the wealthy nations.

DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. President, now to my second and last issue of the day, I want to report on the Pentagon’s most recent audit. Unfortunately, I don’t come with tidings of comfort and joy. Instead, I come with tidings of bad news. The Department of Defense has flunked another test of fiscal fitness yet again.

Last year, Congress authorized more than \$700 billion for the Department of Defense. That is a heck of a lot of money. That is why it is a big deal that the Pentagon is unable to account for the hundreds of billions of taxpayer dollars it spends from one year to the next year.

Every dollar that Congress approves for the Defense Department is crucial for our national security. We must ensure that America’s sons and daughters in uniform are well paid and well equipped to defend our great country. That is why I work tirelessly to hold the Pentagon accountable.

The good news is, I am Iowa-stubborn. As a taxpayer watchdog, I won’t let go of this bone until I see results.

There is always bad news after you announce good news, so the bad news is that the Pentagon’s books are a big fiscal mess. In fact, the Defense Department is the very last Federal agency to comply with a Federal law—decades old—requiring an annual audit.

It took 28 years after Congress enacted a law requiring every Federal agency to conduct an annual audit for the Pentagon to get its ducks in a row. Unfortunately, the results are not what they are quacked up to be.

As required by the 1990 Chief Financial Officers Act, the bean counters at the Department of Defense disclosed their financial assessments for fiscal year 2019 to the Office of Inspector General, and then the IG deployed 1,400 auditors to 600 sites around the world. These 1,400 auditors at 600 different sites surveyed \$2.9 trillion in assets and tallied \$2.8 trillion in liabilities. After spending \$1 billion to conduct this audit, the Department of Defense inspector general was unable to issue a clean opinion, and that is the goal we seek.

Just like other Departments can get clean opinions, why can’t the Defense Department do so? The case is that year after year, the Pentagon is unable to account for tax dollars coming in and tax dollars going out.

Let me clarify for everyone listening just what happens when big spenders aren’t held accountable. Tax dollars are ripe for wrongdoers to harvest, and in the sprawling bureaucracy that we call the Defense Department, with bases and contractors stationed around the globe, Pentagon spending is vulnerable to waste, fraud, and abuse.

As a Pentagon watchdog, I have approached this podium nearly 50 times over my years of service here in the Senate to continually call attention to this wasteful spending by the Department of Defense. At the same time, I haven’t avoided calling attention to wasteful spending in any agency of the Federal Government, but the Department of Defense has gotten the majority of my attention. During this period of time, I have written countless oversight letters and launched scores of investigations. I have encouraged my colleagues to ramp up their oversight work so we can work together to fix what is broken.

The top dogs at the Pentagon have undertaken countless reform efforts, so I am not saying they don’t recognize it and try to do something about it, but after all these decades, they have not succeeded.

At the same time, besides undertaking countless reform efforts, they have issued endless promises. They have testified that real solutions are underway. Yet the results of the fiscal 2019 audit leaves this Iowa Senator underwhelmed. Tax dollars are still leaking through the Pentagon ledgers like a sieve. The plumbing is broken. When the fiscal faucets are cranked wide open, at full throttle, with no internal controls welded in place to prevent leaking, tax dollars are flushed down the drain.

Over many years of oversight, dozens of top dogs at the Defense Department and the top brass of U.S. military have come to my office to offer explanations for wasteful spending, particularly

after the Pentagon is on the receiving end of unflattering headlines. They have polished their skills when it comes to dodging tough questions posed by my oversight letters. They are also well prepared to rationalize hundreds of billions of dollars for their budget.

It is entirely reasonable and the responsibility of each of our lawmakers, including this one, to expect that they also have the ability to show us where the money goes. I have approached dialogue with our Nation’s military leaders in good faith, but time and again, I have been disappointed. The Defense Department’s inability or unwillingness to make necessary and overdue changes is quite unacceptable. The buck stops here, of course. As representatives of the American people, we owe it to our constituents.

The Defense Department is the largest Federal agency. Over time, bureaucrats get wrapped up in a culture of go along to get along. Some insiders take the brave step to blow the whistle on waste, fraud, and abuse; however, many are afraid to follow suit. That is why it is so important to inject a dose of reality into that swamp.

What is really needed is a massive transfusion to change the mindset. We have a lot of history, so let me remind my colleagues, Washington is an island surrounded by reality, and when it comes to fiscal responsibility, the Pentagon operates on its own special fantasy island. That is why Congress can’t rubberstamp the Defense Department’s budget with no accountability for how the money is spent.

Every time a new defense authorization funding bill is due in Congress, military leaders speak to the ever-changing threats facing our country. Those same military leaders plead for additional funding to defend our Nation, fight our enemies, and protect our interests abroad. Those military leaders discuss the growing threat of cyber attacks, aging and obsolete equipment, and say that cuts to their budget would hurt our men and women in uniform.

National defense, as we all know, is the No. 1 priority of the Federal Government under the Constitution, so Congress is understandably reluctant to deny money that military leaders say they need. That, in turn, is the reason earning a clean audit is shoved to the back burner at the Defense Department.

Congress and the Pentagon need to reach an understanding. Fiscal accountability and military readiness are not mutually exclusive. It is not an either/or scenario. Earning a clean bill of fiscal health would strengthen military readiness and boost support for necessary increases to defense spending in Congress and among the American people.

Money somehow seems to simply get lost at the Defense Department. It is unreasonable to concede that it is OK for military inventory to vanish into thin air. It boils down to sloppy bookkeeping and antiquated accounting

systems that can't generate reliable transaction data.

The problem starts at the top and filters down throughout the five quarters of the Pentagon. Let's consider the recent debacle with the TransDigm Group. In February, the Defense Department's Office of Inspector General released a report on spare parts that the Pentagon purchased from TransDigm. The result of that report exposed the rinse-and-repeat fiscal shenanigans corroding the accounting systems at the Pentagon. In the report, the IG analyzed 113 contracts between January 2015 and January 2017. It reviewed 47 spare parts the Defense Department purchased from TransDigm. In that window of time of only 2 years, TransDigm overcharged the Defense Department by more than \$16 million.

I will go out on a limb and suggest that Americans would rather spend \$16 million for the Defense Department on our men and women in uniform rather than overpaying for spare parts rip-offs to a defense contractor.

Congress can't sign blank checks to the Defense Department. We must work to ensure every dollar is present and accounted for. The Nation's strongest military in the world is managed by a Defense Department where taxpayer dollars seem to vanish without explanation, without receipts, and without accountability. Over the years, I have collected a laundry list of Pentagon waste, fraud, and abuse from \$436 hammers to \$640 toilet seats, \$117 soap dish covers, and \$999 pliers. Most recently, I have exposed \$1,200 reheatable coffee cups and \$14,000 toilet seat lids. The dirty laundry just keeps piling up, and at the same time it is piling up, it is soaking the taxpayer.

These wasteful expenditures represent just the tip of an iceberg. The simple truth is the Defense Department can't keep track of or doesn't seem to care where tax dollars are spent. Internal controls are weak and, in some cases, nonexistent. That has been reinforced by this second audit for which the Department of Defense inspector general can't give a clean audit.

For a second time, I would suggest that what the law of 28 years ago tries to accomplish is that every Department get a clean audit—a clean opinion on their audit. Let me repeat for a second time that the Defense Department is the only agency of the Federal Government that can't do that. The Defense Department, repeating again, is the only agency that hasn't been able to deliver a clean audit, despite spending billions of dollars to modernize its accounting system. All of that investment hasn't produced better systems.

No one except me and a few others ever talk about this, but it needs to be talked about and talked about a lot more, and it needs to be talked about in a deliberate way and very often. Congress can't allow the Defense Department to sweep this issue under the rug year after year.

The TransDigm fiasco is just one very small example, even though it cost the taxpayers a lot of wasted dollars. Price gouging has been going on for years at the expense of the taxpayer and military readiness. Top-level managers know all about what I am talking about, but they aren't doing a doggone thing to fix it. People must be held accountable for missing receipts, for lost financial information, for wasteful spending approvals, for questionable contracting agreements, and every other abuse of power that leads to more taxpayer dollars being squandered.

American households across the country scrutinize their spending and keep tabs on their bills. The Defense Department should approach spending no differently. That is why I pushed for an amendment to the latest Defense authorization bill that would have required the Pentagon to keep better track of its contracts and to make sure they do make reports to the Congress. While this amendment was ultimately not included in the bill, I want my colleagues to know that I am going to continue to push for more accountability.

Throughout my years of oversight, the Pentagon officials have claimed they want to reverse the cycle of cost overruns; they want to clean up their books; and they want to hold people responsible. Yet it never seems to happen. Although I am encouraged by the conversations I have had so far with new Defense Secretary Esper, the proof is in the pudding. From one administration to the next, it has been the same story. Business goes on as usual.

From the top of the chain of command to the rank and file, there is a pervasive mindset that assumes no one is watching over them and that no one cares. For four decades, this Senator has been watching, and this Senator cares. I am disgusted each time I discover another example of wasteful spending.

So I am here this very day, as I have been dozens of times before in my service in the Senate, to ask my colleagues in both the Senate and House of Representatives to join me in a crusade to stop wasteful spending at the Defense Department. There is a saying that goes something like this: no guts, no glory. Well, wasteful spending is gutting our military readiness and goring the taxpayers. There is no glory in that, and people might wonder then, why does this Senator bother?

I have fought fiscal mismanagement at the Defense Department for these many decades. I have launched investigation after investigation and come to the floor of the Senate to talk until I am blue in the face. Billions of dollars have been poured into a decades-long effort to right the fiscal ship at the Defense Department. The Pentagon has shelled out billions for several hundred partial orders, two complete audits, and endless technology updates to modernize its IT and accounting sys-

tems. Yet no one can tell us when, if ever, a clean audit might be possible. How can that be? After nearly 30 years of effort, there is no solution.

The Department of Defense can develop the most advanced weapons systems in the world, but it can't seem to deploy something as simple and common as an accounting system that is capable of capturing payment transactions and generating reliable fiscal and financial data. That is why it is a cakewalk for crooks to rip into the Pentagon's money sack from both ends and use a front end loader to freeload their way through this money pit.

Without a clean audit on the foreseeable horizon, there is no evidence to catch anyone's hands in the Pentagon cookie jar. The only way we will root out fraud and wasteful spending is by knowing where the money is being spent.

That brings me back to square one as I finish. We need a clean audit and a reliable accounting system. As I mentioned earlier, I am Iowa stubborn, and, by God, I am willing to work with my colleagues and go toe-to-toe with any administration, Republican or Democrat. I will work as long as it takes for us to see eye to eye to hold the Defense Department accountable once and for all.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BRAUN). The Senator from Maryland.

UNITED NATIONS FRAMEWORK CONVENTION ON CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I rise to commemorate the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change 25th Conference of the Parties, or COP25, which is taking place in Madrid until December 12 this year. I do so despite the cloud cast by President Trump's announcement of his intention to withdraw the United States from the Paris Agreement.

The Paris Agreement is a landmark effort to reduce global greenhouse gas emissions in an effort to limit the global temperature increase in this century to 2 degrees Celsius above preindustrial levels while pursuing means to limit the increase to 1.5 degrees.

The COP meetings now routinely represent the largest multilateral diplomatic events in the world. This year's conference is designed to take the next critical steps in the U.N. climate change process. Following agreements on the implementation guidelines of the Paris Agreement COP24 in Poland last year, a key objective is to complete several matters with respect to the full operationalization of the Paris climate change agreement.

Article 28 of the Paris Agreement specifies that after joining, no country can withdraw for 3 years, after which a 1-year waiting period must occur before withdrawal takes effect. The Trump administration recklessly filed withdrawal documents on November 4, 2019, making November 4, 2020, the earliest possible date the United States can be out of the agreement.

Withdrawal could not come at a costlier time. In an analysis I requested to review the Federal approach to prioritizing and funding climate resilience projects that address the Nation's most significant climate risks, the Government Accountability Office notes that there were at least 14 disasters whose costs exceeded \$1 billion each in 2018 alone.

GAO, an independent, nonpartisan agency that examines how taxpayer dollars are spent and is known as the congressional watchdog, reported that the total estimated costs reached at least \$91 billion in damage to public and private property.

"The cost of recent weather disasters has illustrated the need to plan for climate change risks and invest in climate resilience," the report says. "Investing in climate resilience can reduce the need for far more costly steps in the decades to come."

The Paris Agreement establishes a global goal on adaptation that consists of, one, enhancing adaptation capacity; two, strengthening resilience; and three, reducing vulnerability to climate change in the context of the temperature goal of the agreement. It aims at strengthening the national adaptation efforts, including through support and international cooperation. It recognizes that adaptation is a global challenge faced by all, including the United States.

Because U.S. withdrawal will not formally take effect until November 4, 2020, the U.S. team's posture at COP25 remains largely unchanged. A group of dedicated career civil servants will be on the ground.

Moreover, 2 years ago, numerous U.S. States, cities, Tribal nations, businesses, faith groups, universities, and others enhanced their presence at major international events, including COP meetings, to maintain and encourage American progress toward its national climate goals.

I am proud that nearly 100 Maryland pledgers "Are Still In." They comprise dozens of businesses—many small. We have over 10 cities, 6 counties, cultural institutions, faith and healthcare organizations, 20 universities, including my alma mater, the University of Maryland School of Law in Baltimore, and investors, such as the State treasurer of Maryland. They are all still in.

Members of the Senate "Are Still In." I am proud to be leading 38 of my colleagues in S. Res. 404. This bipartisan resolution expresses the sense of the Senate that the United States should be working in cooperation with the international community in continuing to exercise global leadership to address the causes and effects of climate change.

Prior to that, I led a congressional delegation of 10 Senators to COP21 that produced the Paris Agreement in 2015. Then the United States committed to lowering its contribution of greenhouse gas emissions 26 to 28 percent below 2005 levels by 2025.

Business and labor "are still in." In a recent letter, 75 major CEOs and organized labor that are represented by the AFL-CIO stressed the importance of the Paris Agreement and the need for the United States to remain in it. This represents one of the most powerful recognitions ever from the private sector of the economic risks and opportunities that climate change presents to the United States and the world. The December 2, 2019, Joint Labor Union and CEO Statement on the Paris Agreement comprises a group of CEOs who employ more than 2 million people in the United States and union leaders who represent more than 12.5 million workers.

In 2009, at the Copenhagen COP 15, the U.S. helped to drive the creation of goals for developed nations to mobilize \$100 billion in public and private climate finance in 2020. The result was the Green Climate Fund, which helps to fund climate finance investment in low emissions, climate-resilient development.

The Paris Agreement affirmed and extended that \$100 billion goal. Although President Trump has stymied its funding, the fiscal year 2020 State Department and Foreign Operations bill the Senate Committee on Appropriations reported is the most favorable, forward-leaning on multilateral climate assistance in years, funding renewable energy programs at \$179 million and resiliency programs at \$177 million. In addition, the bill commits \$140 million to the Global Environmental Facility and \$10 million to the U.N. climate convention.

We must not forget the cooperation President Trump would have us forget. On a bipartisan basis, the U.S. Congress has uniformly rejected the President's repeated calls to zero out climate assistance funding. This rebuke represents the true, cooperative spirit of our country, once a global leader on climate issues.

I urge President Trump to reassert our Nation's strong leadership in implementing the Paris Agreement before the next Conference of the Parties. In the meantime, I applaud the courage of the general public, universities, faith-based groups, nonprofits, labor organizations, private sector companies, and State and local governments that have helped to step into the void President Trump created by his withdrawal from this agreement.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

UNITED STATES-MEXICO-CANADA AGREEMENT

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, I rise to discuss the need to pass the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement.

It is frustrating that we have to continue to speak about this issue. We have been so close for a long time now, but the lack of action on the part of the House leadership continues to unnecessarily delay its ratification.

Our neighbors to the north and south are our natural allies and trading part-

ners; yet our trade policy with them has not been updated in 25 years. The President and his team have worked very hard to get Canada and Mexico to the negotiating table to modernize our trade agreement in a mutually beneficial manner. That hard work has paid off in the form of the USMCA. It is ready for ratification, and the Senate is eager to get that done.

Unfortunately, we are at the mercy of the House, which must act first. The House leadership's refusal to move this trade deal is preventing additional job creation in our country, and it is sending the wrong signal to our trading partners across the globe. We ought to be spurring economic activity by striking fair trade agreements globally, not sitting on our hands and refusing to approve an agreement between two of our top trading partners.

A fair and mutually beneficial trade agreement with our neighbors to the north and south is very important to my home State of Arkansas. Canada and Mexico are No. 1 and No. 2 on the list of the top 10 destinations for Arkansas' exports. Arkansas is one of a handful of States that in recent years has consistently exported more than what it has imported from Canada and Mexico.

The World Trade Center Arkansas, which has played a valuable role in connecting businesses in my State with international partners for over a decade, recently released a report that summarizes trade and jobs data for the Natural State.

The center's report underscores the value trade brings to my State's economy and reinforces the fact that the path to a more prosperous, long-term outlook for Arkansas is through opening additional markets for our farmers, manufacturers, and small businesses. The report notes that, as of September 2019, trade in Arkansas supported nearly 350,000 jobs. This represents approximately 26 percent of the State's total employed labor force. It points to a direct correlation between job numbers and trade, documenting that trade-related jobs in the State have grown six times faster than total employment over the past few years.

More importantly, for our purposes here today, the report underscores just how crucial Canada and Mexico are for Arkansas' economy. The Natural State's exports to Canada amounted to \$1.2 billion last year. Our exports to Mexico totaled \$870 million in that same time span. Combined, these two countries account for a third of Arkansas' total exports. Nearly 69,000 jobs in my State are dependent on trade with Canada, and another 41,000 are tied to trade with Mexico.

Melvin Torres, the center's director of Western Hemisphere and European Trade, praised Arkansas' effective partnership with both countries for creating this "symbiotic and successful relationship." That relationship will only grow with the ratification of the USMCA.

Canada and Mexico aren't just important markets for my State. Each of our States stands to gain with the ratification of the USMCA. This landmark trade deal will create over 175,000 jobs, which will help to strengthen our economy and America's middle class. This overdue modernization of NAFTA will benefit workers in a wide array of industries. Manufacturing, tech, and more stand to gain from the USMCA. It will add much needed certainty for farmers and ranchers, who currently need every market they can get. Rural America is struggling right now, and approving this agreement will provide a shot in the arm for the rural economy.

The ratification of the USMCA, along with the recent deals that have been struck with South Korea and Japan, will show the rest of the world that the U.S. is open for business. Proving that the U.S. is negotiating in good faith to reach mutually beneficial outcomes for all parties that are involved could really move the needle in other ongoing trade standoffs.

The House leadership needs to get on the stick. The USMCA is too important for our Nation's economic future for it to be sitting in limbo while House Democrats focus on partisan goals.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BOOZMAN). The majority leader.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to legislative session for a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EQUAL PAY

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, this past October, the young women who make up the Burlington High School girls soccer team in Burlington, VT, made a statement: The time for equal pay is now. All they are looking for is for their leaders—leaders like us in Congress—to show the courage to make it happen.

It all began one Friday night in October, when, after scoring a goal to put them ahead in the closing minutes of a game against neighboring rivals South Burlington, four exuberant members of the soccer team removed their jerseys to reveal T-shirts emblazoned with this simple phrase: “#EqualPay.”

The reception to their silent statement was reminiscent of that moment when the U.S. Women's National Team made history in July, winning its second consecutive World Cup title. After a thrilling win over the Netherlands, the stadium in France was filled with chants of “Equal Pay! Equal Pay!”.

One Friday in October, the stands—though smaller—in Burlington, VT, erupted in the same way. The result? Yellow cards for the offending players, issued by a referee bound by the rules of the league.

The young women of the Burlington High School soccer team became overnight sensations. Within a matter of days, they had sold more than 2,000 of their now iconic simple white T-shirts, raising more than \$30,000 to support the Greater Burlington Girls Soccer League. Men were invited to pay an extra \$4 for the \$25 T-shirt: 16 percent of the cost, to represent the pay gender pay gap in Vermont. Their story was reported by local outlets like VT Digger and the Burlington Free Press, and it was featured on “Good Morning America” and on CNN. It even reached across the pond, where the UK's Daily Mail featured the team's advocacy. I ask unanimous consent that the report from VT Digger be printed in the RECORD following these remarks.

The lesson here is simple, and the voices could not be clearer: Equal pay for equal work should not be controversial, nor should it be challenged. Yet today in Vermont, a woman makes \$0.84 for every \$1 earned by a man. In some States, the gap is as wide as 70 percent. It is inexplicable. It is unacceptable. And it needs to stop.

Marcelle and I are proud to support the young women of the Burlington High School soccer team. We proudly wore our #EqualPay shirts outside the U.S. Capitol, standing in solidarity with these young Vermonters and with women everywhere who are simply demanding what should be theirs: equal pay for equal work.

Earlier this year, after the U.S. Women's National Team's inspiring victory at the World Cup, I reintroduced a simple resolution calling for the Federation Internationale de Football Association, FIFA, to immediately eliminate gender pay inequity and treat all athletes with the same respect and dignity, regardless of gender. It is straightforward. It is common sense. And it is past due.

Following the October game, the referee who issued the yellow card bought one of the team's #EqualPay shirts for himself. I find in that action a simple metaphor: There is simply no longer support for arcane practices that never should have existed. We should heed the call of the next generation and end these discriminatory practices, not just in sports but across the workforce. Equal pay for equal work should be the right of every person. It is as simple as that.

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

[From the VT Digger, Oct. 22, 2019]

BURLINGTON GIRLS SOCCER TEAM MAKES WAVES WITH EQUAL PAY ACTIVISM
(By Aidan Quigley)

BURLINGTON.—When Burlington girls soccer midfielder Helen Worden knocked in the take-the-lead goal during the team's Friday

night game against South Burlington with under five minutes to play, her team burst into a celebration.

Team members took the opportunity to lift their jerseys up to reveal #equalpay T-shirts underneath, with a few removing their jerseys to show the full #equalpay shirts.

While four members of the teams received yellow cards for removing their jerseys, the celebration—and team's efforts for gender pay equality—went viral over the weekend, with an appearance on “Good Morning America,” coverage on CNN and a slew of supportive messages.

The team was inspired by the U.S. women's national soccer team's campaign this summer during the World Cup. Members of the national team filed a federal lawsuit alleging gender discrimination against U.S. Soccer which stated the women's team generated \$20 million more in revenue than the men's team while earning a quarter of what the men were paid.

Klara Martone, Burlington's senior goalie, said that the players were working hard in school and wanted to bring attention to the pay gap in society.

“The idea that we could work this hard and still make less money just based on our gender is incredible to me,” Martone said. “We want to live in our adult lives in a world where we don't have to worry about making less money.”

The girls have sold 2,000 T-shirts and raised a total of \$30,000 as of Monday afternoon.

Worden went to France this summer and witnessed the United States win the World Cup. A chant after the win stuck with her.

“People were cheering ‘equal pay,’ and it was super inspiring,” Worden said. “So I came back and talked to (my teammates) about it, and said we should contribute in some way.”

Martone said that the team originally planned on wearing “equal pay” T-shirts for a dress-up day near the start of the season. But the idea gained steam, and the team decided to open up T-shirt orders to the community.

Junior right back Ruby Wool said at the start, having the boys soccer team wear the T-shirts was a “big victory” for the team.

“Those small little steps we were taking were so big to us, and with each thing everything is getting bigger,” Wool said. “As of right now, I don't think it's going to get smaller for a while.”

The team was “fuming” when they received yellow cards at Friday's game, Worden said.

As four of the girls received yellow cards, the crowd chanted “equal pay.”

“The good thing about the card was hearing everybody had our back,” senior center back/mid Maggie Barlow said. “That was one of the moments we were like, ‘wow, we have such a big support system.’ It was worth it because that was amazing to hear.”

Coach Jeff Hayes said some members of the South Burlington team came over the referees and requested that they not card their opponents. The cards were an exciting moment for the team, he said.

The four players who received yellow cards had to be temporarily taken out of the game and were not able to check back in before South Burlington equalized minutes later. The game ended in a 1-1 tie.

The effort was applauded by Brandi Chastain, a longtime member of the U.S. national team who famously removed her jersey in celebration of her penalty kick goal which won the 1999 World Cup.

“Thank you @bhsgirlssoccer for standing up, celebrating and taking your jerseys off for #equalpay Proud of you! #rolemodels,” Chastain tweeted Saturday.

Removing a jersey as part of a goal celebration—a popular goal celebration—is an

automatic yellow card under the regulations of FIFA, soccer's worldwide governing body.

Vermont Sen. Patrick Leahy tweeted a photo of himself and his wife, Marcelle, both wearing the #equalpay jerseys.

"Marcelle and I stand with you!" Leahy tweeted.

The team has worked with Change The Story VT, a nonprofit initiative which works to address the wage gap and advance economic opportunities for women in the state. Women in Vermont earn 84 cents to every dollar earned by men, according to Change the Story.

Jessica Nordhaus, director of strategy and partnerships for Change the Story, said the organization has been helping the team with logistics and strategy. She said it has been a good opportunity to talk to young people about the wage gap, which isn't on track to close until 2048.

"They're doing the math and thinking, 'How old will I be in 2048?'" Nordhaus said. "We've just been so thrilled to see them take this issue on and do some of the activism that raises awareness about pay inequity."

The team is selling the jerseys for \$25, with a looser fit "men's" style jersey for \$29.80. The men's jersey is 16% more expensive, which is meant to even the wage gap.

The jerseys have #EqualPay on the front with the BHS Seahorse logo and Change The Story logos on the sleeves.

Funds raised in the sales will go to a local youth soccer Greater Burlington Girls Soccer League. The players are hoping the funds raised can help with outreach across the city and help make participants in the soccer league more reflective of the demographics of the city.

"We want them to be able to give scholarships to girls who aren't able to play," Barlow said. "We're working on widening access for all different kinds of people and making sure GBGSL has the means to fund that."

The team finished its regular season with a 9-4-1 record, receiving the fourth seed in the Division 1 playoffs. Burlington will face off with 13th seed Brattleboro Wednesday in the first round of the playoffs.

Hayes said he is excited for the playoffs and that the activism is bringing the team even closer together.

"It just brought this team so together," Hayes said. "They're so cohesive when they are using their voices. They're making waves in the community, and they're good waves."

FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE INTER-AMERICAN FOUNDATION

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, for 50 years the Inter-American Foundation, IAF, has partnered with grassroots organizations and underserved populations throughout Latin America and the Caribbean to advance U.S. interests by helping to improve the lives of the hemisphere's poorest people, supporting civil society, and strengthening democratic institutions. I want to take this opportunity today, on IAF's 50th anniversary, to comment briefly on the foundation's accomplishments and on the unique value of small-grant, community-led development.

In 1969, Congress established IAF as an independent development agency charged with identifying and investing in community-led development solutions. IAF awards small grants, averaging \$280,000 over 4 years, directly to local organizations, eliminating costly

intermediaries and ensuring programs are led and implemented locally. IAF also requires grantees to contribute or mobilize their own cash or in-kind resources, helping to ensure sustainability and local investment in project success. On average, such counterpart investments mobilize \$1.31 for every \$1 invested by IAF.

According to IAF, in fiscal year 2019 alone, it awarded \$18.5 million to 97 grassroots organizations in 24 countries and mobilized \$20 million in grantee counterpart resources. IAF grantees created more than 2,500 partnerships with other organizations to share experiences and advance their missions, trained more than 200,000 people in new leadership and technical skills, and contributed to the creation of 11,000 new or improved jobs.

IAF's development model illustrates that if modest resources and technical support are provided directly to communities and their grassroots organizations so they can define their own needs, design their own solutions, and invest in their own communities, then local ownership, self-reliance, and sustainable development are possible.

IAF's small-grants model also enables it to be nimble and responsive to changing conditions on the ground, including natural and man-made disasters. In recent years, IAF has used its network of grantees in Brazil, Colombia, Ecuador, and Peru to support thousands of displaced Venezuelans and the communities where they have relocated.

After the signing of the Colombia Peace Accords in 2016, IAF launched the Colombian Peacebuilding Initiative and invested nearly \$2 million in 23 local Colombian organizations to support community-level peacebuilding and reconciliation.

In Central America, IAF has 98 projects addressing the causes of migration in areas likely to be targets of criminal gangs in order to help families and communities resist such violence. And since June 2019, IAF has awarded \$650,000 in grants to civil society organizations across the Eastern Caribbean focused on strengthening community-led disaster mitigation and preparedness planning.

IAF's successful approach to development is why we increased funding in the fiscal year 2020 State and Foreign Operations Appropriations bill, which was reported unanimously by the Appropriations Committee in September. Increased funding would enable IAF to support a greater number of meritorious grant proposals, as the foundation was able to fund only 7 percent of the almost 800 proposals received in fiscal year 2019.

Regrettably, this model of donors directly supporting small-scale, local initiatives to design, implement, and sustain their own development solutions is more the exception than the rule. I hope IAF's 50th anniversary serves not only as an opportunity to commemorate its many accomplishments, but

also to reflect on the need to expand IAF's approach to development across the U.S. Government.

(At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the following statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.)

VOTE EXPLANATION

• Ms. HARRIS. Mr. President, I was absent, but had I been present, I would have voted no on rollcall vote No. 375, the motion to invoke cloture on Executive Calendar No. 479, Richard Ernest Myers II, of North Carolina, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of North Carolina.

Mr. President, I was absent, but had I been present, I would have voted no on rollcall vote No. 376, the motion to invoke cloture on Executive Calendar No. 489, Sherri A. Lydon, of South Carolina, to be United States District Judge for the District of South Carolina.

Mr. President, I was absent, but had I been present, I would have voted no on rollcall vote No. 378, the confirmation of Executive Calendar No. 353, John L. Sinatra, Jr., of New York, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of New York.

Mr. President, I was absent, but had I been present, I would have voted no on rollcall vote No. 379, the confirmation of Executive Calendar No. 478, Sarah E. Pitlyk, of Missouri, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Missouri.

Mr. President, I was absent, but had I been present, I would have voted no on rollcall vote No. 380, the confirmation of Executive Calendar No. 381, Douglas Russell Cole, of Ohio, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Ohio.

Mr. President, I was absent, but had I been present, I would have voted no on rollcall vote No. 381, the confirmation of Executive Calendar No. 459, R. Austin Huffaker, Jr., of Alabama, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Alabama.

Mr. President, I was absent, but had I been present, I would have voted no on rollcall vote No. 382, the confirmation of Executive Calendar No. 460, David B. Barlow, of Utah, to be United States District Judge for the District of Utah. •

ARMS SALES NOTIFICATION

Mr. RISCH. Mr. President, section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act requires that Congress receive prior notification of certain proposed arms sales as defined by that statute. Upon such notification, the Congress has 30 calendar days during which the sale may be reviewed. The provision stipulates that, in the Senate, the notification of proposed sales shall be sent to the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

In keeping with the committee's intention to see that relevant information is available to the full Senate, I

ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the notifications which have been received. If the cover letter references a classified annex, then such annex is available to all Senators in the office of the Foreign Relations Committee, room SD-423.

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

DEFENSE SECURITY
COOPERATION AGENCY,
Arlington, VA.

Hon. JAMES E. RISCH,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(5)(C) of the Arms Export Control Act (AECA), as amended, we are forwarding Transmittal No. 20-0A. This notification relates to enhancements or upgrades from the level of sensitivity of technology or capability described in the Section 36(b)(1) AECA certification 08-60 of August 1, 2008.

Sincerely,

CHARLES W. HOOPER,
Lieutenant General, USA, Director.

Enclosures.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 20-0A

Report of Enhancement or Upgrade of Sensitivity of Technology or Capability (Sec. 36(b)(5)(c), AECA)

(i) Purchaser: Government of Italy.

(ii) Sec. 36(b)(1), AECA Transmittal No.: 08-60; Date: August 1, 2008; Military Department: Air Force.

(iii) Description: On August 1, 2008, Congress was notified by Congressional certification transmittal number 08-60 of the possible sale, under Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, of 4 MQ-9 Unmanned Aerial Vehicles (UAV), 3 Mobile Ground Control Stations, five years of maintenance support, engineering support, test equipment, ground support, operational flight test support, communications equipment, technical assistance, personnel training/equipment, spare and repair parts, and other related elements of logistics support. These UAVs included AN/DPY-1 Synthetic Aperture Radar/Ground Moving Target Indicator (SAR/GMTI) systems with 0.3 to 3 meter resolution. The estimated total cost was \$330 million. Major Defense Equipment (MDE) constituted \$50 million of this total.

On November 18, 2009, Congress was notified by Congressional certification transmittal number 09-60 of the possible sale, under Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, of two unarmed MQ-9 Unmanned Aerial Vehicles (UAVs), one (1) Mobile Ground Control Station, maintenance support, engineering support, test equipment, ground support, operational flight test support, communications equipment, technical assistance, personnel training/equipment, spare and repair parts, and other related elements of logistics support. These UAVs included AN/DPY-1 Synthetic Aperture Radar/Ground Moving Target Indicator (SAR/GMTI) systems with 0.1 to 3 meter resolution. The estimated total cost was \$63 million. MDE constituted \$36 million of this total.

On December 17, 2009, Congress was notified by Congressional certification transmittal number 0C-09 of the possible sale, under Section 36(b)(5)(a) of the Arms Export Control Act, of a performance upgrade of the AN/DPY-1 SAR/GMTI systems aboard the four MQ-9s UAVs previously notified on transmittal 08-60 from 0.3 to 3 meter resolution to the same 0.1 to 3 meter resolution of the two MQ-9s notified on transmittal 09-60.

There was no increase in cost of MDE for this upgrade.

This transmittal reports the addition of Major Defense Equipment items beyond what was originally notified to include:

1. Retrofit of five (5) existing MQ-9A Block 1 Unmanned Aerial Vehicles (UAV) to Block 5;
2. Retrofit of two (2) existing MGCS Block 30;
3. Addition of three (3) MQ-9A Block 5;
4. Addition of eight (8) Multi-Spectral Targeting Systems (MTS-B) AN/DAS-1A;
5. Addition of eight (8) General Atomics AN/APY-8 Lynx (exportable) Synthetic Aperture Radar/Ground Moving Target Indicator (SAR/GMTI) Systems, with Maritime Wide Area Search (MWAS) capability;
6. Addition of two (2) Mobile Ground Control Station (MGCS) Block 30, and;
7. Addition of twenty-seven (27) Honeywell H-764 Adaptive Configurable Embedded Global Positioning System/Inertial Guidance Units (EGI) with Selective Availability Anti-Spoofing Module (SAASM) (24 installed, 3 spares).

The retrofit, addition of aircraft, and inclusion of the above listed MDE not enumerated in the previous notifications will result in a net increase in MDE costs of \$180 million and non-MDE cost of \$138 million. These notifications represent the entirety of Italy's MQ-9 program, which will now increase in value from \$393 million to \$711 million.

(iv) Significance: As Italy continues with its plans to develop a robust MQ-9A fleet, it has requested additional aircraft. Enhancement of Italy's MQ-9A aircraft will provide strike capability to augment intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance (ISR) capability. The proposed sale increases Italy's capability to participate in Europe and NATO security operations and supports the foreign and national security policies of the US by enhancing the ISR and strike capability of a major ally.

(v) Justification: Italy is a major political and economic power in NATO and a key democratic partner of the United States in ensuring peace and stability around the world. Italy requests these capabilities to provide for the defense of deployed troops, regional security, and interoperability with the United States.

(vi) Sensitivity of Technology:

1. The MQ-9A Block 5 Unmanned Aerial System (UAS) is UNCLASSIFIED. The highest level of classified information required for training, operation, and maintenance is SECRET. The MQ-9A Block 5 is a Medium Altitude, long-endurance (MALE) remotely piloted aircraft that can be used for surveillance, military reconnaissance, and targeting missions. Real-time missions are flown under the control of a pilot in a Ground Control Station (GCS). A datalink is maintained that uplinks control commands and downlinks video with telemetry data. Line-of-Sight (LOS) communications is enabled through C-Band datalink and Beyond-Line-of-Sight (BLOS) communications is enabled through Ku-Band Satellite Communication (SATCOM). Control of the aircraft and payload are done through direct manual inputs by the crew or through preprogrammed mission. Preprogrammed missions are planned and uploaded by the pilots via the GCS and are executed through the control of an onboard suite of redundant computers and sensors. Payload imagery and data are downlinked to the GCS. The pilot may initiate pre-programmed missions once the aircraft is airborne and lands the aircraft when the mission is completed. Pilots can change preprogrammed mission parameters as often as required. When operated BLOS, aircraft control is given to other strategically placed Ground Control Stations—per-

mitting remote split operations (RSO). The MQ-9A Block 5 is designed to carry 850 pounds of internal payload with maximum fuel and can carry multiple mission payloads aloft. The MQ-9A Block 5 will be configured for the following payloads: Electro-Optical/Infrared (EO/IR), Synthetic Aperture Radar (SAR), Electronic Support Measures (ESM), Signals Intelligence (SIGINT), laser designators, and various weapons packages. The MQ-9A Block 5 systems will include the following components:

a. The Ground Control Station (GCS) can be either fixed or mobile. The fixed GCS is enclosed in a customer-specified shelter. It incorporates workstations that allow operators to control and monitor the aircraft, as well as record and exploit downlinked payload data. The mobile GCS allows operators to perform the same functions and is contained on a mobile trailer. Workstations in either GCS can be tailored to meet customer requirements. The GCS, technical data, and documents are UNCLASSIFIED.

b. The Raytheon Multi-Spectral Targeting System-B (MTS-B) integrates electro-optical (EO), infrared (IR), laser designation and laser illumination capabilities to provide detection, ranging, and tracking capabilities specifically for high-altitude applications. This advanced EO and IR system provides long-range surveillance, high altitude target acquisition, tracking, range finding, and laser designation for the Hellfire missile and for all tri-service and NATO laser-guided munitions.

c. The AN/APY-8 Lynx Block 20 Synthetic Aperture Radar and Ground Moving Target Radar system provides all-weather surveillance, tracking and targeting for military and commercial customers from manned and unmanned vehicles. The AN/PY-8 Lynx Block 20SAR/GMTI radar system and technical data/documents are UNCLASSIFIED.

d. The Honeywell H-764 Adaptive Configurable Embedded Global Positioning System/Inertial Guidance Unit (EGI) contains the Force 524D GPS Receiver card with Selective Availability Anti-Spoofing Module (SAASM). The Force 524D is a 24-channel SAASM based GPS receiver with precise positioning service capability built upon Trimble's next generation GPS technology. The Force 524D retains backward compatibility with the proven Force 5GS while adding new functionality to interface with the digital antenna electronics to significantly improve anti jam performance. The host platform can select the radio frequency of digital antenna electronics interface. In the digital mode, the Force 524D is capable of controlling up to 16 independent beams.

(vii) Date Report Delivered to Congress: December 4, 2019.

FUTURE ACT

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, today, the Senate passed a solution that Senator MURRAY and I reached to permanently fund historically Black colleges and universities and other minority serving institutions.

It is hard to think of a piece of legislation that would have more of a lasting impact on minority students and their families than this bill.

This legislation does two things:

First, it provides permanent funding—that is fully paid for—for HBCUs and other Minority-Serving Institutions attended by over 2 million minority students.

Second, after 5 years of bipartisan effort, it greatly simplifies the free application for Federal student aid—the

FAFSA—that 20 million families, including 8 million minority students, fill out every year to qualify for Federal student aid.

This bipartition provision—which was sponsored by Senators MURRAY, WHITEHOUSE, and GARDNER when it passed the Senate by unanimous consent last December—stops families from having to give their same tax information to the Federal Government twice—first to the IRS, then again to the Department of Education. Students give permission to the IRS and the Department of Education to share tax return data, which eliminates up to 22 questions on the FAFSA with one click.

It should eliminate most of the so-called verification process, which is a bureaucratic nightmare that 5.5 million students go through annually to make sure the information they gave to the Department of Education is exactly the same as they gave to the IRS. The president of East Tennessee State University recently told me that half the students applying to ETSU go through verification at some point.

According to the Department of Education, it helps taxpayers by eliminating up to \$6 billion each year in mistakes—both in overpayments and underpayments—in Pell grants and student loans.

It has taken 20 years to reach this result, and it would not have happened without Jeff Appel, a longtime staff member at the Department of Education who recently passed away, and Secretary DeVos and Secretary Mnuchin's commitment to getting this over the finish line.

In addition, I want to thank the staff who have been instrumental in getting the proposal to this place: on Senator MURRAY's staff, Kara Marachione, Bryce McKibben, Mary Barry, and Evan Schatz. Conor Sheehey with Senator SCOTT. Rebecca Howard with Senator JONES. Christopher Toppings with Senator BURR. Corey Linehan with Senator COONS. And from my staff, Robert Moran, Lauren Davies, Andrew LaCasse, Mary Catherine Cook, and David Cleary.

The final step to simplify the FAFSA is to pass additional legislation that will reduce the 108 questions on the FAFSA to a total of between 18 and 30 questions and make Pell grants predictable so students can know how much grant aid they will receive to attend college.

I and Senators MURRAY, SCOTT, JONES, BURR, and COONS worked together to reach this result and I am glad the Senate passed it today so it can be sent to the House and signed into law by the President before the end of the year.

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. Mr. President, Florida is the Nation's greatest melting pot, with people from all over the Nation choosing to make Florida their permanent home. Our State has the best colleges and universities in the Nation, including many Historically

Black Colleges and Universities and Minority Serving Institutions. As Governor of Florida, I made historic investments in higher education and fought to keep higher education affordable so more students can get a great education in Florida.

As Senator, I will continue to fight to make sure every child has access to a quality education at a price they can afford. Our Historically Black Colleges and Universities and Minority Serving Institutions are critical to the success of our State and the future of our children, and I will always work to support their mission.

The best way to support our colleges and universities is to make sure our economy is thriving so we have the resources we need to invest in education. That means we have to be careful about how we are spending taxpayer dollars. I have concerns any time the government permanently funds a program, no matter what that program is. Funding anything permanently means there is little to no accountability or oversight. We must be careful to regularly review every government-funded program to make sure taxpayers are always getting the best return on their investment.

TRIBUTE TO MAJOR JORDAN KAHN

Mr. MANCHIN. Mr. President, I rise today to acknowledge the service of my defense fellow, Maj. Jordan Kahn, who is approaching the end of his assignment with my office as part of his experience in the U.S. Air Force Legislative Fellowship Program.

Major Kahn joined my office in January and his dedication, work ethic, and intelligence quickly made him a trusted voice on my legislative team. A proud member of the U.S. Air Force, as well as being a graduate of both the U.S. Air Force Academy and the U.S. Air Force Weapons School, Jordan has deployed to defend our country multiple times, and because of his service, our Nation is safer. Most importantly, Jordan is a devoted husband and father, and I have had the pleasure of watching his family grow over the last year. In November, his wife Becky gave birth to their second son Haden, and his firstborn son Harrison has now dutifully taken on the responsibility of big brother.

As Major Kahn moves on to his next assignment, I have full faith that he will continue to excel as a leader in the Air Force and would trust him in the most demanding and sensitive positions within our Armed Forces. I extend my sincere thanks for his service to our Nation and our office and wish him and his family continued success in his future endeavors.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO BETH WALSH, CLAIRE PICHETTE, THOMAS REDMON, AND JUSTINE HURLEY

• Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, this week I have the honor of recognizing four Montana school teachers for their passion and dedication to teaching math and science to young Montanans.

Beth Walsh from East Valley Middle School, Claire Pichette from Helena High School, Thomas Redmon from Daly Elementary, and Justine Hurley from White Sulphur Springs Elementary School have all been awarded the Presidential Award for Excellence in Mathematics and Science Teaching between 2017 and 2018.

The Presidential Award for Excellence in Mathematics and Science Teaching is an incredibly high honor for school teachers across the country and no easy task to receive. A committee of Montana math and science teachers select finalists from a collection of statewide applications followed by a national panel of distinguished scientists, mathematician, and educators who select four national award winners from those finalists.

These teachers won the Presidential Award for their superior abilities to educate young Montanans on mathematics and science ranging from kindergarten children to seniors in high school. They show passion for their profession daily, and this award is a symbol of that passion. We are lucky to have such highly qualified teachers educating Montana students.

It is my honor to recognize Beth Walsh, Claire Pichette, Thomas Redmon, and Justine Hurley for their exemplary work educating Montana students. They are a true testament to the incredible education system we have throughout Big Sky Country. •

REMEMBERING DR. WOODIE FLOWERS

• Ms. HASSAN. Mr. President, today I would like to recognize the life of an extraordinary individual, Dr. Woodie Flowers.

As an engineer, a professor at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology—MIT—and an integral part of FIRST—For Inspiration and Recognition of Science and Technology—Woodie helped educate and inspire people in New Hampshire, across the country, and around the world.

I first had the privilege of meeting Woodie in the 1980s when I was doing legal work for MIT. Almost immediately, I recognized his curiosity and eagerness to learn, his patience and understanding, and his desire to collaborate and work effectively. Woodie extended that ethos and enthusiasm for education to every aspect of his life, including through his groundbreaking leadership at MIT and FIRST.

Throughout his career, Woodie brought a unique vision to his work

and frequently stressed that technology is changing at a pace that the human brain simply cannot keep up with. This understanding and concern led him to emphasize the importance of teaching critical thinking and an allegiance to objective truth, which he posited would push back against the tribalism and binary thinking afflicting our society.

As part of his efforts to bridge division and expand human understanding, Woodie served as a mentor to countless students. While following Woodie in a speaking program was certainly a daunting task, I always looked forward to hearing his perspective at FIRST events. The major theme that Woodie sought to impart to students is that life is not a zero sum game. He would encourage them to work and compete with "gracious professionalism," where you work hard and challenge one another to be your very best, but you always engage with respect and kindness. FIRST encourages its participants to consider the annual contest as "cooptition," and Woodie used the opportunity to interact with the students and coaches as a way to reinforce this critical concept, that success comes through bringing out the best in each other and in humanity.

Woodie understood what a good leader should be, and his vision and example are characteristics that all Americans should aspire to. And in many ways, his confidence in our ability as human beings to solve problems and transcend our most basic tribal instincts, informed by science and grace, was uniquely American.

Dr. Woodie Flowers was one of the most brilliant, kind, and creative people I have ever met, and it was an honor to know him. I extend my condolences to Woodie's talented and magnificent wife and partner, Margaret, and their entire family. And I join them and the FIRST community in mourning an extraordinarily intelligent inventor, humanist, and American.

We will miss Woodie more than I can say, but I am certain that his legacy will live on through the countless lives he has touched. The world is a smarter, better, and more hopeful place because Woodie Flowers lived his life with love and purpose.●

TRIBUTE TO EDWARD HALL

Ms. ROSEN. Mr. President, today it is my honor to pay tribute to Edward Hall, an incredible 96-year-old Nevadan, whose story began when he answered the call to defend his country. Eighty years ago, in 1939, at the age of 16, Ed lied about his age to enlist in the Army Air Corps and began his military service to our great Nation. On December 7, 1941, at just 18 years old, he found himself stationed at Hickam Field, Hawaii, working in the mess hall cleaning up and preparing for the day when he and his fellow troops heard an explosion. This was the beginning of the

Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor, and Ed, like many of the men on Hickam Field, stopped what he was doing to respond to this attack on the American Base. Without hesitation, Ed put his life on the line, joining in to rescue his fellow servicemembers injured in the ongoing attack. Along with an Army officer, Ed commandeered a truck and began driving around the flight line picking up the injured to move them to the base hospital in spite of coming into direct fire from Japanese aircraft. Upon returning from his third round of picking up the injured, Ed's truck was strafed by a Japanese Zero fighter and taken out of action, but Ed kept at it, as he knew helping the injured was his priority. As the bodies of the dead and injured continued to mount, Ed grabbed a .45-caliber pistol off one of his fallen comrades in order to have the means to defend himself from the attack as enemy planes buzzed the skies above him. He would go on to keep that pistol for the remainder of the war.

As the attack on Pearl Harbor ended, the recovery of the base began as Ed and other survivors began dealing with the aftermath of the attack and preparing for our formal entry into World War II in the Pacific theater. Ed kept going, as many of the members of that "greatest generation" did throughout World War II, embodying the American spirit of tenacity when faced with the greatest adversity, the spirit that eventually led to our success in defeating tyranny and enabling freedom across the world at the end of the Great War in 1945.

Mr. President, to Edward Hall, I join citizens across Nevada and the Nation in sending our sincere gratitude to him for his service to the United States. It is heroes like Ed whose service has kept our communities, States, Nation, and world safe. His service during World War II, and the life he has led since are an incredible testament to resilience, and we are forever grateful.

TRIBUTE TO ANTHONY BORDA

● Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, today I recognize Anthony Borda, an intern in my Washington, DC, office, for all of the hard work he has done for me, my staff, and the State of South Dakota over the past several months.

Anthony is a graduate of Nutley High School in Nutley, NJ. Currently, he is attending American University in Washington, DC, where he is majoring in political science. He is a hard worker who has been dedicated to getting the most out of his internship experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Anthony for all of the fine work he has done and wish him continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO WILLIAM SHUSTER DIXON

● Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, today I recognize William Shuster Dixon, an intern in my Washington, DC, office, for all of the hard work he has done for me, my staff, and the State of South Dakota over the past several months.

Will is a graduate of Altoona Area High School in Altoona, PA. Currently, he is attending American University in Washington, DC, where he is pursuing a degree in communications, law, economics, and government. He is a hard worker who has been dedicated to getting the most out of his internship experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Will for all of the fine work he has done and wish him continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO ALEXANDER REINKE

● Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, today I recognize Alexander Reinke, an intern in my Washington, DC, office, for all of the hard work he has done for me, my staff, and the State of South Dakota over the past several months.

Alex is a recent graduate of South Dakota State University in Brookings, SD, having earned a degree in history. This spring, Alex plans to continue serving the public by working on Capitol Hill. He is a hard worker who has been dedicated to getting the most out of his internship experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Alex for all of the fine work he has done and wish him continued success in the years to come.●

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 10:02 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, with an amendment, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 151. An act to deter criminal robocall violations and improve enforcement of section 227(b) of the Communications Act of 1934, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

At 12:22 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bill:

H.R. 5277. An act to amend section 442 of title, United States Code, to exempt certain interests in mutual funds, unit investment trusts, employee benefit plans, and retirement plans from conflict of interest limitations for the Government Publishing Office.

The enrolled bill was subsequently signed by the President pro tempore (Mr. GRASSLEY).

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. WICKER, from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation,

with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 153. A bill to promote veteran involvement in STEM education, computer science, and scientific research, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 116-164).

S. 529. A bill to establish a national program to identify and reduce losses from landslide hazards, to establish a national 3D Elevation Program, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 116-165).

By Mr. WICKER, from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, with an amendment:

S. 906. A bill to improve the management of driftnet fishing (Rept. No. 116-166).

By Mr. WICKER, from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, without amendment:

S. 908. A bill to provide for an equitable management of summer flounder based on geographic, scientific, and economic data and for other purposes (Rept. No. 116-167).

S. 914. A bill to reauthorize the Integrated Coastal and Ocean Observation System Act of 2009, to clarify the authority of the Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration with respect to post-storm assessments, and to require the establishment of a National Water Center, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 116-168).

By Mr. WICKER, from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, with an amendment:

S. 1148. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to require the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration to give preferential consideration to individuals who have successfully completed air traffic controller training and veterans when hiring air traffic control specialists (Rept. No. 116-169).

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

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

By Ms. BALDWIN (for herself, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. ROBERTS, Mrs. CAPITO, and Mr. TESTER):

S. 2982. A bill to expand eligibility for certain housing programs for qualified volunteer first responders; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN:

S. 2983. A bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to seek to enter into an agreement with the city of Vallejo, California, for the transfer of Mare Island Naval Cemetery in Vallejo, California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. THUNE (for himself and Mr. ISAKSON):

S. 2984. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow for certain residential rental property to be depreciated over a 30-year period; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MCCONNELL:

S. 2985. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study to assess the suitability and feasibility of designating certain land in the State of Kentucky as the Kentucky Wildlands National Heritage Area, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. YOUNG (for himself and Ms. STABENOW):

S. 2986. A bill to amend part A of title XI of the Social Security Act to establish an interagency council on social determinants of health, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. TILLIS (for himself, Mr. COONS, Mr. CASSIDY, and Ms. HIRONO):

S. 2987. A bill to authorize U.S. Customs and Border Protection to seize imported merchandise that infringes a design patent, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. TESTER (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. CASEY, and Mr. DAINES):

S. 2988. A bill to address the financial exploitation of veterans receiving pension from the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

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

S. 2989. A bill to amend title XI of the Social Security Act to clarify the mailing requirement relating to social security account statements; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. THUNE:

S. 2990. A bill to require that the Federal Government procure from the private sector the goods and services necessary for the operations and management of certain Government agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. SULLIVAN (for himself and Ms. BALDWIN):

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; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MERKLEY (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. WARREN, Mr. MENENDEZ, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE):

S. 2992. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to prohibit mandatory pre-dispute arbitration agreements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. WARNER (for himself and Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina):

S. 2993. A bill to amend titles XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act with respect to nursing facility requirements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina (for himself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. GARDNER, Ms. ERNST, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. RUBIO, and Mrs. CAPITO):

S. 2994. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require information reporting with respect to the qualified opportunity zone tax incentives enacted by the 2017 tax reform legislation, to require public reports related to such tax incentives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MANCHIN (for himself and Mrs. CAPITO):

S. 2995. A bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to submit to Congress reports on patient safety and quality of care at medical centers of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LEE (for himself, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mrs. BLACKBURN, and Mr. CRUZ):

S. 2996. A bill to amend the Head Start Act to authorize block grants to States for pre-kindergarten education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 133

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the names of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY) and the Senator from

Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) were added as cosponsors of S. 133, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the United States merchant mariners of World War II, in recognition of their dedicated and vital service during World War II.

S. 319

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 319, a bill to improve the reproductive assistance provided by the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs to severely wounded, ill, or injured members of the Armed Forces, veterans, and their spouses or partners, and for other purposes.

S. 460

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 460, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the exclusion for employer-provided education assistance to employer payments of student loans.

S. 511

At the request of Mr. COTTON, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 511, a bill to promote and protect from discrimination living organ donors.

S. 622

At the request of Mr. JONES, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Ms. ERNST) was added as a cosponsor of S. 622, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to repeal the requirement for reduction of survivor annuities under the Survivor Benefit Plan by veterans' dependency and indemnity compensation, and for other purposes.

S. 670

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 670, a bill to make daylight savings time permanent, and for other purposes.

S. 800

At the request of Mr. CASSIDY, the names of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) and the Senator from Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY) were added as cosponsors of S. 800, a bill to establish a postsecondary student data system.

S. 839

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 839, a bill to extend Federal Pell Grant eligibility of certain short-term programs.

S. 879

At the request of Mr. VAN HOLLEN, the names of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) and the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 879, a bill to provide a process for granting lawful permanent resident status to aliens from certain countries who meet specified eligibility requirements, and for other purposes.

S. 880

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 880, a bill to provide outreach and reporting on comprehensive Alzheimer's disease care planning services furnished under the Medicare program.

S. 901

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) was added as a cosponsor of S. 901, a bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to support individuals with younger onset Alzheimer's disease.

S. 944

At the request of Mr. SCHATZ, the names of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) and the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS) were added as cosponsors of S. 944, a bill to enhance the security operations of the Transportation Security Administration and the stability of the transportation security workforce by applying a unified personnel system under title 5, United States Code, to employees of the Transportation Security Administration who are responsible for screening passengers and property, and for other purposes.

S. 1015

At the request of Mr. BURR, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1015, a bill to require the Director of the Office of Management and Budget to review and make certain revisions to the Standard Occupational Classification System, and for other purposes.

S. 1032

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1032, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the definition of income for purposes of determining the tax-exempt status of certain corporations.

S. 1657

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1657, a bill to provide assistance to combat the escalating burden of Lyme disease and other tick and vector-borne diseases and disorders.

S. 1820

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1820, a bill to improve the integrity and safety of horseracing by requiring a uniform anti-doping and medication control program to be developed and enforced by an independent Horseracing Anti-Doping and Medication Control Authority.

S. 2001

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the names of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY),

the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER), the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN), the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) and the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) were added as cosponsors of S. 2001, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to Willie O'Ree, in recognition of his extraordinary contributions and commitment to hockey, inclusion, and recreational opportunity.

S. 2179

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2179, a bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to provide social service agencies with the resources to provide services to meet the urgent needs of Holocaust survivors to age in place with dignity, comfort, security, and quality of life.

S. 2254

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2254, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to create a Pension Rehabilitation Trust Fund, to establish a Pension Rehabilitation Administration within the Department of the Treasury to make loans to multi-employer defined benefit plans, and for other purposes.

S. 2317

At the request of Mr. MURPHY, the names of the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 2317, a bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to credit individuals serving as caregivers of dependent relatives with deemed wages for up to five years of such service, and to support State medical training programs for caregivers.

S. 2407

At the request of Mr. DAINES, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2407, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide criminal penalties for individuals acting as agents or attorneys for the preparation, presentation, or prosecution of a claim under a law administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs without being recognized by the Secretary for such purposes, and for other purposes.

S. 2417

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the names of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) and the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) 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. 2599

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2599, a bill to amend the Department of Agriculture Reorganiza-

tion Act of 1994 to provide assistance to manage farmer and rancher stress and for the mental health of individuals in rural areas, and for other purposes.

S. 2638

At the request of Ms. DUCKWORTH, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2638, a bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to require small hub airports to construct areas for nursing mothers, and for other purposes.

S. 2661

At the request of Mr. GARDNER, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) 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.

S. 2688

At the request of Mr. CASSIDY, the names of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) were added as cosponsors of S. 2688, a bill to amend the Energy Policy Act of 2005 to establish an Office of Technology Transitions, and for other purposes.

S. 2695

At the request of Mr. ROBERTS, the names of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE) were added as cosponsors of S. 2695, a bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to provide for the defense of United States agriculture and food through the National Bio and Agro-Defense Facility, and for other purposes.

S. 2715

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) 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. 2753

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2753, a bill to amend title XVI of the Social Security Act to update eligibility for the supplemental security income program, and for other purposes.

S. 2754

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the names of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) and the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) were added as cosponsors of S. 2754, a bill to create jobs and drive innovation and economic growth in the United States by supporting and promoting the manufacture of next-generation technologies, including refrigerants, solvents, fire suppressants, foam blowing agents, aerosols, and propellants.

S. 2827

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the names of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) were added as cosponsors of S. 2827, a bill to amend title 54, United States Code, to establish within the National Park Service the U.S. African-American Burial Grounds Network, and for other purposes.

S. 2898

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, the names of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN), the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) and the Senator from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA) were added as cosponsors 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. 2976

At the request of Mr. CASSIDY, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2976, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide an election to advance future child tax credits in the year of birth or adoption.

S. RES. 112

At the request of Mr. BOOZMAN, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 112, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that the United States condemns all forms of violence against children globally and recognizes the harmful impacts of violence against children.

S. RES. 260

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BRAUN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 260, a resolution recognizing the importance of sustained United States leadership to accelerating global progress against maternal and child malnutrition and supporting the commitment of the United States Agency for International Development to global nutrition through the Multi-Sectoral Nutrition Strategy.

S. RES. 447

At the request of Mr. RISCH, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 447, a resolution expressing serious concern about widespread irregularities in Bolivia's October 20, 2019, general elections and supporting the convening of new elections in Bolivia at the earliest possible date.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. MCCONNELL:

S. 2985. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study to assess the suitability and feasibility of designating certain land in the State of Kentucky as the Kentucky Wildlands National Heritage Area, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 2985

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Kentucky Wildlands National Heritage Area Study Act".

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) **HERITAGE AREA.**—The term "Heritage Area" means the Kentucky Wildlands National Heritage Area.

(2) **SECRETARY.**—The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Interior.

(3) **STATE.**—The term "State" means the State of Kentucky.

(4) **STUDY AREA.**—The term "study area" means—

(A) Adair, Bath, Bell, Boyd, Breathitt, Carter, Casey, Clay, Clinton, Cumberland, Elliott, Floyd, Green, Harlan, Jackson, Johnson, Knott, Knox, Laurel, Lawrence, Lee, Leslie, Letcher, Lincoln, Magoffin, Martin, McCreary, Menifee, Metcalfe, Monroe, Morgan, Owsley, Perry, Pike, Pulaski, Rockcastle, Rowan, Russell, Wayne, Whitley, and Wolfe Counties in the State; and

(B) any other areas in the State that—

(i) have heritage aspects that are similar to the heritage aspects of the areas described in subparagraph (A); and

(ii) are adjacent to, or in the vicinity of, the areas described in that subparagraph.

SEC. 3. STUDY.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary, in consultation with State and local historic preservation officers, State and local historical societies, State and local tourism offices, and other appropriate organizations and governmental agencies, shall conduct a study to assess the suitability and feasibility of designating the study area as a National Heritage Area, to be known as the "Kentucky Wildlands National Heritage Area".

(b) **REQUIREMENTS.**—The study shall include analysis, documentation, and determinations on whether the study area—

(1) has an assemblage of natural, historic, and cultural resources that—

(A) represent distinctive aspects of the heritage of the United States;

(B) are worthy of recognition, conservation, interpretation, and continuing use; and

(C) would be best managed—

(i) through partnerships among public and private entities; and

(ii) by linking diverse and sometimes non-contiguous resources and active communities;

(2) reflects traditions, customs, beliefs, and folklore that are a valuable part of the story of the United States;

(3) provides outstanding opportunities—

(A) to conserve natural, historic, cultural, or scenic features; and

(B) for recreation and education;

(4) contains resources that—

(A) are important to any identified themes of the study area; and

(B) retain a degree of integrity capable of supporting interpretation;

(5) includes residents, business interests, nonprofit organizations, and State and local governments that—

(A) are involved in the planning of the Heritage Area;

(B) have developed a conceptual financial plan that outlines the roles of all participants in the Heritage Area, including the Federal Government; and

(C) have demonstrated support for the designation of the Heritage Area;

(6) has a potential management entity to work in partnership with the individuals and entities described in paragraph (5) to develop the Heritage Area while encouraging State and local economic activity;

(7) could impact the rights of private property owners with respect to private property; and

(8) has a conceptual boundary map that is supported by the public.

SEC. 4. REPORT.

Not later than 3 years after the date on which funds are first made available to carry out this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate and the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives a report that describes—

(1) the findings of the study under section 3; and

(2) any conclusions and recommendations of the Secretary.

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

S. 2989. A bill to amend title XI of the Social Security Act to clarify the mailing requirement relating to social security account statements; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I along with Finance Committee member Senator CASSIDY are introducing a bill to make a common-sense, low-cost change to the law that will help American workers help themselves when preparing for retirement: The Know Your Social Security Act. This bill is simple: it clarifies the law about Congressional intent so that every worker over 25 receives a Social Security statement in the mail each year, unless the worker has accessed their statement online or declined to receive the statement in the mail.

The history of the Social Security statement runs right through the Senate and the "powerful" Committee on Finance. Senator Daniel Patrick Moynihan summed up the intent very well: "All of us pay into Social Security but rarely, until we become beneficiaries, do we ever hear from Social Security . . . in every paycheck, we see money withheld for Social Security, but we hear nary a word from the Social Security Administration. Let us take this simple step [sending statements] to reassure Americans that Social Security will be there for them." The Social Security statement has three goals: to provide workers with information about their Social Security benefits, to help workers plan for the future, and enable workers to review their earnings records.

After enactment and once fully phased in, every worker aged 25 and older received an annual statement from Social Security starting in the year 2000. After a few years, Social Security's website allowed workers to obtain a Social Security statement online. At the time, the online option was a good step forward in customer service. But as sometime happens, advances in technology shortchanged good intentions. Due to tight budgets, SSA came to view the online option as

“providing” the worker with a statement and fulfilling their responsibilities under the law. SSA stopped mailing the statements in 2011 in order to shift resources towards other priorities. Currently, only individuals over the age of 60 who are not receiving benefits receive statements through the mail.

Paper statements delivered through the mail are desirable because no action is necessary by the worker and the statement is a yearly reminder to the worker to think about the future. Research has shown that workers provided with statements are significantly more likely to save, more certain about their retirement income, and have higher satisfaction with their finances relative to those who are not provided with any type of financial planning materials. Providing Social Security statement through the mail is a simple policy that could help many workers, hopefully leading to better decisions about their financial future.

Ways and Means Social Security Subcommittee Chairman JOHN LARSON and Ways and Means Committee Member VERN BUCHANAN are introducing the companion bill in the House of Representatives. We have received letters of endorsement from AARP, the Coalition for Paper Options, Justice in Aging, the National Committee to Preserve Social Security and Medicare, Paralyzed Veterans of America, Social Security Works, The Arc of the United States and The Senior Citizens League. I ask that the letters be included in the RECORD following my remarks.

I hope my colleagues in the Senate will join us and cosponsor the Know Your Social Security Act. Together, we can work towards better retirement outcomes for all Americans.

AARP,

Washington, DC, December 5, 2019.

Hon. RON WYDEN,
Ranking Member, Committee on Finance,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

Hon. BILL CASSIDY,
Committee on Finance,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR RANKING MEMBER WYDEN AND SENATOR CASSIDY: On behalf of our nearly 38 million members and all older Americans nationwide, AARP is pleased to endorse the Know Your Social Security Act. This bipartisan bill would once again place vital, paper Social Security statements in the hands of millions of Americans, to help them more effectively plan for retirement, identify fraud and correct earnings records, and better understand their stake in Social Security.

The Social Security statement is an essential financial planning tool that provides key information on an individual's earnings and payroll tax contributions record, as well as an estimate of their earned monthly benefits. When Social Security sends this statement through the mail, more Americans are able to better plan for their future, not only due to an increased understanding of their Social Security benefits, but also any gaps in their current retirement plan. Having a hard copy of your Social Security statement also allows an individual to spot and correct errors or even to detect outright fraud. Finding and correcting these errors in a timely manner will save workers and the Social Security Administration frustration, time and

money. Finally, when Americans receive an annual statement in the mail, it helps them better understand the importance of Social Security as part of their overall retirement plan. Paper statements are annual reminders, especially to younger workers, that they have contributed to Social Security and have earned a stake in the program.

AARP believes strongly that all Americans, unless they opt-out, should have access to their Social Security statements via mail. We are pleased to endorse the Know Your Social Security Act to once again place vital, paper statements in the hands of millions of Americans. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me, or have your staff contact Tom Nicholls on our Government Affairs staff at tnicholls@aarp.org or (202) 434-3765.

Sincerely,

CRISTINA MARTIN FIRVIDA,
Vice President, Federal Financial Security
& Consumer Affairs,
Government Affairs.

—
THE COALITION FOR PAPER OPTIONS,
Washington, DC, December 5, 2019.

Hon. JOHN LARSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Hon. VERN BUCHANAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Hon. RON WYDEN,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

Hon. BILL CASSIDY,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVES LARSON, BUCHANAN AND SENATORS WYDEN AND CASSIDY: The Coalition for Paper Options—an alliance of consumer organizations, labor unions, rural advocates, and print communications industry leaders is pleased to support today's introduction of the bipartisan Know Your Social Security Act. Introduced in both the House and Senate, the bill would require the Social Security Administration to reinstate the mailing of annual Statement of Earnings until such time as a wage earner establishes an on line account.

The annual Statement, which summarizes each wage earner's recorded earnings and projects future retirement benefits, has been hailed as one of the most important financial planning tools that most Americans will ever see, yet the Social Security Administration stopped sending these statements to workers in 2017 without any congressional oversight. A report released in February 2019 by the Social Security Administration's Inspector General highlights a tremendous decline in overall access since the primarily online-only policy took place.

The Know Your Social Security Act would reinstate the mailing of the Statements until a wage earner accesses their account through the my Social Security online portal. This would allow the Social Security Administration to economize as online participation grows, but it would not force citizens into online access before they choose or are able to manage it.

CPO's diverse network of allies includes: Consumer Action, Social Security Works, the National Consumers League, the National Grange, the National Association of Letter Carriers, as well as leading organizations in the paper and print communications industry is pleased to endorse this important legislation and offer our full support.

Regards,

JOHN RUNYAN,
Executive Director.

JUSTICE IN AGING,

Washington, DC, December 4, 2019.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVES LARSON AND BUCHANAN, AND SENATORS WYDEN AND CASSIDY: Justice in Aging endorses the bipartisan Know Your Social Security Act, which would reaffirm SSA's obligation to send Social Security statements by mail to all workers each year. This legislation would clarify SSA's duty and ensure that workers understand the Social Security benefits they are earning over time.

Many people are not fully aware of the level of Social Security benefits they could receive when they retire, nor do they realize the Social Security benefits available for themselves and their family members in the event that they experience a disability that limits their capacity to work, or in the event that they pass away leaving a spouse, young children, or other eligible survivors. The Know Your Social Security Act would provide this important information, as required, to ensure that workers know what benefits are available to them and their loved ones, allowing them to better plan for retirement as they age.

We believe it is not only SSA's obligation to send these statements, but that it is vital to the well-being of workers who need to be fully informed about their potential Social Security benefits in order to make decisions about their own working lives, and their retirement. While those who choose to get this information electronically and decline a paper statement have clearly demonstrated their awareness of the benefits they may receive in the future, others who do not make this choice should receive the statement in the mail as required under the law. For these reasons, Justice in Aging supports this bill.

Sincerely,

TRACEY GRONNIGER,
Director of Economic Security.

—
NATIONAL COMMITTEE TO PRESERVE,
SOCIAL SECURITY & MEDICARE,
Washington, DC, December 4, 2019.

Hon. JOHN B. LARSON,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Social Security,
Committee on Ways and Means, Wash-
ington, DC.

Hon. VERN BUCHANAN,
Washington, DC.

Hon. RON WYDEN,
Ranking Member, Committee on Finance,
Washington, DC.

Hon. BILL CASSIDY, M.D.,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN LARSON, CONGRESSMAN BUCHANAN, RANKING MEMBER WYDEN AND SENATOR CASSIDY: On behalf of the millions of members and supporters of the National Committee to Preserve Social Security and Medicare, I am writing to endorse your bill, the Know Your Social Security Act. This important legislation requires the Social Security Administration to resume annual mailing of Social Security statements to all of the estimated 150 million American workers who are eligible to receive them, and have not otherwise accessed them through their My SSA account.

For nearly a decade now, SSA has unilaterally nullified section 1143 of the Social Security Act by refusing to mail annual statements to workers, even though section 1143 is unambiguously clear that such statements are required. The Know Your Social Security Act clarifies that mailings are required, a measure that is deeply appreciated by our members.

The Social Security statement is one of the many enduring legacies left to the nation by one of its most distinguished lawmakers, Senator Daniel Patrick Moynihan of New York. He regarded the statement as a simple and efficient way of building public

support and understanding for Social Security. Not surprisingly, Senator Moynihan's simple, common sense amendment worked as intended while SSA was producing the statements each year. In fact, the bipartisan Social Security Advisory Board of 10 years ago found that SSA's own survey data showed "... a link between increasing public confidence and receipt of a statement. People who receive a statement not only experience higher knowledge of Social Security than non-recipients, but also exhibit greater confidence that the program still will be there for them when they need it."

The statement also raises workers' awareness of the need for retirement planning by focusing attention on their future retirement income. It brings clarity to an often confusing and perplexing subject by providing a starting point: the individual's estimated Social Security benefits, whether retirement, survivors or disability insurance. From there, workers can determine how much more they need to save for the future. Because the statements were intended to reach people early in their working lives, they provided an invaluable service.

Another important function of the Social Security statement, if it were to be delivered annually as Congress intended, would be to enable workers to determine the accuracy of the wage records maintained by SSA for each worker. As the statement indicates, workers are encouraged to review the chart showing their reported wages, comparing the amounts reflected on SSA's records with information from the worker's own records. Workers are further advised that only they can perform this function and that they should report discrepancies to SSA as soon as possible.

We have been especially concerned that, with the suspension of statements to all but those who are approaching retirement age, few workers have been able to check the accuracy of SSA's wage records. The annual statement, when it was being provided, helped to assure that if errors were made in the reporting of wages that they could be quickly discovered and corrected while the required evidence would still be readily at hand. Since SSA has suspended the statements now for nearly a decade, we are concerned that many errors in SSA's records will go undetected and that some workers' benefits will be reduced as a result.

As mentioned earlier, one function performed by annual distribution of Social Security statements was to inform workers of the kinds of benefits that are provided by Social Security. The statements focused on retirement, survivors, and disability benefits. In other words, the statements were an invaluable annual tutorial of what Social Security is all about. And knowledge about Social Security is vitally important to the successful functioning of the program. We see that reflected in recent work that finds that one reason for the seemingly inexplicable recent decline in disability applications is related to the suspension of the statements. Clearly, restoration of annual production and mailing of the annual statements, as is required in the Know Your Social Security Act, is long overdue.

When it was being mailed to all eligible workers, the Social Security statement was able to play a critical role in building and strengthening public confidence in Social Security. It provided workers with the only meaningful pre-retirement information that they ever received about the program and the benefits they could expect when they retire or otherwise qualify for benefits. SSA's decision to end annual mailings has harmed many workers. It is time for SSA to undo this harmful decision and to follow the clear, unambiguous requirements of the law to

mail statements to all eligible workers. We applaud you for your leadership in introducing the Know Your Social Security Act, and look forward to working with you to enact this important measure.

Sincerely,

MAX RICHTMAN,
President and CEO.

PARALYZED VETERANS OF AMERICA,
Washington, DC, December 5, 2019.

Hon. RON WYDEN,
Ranking Member, Senate Finance Committee,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.
Hon. BILL CASSIDY,
Senate Finance Committee,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.
Hon. JOHN LARSON,
Chairman, Ways and Means Social Security
Subcommittee, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.
Hon. VERN BUCHANAN,
Ways and Means Committee,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATORS WYDEN AND CASSIDY, CHAIRMAN LARSON AND REPRESENTATIVE BUCHANAN: Paralyzed Veterans of America (PVA) is pleased to support the Know Your Social Security Act. PVA is the nation's only Congressionally chartered veterans service organization solely dedicated to representing veterans with spinal cord injuries and/or disorders. Many of our members are among the nine million veterans who receive Social Security retirement or disability benefits. Others are among the millions of veterans and military service members and their families who will at some point in their lives benefit from the system.

For many years, the Social Security Administration (SSA) issued paper earnings and benefits statements that helped to inform people about their status under Social Security and what they might expect to receive in retirement or in the event of a catastrophic disability. When SSA suspended that practice in favor of disseminating the statements only online, it meant that people who lack internet access or who prefer not to set up an internet account lost access to that information. These Americans are then denied knowing about what they have accumulated on their earnings record, what their retirement benefits might be, what they might receive in spousal benefits, or the fact they qualify for disability or survivor benefits.

As we understand, your bill will clarify that the existing requirement in the Social Security Act for SSA to provide an annual Social Security Statement means providing this document by mail. The bill also clarifies that SSA may provide an on-demand electronic statement when an individual chooses electronic delivery. Furthermore, the bill stipulates that SSA has met its requirement to mail an annual statement if individuals have accessed their statements electronically in the prior year and have declined to receive their statements by mail for that year.

This will be a very helpful measure for millions of Americans. PVA thanks you for introducing the Know Your Social Security Act and urges Congress to do all it can to quickly pass this bipartisan legislation this year.

Sincerely,

HEATHER ANSLEY,
Associate Executive Director,
Government Relations.

SOCIAL SECURITY WORKS,
Washington, DC, December 5, 2019.

Hon. RON WYDEN,
Washington, DC.
Hon. JOHN LARSON,
Washington, DC.
Hon. BILL CASSIDY,
Washington, DC.
Hon. VERN BUCHANAN,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN WYDEN, SENATOR CASSIDY, CHAIRMAN LARSON, AND REPRESENTATIVE BUCHANAN: We strongly endorse your new legislation, the Know Your Social Security Act. Your bill clarifies the important law Congress passed in 1989 requiring the Social Security Administration (SSA) to mail Social Security earnings statements to those earning benefits with every paycheck.

When the late Senator Daniel Patrick Moynihan introduced the original earnings statement legislation in 1988, he explained one of the reasons mailing these statements is so crucial:

"All of us pay into Social Security but rarely, until we become beneficiaries, do we ever hear from Social Security . . . every month, in every paycheck, we see money withheld for Social Security, but we hear nary a word from the Social Security Administration. Let us take this simple step [mailing Social Security earnings statements] to reassure Americans that Social Security will be there for them . . ."

Social Security earnings statements help families plan for the future. The statements educate and inform working families of the kinds of benefits they are earning. Crucially, they allow workers to identify and correct their earnings records in a timely way, when mistakes are made.

Your wise legislation clarifies that these vital statements are to be mailed automatically each year. Distressingly, more and more private and public services are being shifted to individuals. This should not happen with Social Security. As technology continues to progress, there is a tendency for administrators to lean more on its capabilities and move communications with consumers and constituents online. Electronic communication is, no doubt, desired in many situations. However, the most important financial documents, including the Social Security earnings statements, should default to postal mail as intended by the original law.

That the earnings statements be mailed is vital for everyone, including those who have access to high speed computing. Of course, not everyone even has this kind of access. For example, a 2018 Pew Research Survey found that one in four Americans living in rural areas lack reliable access to high speed internet service. Other polling found that Americans, even those between ages 18 and 29, prefer not to receive important information from SSA online.

We applaud your effort to clarify the requirement that annual Social Security earnings statements be mailed. We are confident that the Know Your Social Security Act will help strengthen Social Security. We look forward to working with you to see this excellent bipartisan legislation become law quickly.

Sincerely,

NANCY J. ALTMAN,
President.
ALEX LAWSON,
Executive Director.

THE ARC,
December 4, 2019.

Representative LARSON,
Washington, DC.
Senator WYDEN,
Washington, DC.
Representative BUCHANAN,
Washington, DC.
Senator CASSIDY,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE LARSON, REPRESENTATIVE BUCHANAN, SENATOR WYDEN, AND SENATOR CASSIDY: The Arc of the United States writes in support of the Know Your Social Security Act. The Arc is the largest national community-based organization advocating for people with intellectual and developmental disabilities (I/DD) and their families.

Social Security statements are a crucial tool to help recipients plan for their future by providing accurate information about their earnings and future benefits. In addition, the statement raises awareness about all Social Security benefits, including about the Disability and Survivors Insurance that helps many people with I/DD. It also allows claimants to ensure that their earnings records are accurate.

We are concerned that recent changes that the Social Security Administration has made to only mail paper statements to a limited population means that many people are not receiving this crucial information. While the information may be available via the My Social Security website, less than half of registered users of the website checked their statements in 2018. In addition, low income households are less likely to have internet access at home and be able to access the website, despite the importance of Social Security benefits to these households; using library or other public internet sources is not advised due to the highly private nature of the information and the risk of identity theft. Without mailed statements, those households may have no access to the crucially important information about their Social Security benefits in the statement necessary to plan for their futures.

For these reasons, we strongly support the Know Your Social Security Act. Please contact Bethany Lilly at lilly@thearc.org with any questions, or if you would like to further discuss these issues.

Sincerely,

BETHANY LILLY,
Director of Income Policy.

THE SENIOR CITIZENS LEAGUE,
Alexandria, VA, December 4, 2019.

Hon. VERN BUCHANAN,
Washington, DC.
Hon. BILL CASSIDY,
Washington, DC.
Hon. JOHN LARSON,
Washington, DC.
Hon. RON WYDEN,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMEN BUCHANAN, CONGRESSMAN LARSON, SENATOR CASSIDY AND SENATOR WYDEN: On behalf of the approximately one million supporters of The Senior Citizens League (TSCl), I would like to thank you for being true champions for Social Security beneficiaries.

The Senior Citizens League lends its enthusiastic support to the "Know Your Social Security Act". Every American who pays into Social Security has a right to see a written statement from Social Security to ensure their record is accurate, and to learn the estimated amount of their benefits. A printed record is important for those who do not have the means to routinely access their record electronically and it serves as a critical planning tool for determining the best

retirement dates. Regular receipt of these statements serves to remind and educate older workers of the benefits of staying in the workforce. Doing so strengthens retirement benefits, strengthens Social Security and strengthens our national economy.

As such, TSCl salutes you for introducing legislation that clarifies that the requirement in the Social Security Act for SSA to provide an annual Social Security Statement means providing it by mail. The bill also clarifies that SSA may provide an on-demand statement electronically when the individual chooses electronic delivery for that request; and that SSA has met its requirement to mail an annual Statement if an individual has accessed their Statement electronically in the prior year and has declined to receive their Statement by mail for that year.

We look forward to informing our supporters about your leadership on this important issue in Congress. In the meantime, if we may be of assistance to you or your staff in any way, please do not hesitate to call upon us. Again, thank you for being a positive voice for America's seniors.

Sincerely,

RICK DELANEY,
Chairman.

By Mr. THUNE:

S. 2990. A bill to require that the Federal Government procure from the private sector the goods and services necessary for the operations and management of certain Government agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

MR. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 2990

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Freedom from Government Competition Act of 2019".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

- (1) Private sector business concerns, which are free to respond to the private or public demands of the marketplace, constitute the strength of the United States economic system.
- (2) Competitive private enterprises are the most productive, efficient, and effective sources of goods and services.
- (3) Unfair Government competition with the private sector of the economy is detrimental to the United States economic system.
- (4) Unfair Government competition with the private sector of the economy is at an unacceptably high level, both in scope and in dollar volume.
- (5) Current law and policy have failed to address adequately the problem of unfair Government competition with the private sector of the economy.
- (6) It is in the public interest that the Federal Government establish a consistent policy to rely on the private sector of the economy to provide goods and services necessary for or beneficial to the operation and management of Federal agencies and to avoid unfair Government competition with the private sector of the economy.

(5) Current law and policy have failed to address adequately the problem of unfair Government competition with the private sector of the economy.

(6) It is in the public interest that the Federal Government establish a consistent policy to rely on the private sector of the economy to provide goods and services necessary for or beneficial to the operation and management of Federal agencies and to avoid unfair Government competition with the private sector of the economy.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act, the term "agency" means—

(1) an executive department as defined by section 101 of title 5, United States Code;

(2) a military department as defined by section 102 of such title; and

(3) an independent establishment as defined by section 104(l) of such title.

SEC. 4. PROCUREMENT FROM PRIVATE SOURCES.

(a) POLICY.—In the process of governing, the Federal Government should not compete with its citizens. The competitive enterprise system, characterized by individual freedom and initiative, is the primary source of national economic strength. In recognition of this principle, it has been and continues to be the general policy of the Federal Government—

(1) to rely on commercial sources to supply the products and services the Government needs;

(2) to refrain from providing a product or service if the product or service can be procured more economically from a commercial source; and

(3) to utilize Federal employees to perform inherently governmental functions (as that term is defined in section 5 of the Federal Activities Inventory Reform Act of 1998 (Public Law 105-270; 112 Stat. 2384)).

(b) GENERAL RULE.—Except as provided in subsection (c) and notwithstanding any other provision of law, each agency shall obtain all goods and services necessary for or beneficial to the accomplishment of its authorized functions by procurement from private sources.

(c) EXEMPTIONS.—Subsection (b) shall not apply to an agency with respect to goods or services if—

(1) the goods or services are required by law to be produced or performed, respectively, by the agency; or

(2) the head of the agency determines and certifies to Congress in accordance with regulations promulgated by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget that—

(A) Federal Government production, manufacture, or provision of a good or service is necessary for the national defense or homeland security;

(B) a good or service is so critical to the mission of the agency or so inherently governmental in nature that it is in the public interest to require production or performance, respectively, by Government employees; or

(C) there is no private source capable of providing the good or service.

(d) METHOD OF PROCUREMENT.—The provision of goods and services not exempt under subsection (c) shall be performed by an entity in the private sector through—

(1) the divestiture of Federal involvement in the provision of a good or service;

(2) the award of a contract to an entity in the private sector, using competitive procedures, as defined in section 152 of title 41, United States Code, and section 2302 of title 10, United States Code; or

(3) conducting a public-private competitive sourcing analysis in accordance with the procedures established by the Office of Management and Budget and determining that using the assets, facilities, and performance of the private sector is in the best interest of the United States and that production or performance, respectively, by the private sector provides the best value to the taxpayer.

(e) CONTRACTED ACTIVITIES.—The head of an agency may utilize Federal employees to provide goods or services previously provided by an entity in the private sector upon completion of a public-private competitive sourcing analysis described in subsection (d)(3), and after making a determination that the provision of such goods or services by Federal employees provides the best value to the taxpayer.

(f) REGULATIONS.—The Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall promulgate such regulations as the Director considers necessary to carry out this section. In promulgating such regulations, the Director shall assure that any State or territory, or political subdivision of a State or territory, complies with the policy and implements the requirements of this section when expending Federal funds.

SEC. 5. STUDY AND REPORT.

The Director of the Office of Management and Budget, after consultation with the Comptroller General of the United States, shall carry out a study to evaluate the activities carried out in each agency, including those identified as commercial and inherently governmental in nature in the inventory prepared pursuant to the Federal Activities Inventory Reform Act of 1998 (Public Law 105-270; 31 U.S.C. 501 note) and shall transmit a report to the Congress prior to June 30 of each year. The report shall include—

- (1) an evaluation of the justification for exempting activities pursuant to section 4(c); and
- (2) a schedule for the transfer of commercial activities to the private sector, pursuant to section 4(d), to be completed within 5 years after the date on which such report is transmitted to the Congress.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 1255. Mr. SCOTT, of South Carolina (for Mr. ALEXANDER (for himself, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mr. JONES, Mr. BURR, and Mr. COONS)) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 2486, to reauthorize mandatory funding programs for historically Black colleges and universities and other minority-serving institutions.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 1255. Mr. SCOTT, of South Carolina (for Mr. ALEXANDER (for himself, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mr. JONES, Mr. BURR, and Mr. COONS)) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 2486, to reauthorize mandatory funding programs for historically Black colleges and universities and other minority-serving institutions; as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; REFERENCES.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the “Fostering Undergraduate Talent by Unlocking Resources for Education Act” or the “FUTURE Act”.

(b) REFERENCES.—Except as otherwise expressly provided, whenever in this Act an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.).

SEC. 2. CONTINUED SUPPORT FOR MINORITY-SERVING INSTITUTIONS.

Section 371(b)(1)(A) (20 U.S.C. 1067q(b)(1)(A)) is amended by striking “for each of the fiscal years 2008 through 2019.” and all that follows through the end of the subparagraph and inserting “for fiscal year 2020 and each fiscal year thereafter.”.

SEC. 3. SECURE DISCLOSURE OF TAX-RETURN INFORMATION TO CARRY OUT THE HIGHER EDUCATION ACT OF 1965.

(a) AMENDMENTS TO THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1986.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (13) of section 6103(l) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended to read as follows:

“(13) DISCLOSURE OF RETURN INFORMATION TO CARRY OUT THE HIGHER EDUCATION ACT OF 1965.—

“(A) INCOME-CONTINGENT OR INCOME-BASED REPAYMENT AND TOTAL AND PERMANENT DISABILITY DISCHARGE.—The Secretary shall, upon written request from the Secretary of Education, disclose to officers, employees, and contractors of the Department of Education, as specifically authorized and designated by the Secretary of Education, only for the purpose of (and to the extent necessary in) establishing enrollment, renewing enrollment, administering, and conducting analyses and forecasts for estimating costs related to income-contingent or income-based repayment programs, and the discharge of loans based on a total and permanent disability (within the meaning of section 437(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965), under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965, the following return information (as defined in subsection (b)(2)) with respect to taxpayers identified by the Secretary of Education as participating in the loan programs under title IV of such Act, for taxable years specified by such Secretary:

“(i) Taxpayer identity information with respect to such taxpayer.

“(ii) The filing status of such taxpayer.

“(iii) The adjusted gross income of such taxpayer.

“(iv) Total number of exemptions claimed, or total number of individuals and dependents claimed, as applicable, on the return.

“(v) Number of children with respect to which tax credits under section 24 are claimed on the return.

“(B) FEDERAL STUDENT FINANCIAL AID.—The Secretary shall, upon written request from the Secretary of Education, disclose to officers, employees, and contractors of the Department of Education, as specifically authorized and designated by the Secretary of Education, only for the purpose of (and to the extent necessary in) determining eligibility for, and amount of, Federal student financial aid under programs authorized by parts A, C, and D of title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (as in effect on the date of the enactment of the Fostering Undergraduate Talent by Unlocking Resources for Education Act) and conducting analyses and forecasts for estimating costs related to such programs, the following return information (as defined in subsection (b)(2)) with respect to taxpayers identified by the Secretary of Education as applicants for Federal student financial aid under such parts of title IV of such Act, for taxable years specified by such Secretary:

“(i) Taxpayer identity information with respect to such taxpayer.

“(ii) The filing status of such taxpayer.

“(iii) The adjusted gross income of such taxpayer.

“(iv) The amount of any net earnings from self-employment (as defined in section 1402), wages (as defined in section 3121(a) or 3401(a)), taxable income from a farming business (as defined in section 236A(e)(4)), and investment income for the period reported on the return.

“(v) The total income tax of such taxpayer.

“(vi) Total number of exemptions claimed, or total number of individuals and dependents claimed, as applicable, on the return.

“(vii) Number of children with respect to which tax credits under section 24 are claimed on the return.

“(viii) Amount of any credit claimed under section 25A for the taxable year.

“(ix) Amount of individual retirement account distributions not included in adjusted gross income for the taxable year.

“(x) Amount of individual retirement account contributions and payments to self-employed SEP, Keogh, and other qualified plans which were deducted from income for the taxable year.

“(xi) The amount of tax-exempt interest.

“(xii) Amounts from retirement pensions and annuities not included in adjusted gross income for the taxable year.

“(xiii) If applicable, the fact that any of the following schedules (or equivalent successor schedules) were filed with the return:

“(I) Schedule A.

“(II) Schedule B.

“(III) Schedule D.

“(IV) Schedule E.

“(V) Schedule F.

“(VI) Schedule H.

“(xiv) If applicable, the fact that Schedule C (or an equivalent successor schedule) was filed with the return showing a gain or loss greater than \$10,000.

“(xv) If applicable, the fact that there is no return filed for such taxpayer for the applicable year.

“(C) RESTRICTION ON USE OF DISCLOSED INFORMATION.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Return information disclosed under subparagraphs (A) and (B) may be used by officers, employees, and contractors of the Department of Education, as specifically authorized and designated by the Secretary of Education, only for the purposes and to the extent necessary described in such subparagraphs and for mitigating risks (as defined in clause (ii)) relating to the programs described in such subparagraphs.

“(ii) MITIGATING RISKS.—For purposes of this subparagraph, the term ‘mitigating risks’ means, with respect to the programs described in subparagraphs (A) and (B),

“(I) oversight activities by the Office of Inspector General of the Department of Education as authorized by the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, and

“(II) reducing the net cost of improper payments to Federal financial aid recipients. Such term does not include the conduct of criminal investigations or prosecutions.

“(iii) REDISCLOSURE TO INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION, STATE HIGHER EDUCATION AGENCIES, AND DESIGNATED SCHOLARSHIP ORGANIZATIONS.—The Secretary of Education, and officers, employees, and contractors of the Department of Education, may disclose return information received under subparagraph (B), solely for the use in the application, award, and administration of student financial aid or aid awarded by such entities as the Secretary of Education may designate, to the following persons:

“(I) An institution of higher education with which the Secretary of Education has an agreement under subpart 1 of part A, part C, or part D of title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965.

“(II) A State higher education agency.

“(III) A scholarship organization which is designated by the Secretary of Education as of the date of the enactment of the Fostering Undergraduate Talent by Unlocking Resources for Education Act as an organization eligible to receive the information provided under this clause.

The preceding sentence shall only apply to the extent that the taxpayer with respect to whom the return information relates provides consent for such disclosure to the Secretary of Education as part of the application for Federal student financial aid under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965.

“(D) REQUIREMENT OF NOTIFICATION OF REQUEST FOR TAX RETURN INFORMATION.—Subparagraphs (A) and (B) shall apply to any disclosure of return information with respect

to a taxpayer only if the Secretary of Education has provided to such taxpayer the notification required by section 494 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 prior to such disclosure.”.

(2) **CONFIDENTIALITY OF RETURN INFORMATION.**—Section 6103(a)(3) of such Code is amended by inserting “, (13)(A), (13)(B)” after “(12)”.

(3) **CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.**—Section 6103(p)(4) of such Code is amended—

(A) by inserting “(A), (13)(B)” after “(13)” each place it occurs, and

(B) by inserting “, (13)(A), (13)(B)” after “(1)(10)” each place it occurs.

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by this section shall apply to disclosures made under section 6103(1)(13) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (as amended by this section) after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 4. NOTIFICATION OF REQUEST FOR TAX RETURN INFORMATION.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Part G of title IV (20 U.S.C. 1088 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 494. NOTIFICATION OF REQUEST FOR TAX RETURN INFORMATION.

“The Secretary shall advise students and borrowers who submit an application for Federal student financial aid under this title or for the discharge of a loan based on permanent and total disability, as described in section 437(a), or who request an income-contingent or income-based repayment plan on their loan (as well as parents and spouses who sign such an application or request or a Master Promissory Note on behalf of those students and borrowers) that the Secretary has the authority to request that the Internal Revenue Service disclose their tax return information (as well as that of parents and spouses who sign such an application or request or a Master Promissory Note on behalf of those students and borrowers) to officers, employees, and contractors of the Department of Education as authorized under section 6103(1)(13) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, to the extent necessary for the Secretary to carry out this title.”.

(b) **CONFORMING AMENDMENT.**—Section 484(q) (20 U.S.C. 1091(q)) is amended to read as follows:

“(q) reserved”.

SEC. 5. INCREASED FUNDING FOR FEDERAL PELL GRANTS.

Section 401(b)(7)(A)(iv) (20 U.S.C. 1070a(b)(7)(A)(iv)) is amended—

(1) in subclause (X), by striking “\$1,430,000,000” and inserting “\$1,455,000,000”; and

(2) in subclause (XI), by striking “\$1,145,000,000” and insert “\$1,170,000,000”.

SEC. 6. REPORTS ON IMPLEMENTATION.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than each specified date, the Secretary of Education and the Secretary of the Treasury shall issue joint reports to the Committees on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions and Finance of the Senate and the Committees on Education and Labor and Ways and Means of the House of Representatives regarding the amendments made by this Act. Each such report shall include, as applicable—

(1) an update on the status of implementation of the amendments made by this Act,

(2) an evaluation of the processing of applications for Federal student financial aid, and applications for income-based repayment and income contingent repayment, under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1070 et seq.), in accordance with the amendments made by this Act, and

(3) implementation issues and suggestions for potential improvements.

(b) **SPECIFIED DATE.**—For purposes of subsection (a), the term “specified date” means—

(1) the date that is 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act,

(2) the date that is 120 days after the first day that the disclosure process established under section 6103(1)(13) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended by section 3(a) of this Act, is operational and accessible to officers, employees, and contractors of the Department of Education (as specifically authorized and designated by the Secretary of Education), and

(3) the date that is 1 year after the report date described in paragraph (2).

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I have 5 requests for committees to meet during today's session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today's session of the Senate:

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

The Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, December 5, 2019, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, December 5, 2019, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, December 5, 2019, at 2 p.m., to conduct a closed hearing.

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

The Subcommittee on Communication, Technology, Innovation, and the Internet of the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, December 5, 2019, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON WESTERN HEMISPHERE, TRANSNATIONAL CRIME, CIVILIAN SECURITY, DEMOCRACY, HUMAN RIGHTS, AND GLOBAL WOMEN'S ISSUES

The Subcommittee on Western Hemisphere, Transnational Crime, Civilian Security, Democracy, Human Rights, and Global Women's Issues of the Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, December 5, 2019, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Angel Ventling, a State Department fellow in my office, be granted floor privileges for the remainder of the day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MERRILL'S MARAUDERS CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL ACT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs be discharged from further consideration of S. 743 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the bill by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 743) to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the soldiers of the 5307th Composite Unit (Provisional), commonly known as “Merrill's Marauders”, in recognition of their bravery and outstanding service in the jungles of Burma during World War II.

There being no objection, the committee was discharged and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 743) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed as follows:

S. 743

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Merrill's Marauders Congressional Gold Medal Act”.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) in August 1943, President Franklin D. Roosevelt and other Allied leaders proposed the creation of a ground unit of the Armed Forces that would engage in a “long-range penetration mission” in Japanese-occupied Burma to—

(A) cut off Japanese communications and supply lines; and

(B) capture the town of Myitkyina and the Myitkyina airstrip, both of which were held by the Japanese;

(2) President Roosevelt issued a call for volunteers for “a dangerous and hazardous mission” and the call was answered by approximately 3,000 soldiers from the United States;

(3) the Army unit composed of the soldiers described in paragraph (2)—

(A) was officially designated as the “5307th Composite Unit (Provisional)” with the code name “Galahad”; and

(B) later became known as “Merrill's Marauders” (referred to in this section as the “Marauders”) in reference to its leader, Brigadier General Frank Merrill;

(4) in February 1944, the Marauders began their approximately 1,000-mile trek through the dense Burmese jungle with no artillery support, carrying their supplies on their backs or the pack saddles of mules;

(5) over the course of their 5-month trek to Myitkyina, the Marauders fought victoriously against larger Japanese forces through 5 major and 30 minor engagements;

(6) during their march to Myitkyina, the Marauders faced hunger and disease that were exacerbated by inadequate aerial resupply drops;

(7) malaria, typhus, and dysentery inflicted more casualties on the Marauders than the Japanese;

(8) by August 1944, the Marauders had accomplished their mission, successfully disrupting Japanese supply and communication lines and taking the town of Myitkyina and the Myitkyina airstrip, the only all-weather airstrip in Northern Burma;

(9) after taking Myitkyina, only 130 Marauders out of the original 2,750 were fit for duty and all remaining Marauders still in action were evacuated to hospitals due to tropical diseases, exhaustion, and malnutrition;

(10) for their bravery and accomplishments, the Marauders were awarded the "Distinguished Unit Citation", later redesignated as the "Presidential Unit Citation", and a Bronze Star; and

(11) though the Marauders were operational for only a few months, the legacy of their bravery is honored by the Army through the modern day 75th Ranger Regiment, which traces its lineage directly to the 5307th Composite Unit.

SEC. 3. CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL.

(a) AWARD AUTHORIZED.—The Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President pro tempore of the Senate shall make appropriate arrangements for the award, on behalf of Congress, of a single gold medal of appropriate design to the soldiers of the 5307th Composite Unit (Provisional) (referred to in this section as "Merrill's Marauders"), in recognition of their bravery and outstanding service in the jungles of Burma during World War II.

(b) DESIGN AND STRIKING.—For the purposes of the award referred to in subsection (a), the Secretary of the Treasury (referred to in this Act as the "Secretary") shall strike a gold medal with suitable emblems, devices, and inscriptions, to be determined by the Secretary.

(c) SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Following the award of the gold medal referred to in subsection (a) in honor of Merrill's Marauders, the gold medal shall be given to the Smithsonian Institution, where it shall be displayed as appropriate and made available for research.

(2) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the Smithsonian Institution should make the gold medal received under paragraph (1) available for display elsewhere, particularly at other locations and events associated with Merrill's Marauders.

SEC. 4. DUPLICATE MEDALS.

Under such regulations as the Secretary may prescribe, the Secretary may strike and sell duplicates in bronze of the gold medal struck under section 3, at a price sufficient to cover the costs of the medals, including labor, materials, dies, use of machinery, and overhead expenses.

SEC. 5. STATUS OF MEDALS.

Medals struck pursuant to this Act are national medals for purposes of chapter 51 of title 31, United States Code.

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, DECEMBER 9, 2019

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 3 p.m., Monday, December 9; further, that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed; further, that following leader

remarks, the Senate proceed to executive session and resume consideration of the Bumatay nomination; and finally, that the cloture motions filed during today's session ripen at 5:30 p.m. on Monday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY, DECEMBER 9, 2019, AT 3 P.M.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 3:57 p.m., adjourned until Monday, December 9, 2019, at 3 p.m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 5, 2019:

UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE

ROBERT M. DUNCAN, OF KENTUCKY, TO BE A GOVERNOR OF THE UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE FOR A TERM EXPIRING DECEMBER 8, 2025.

THE JUDICIARY

RICHARD ERNEST MYERS II, OF NORTH CAROLINA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA.

SHERRI A. LYDON, OF SOUTH CAROLINA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

TRIBUTE FOR MOHAMMED CHOWDHURY

HON. MAX ROSE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 5, 2019

Mr. ROSE of New York. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Mohammed K. Chowdhury, a Staten Island resident. Mr. Chowdhury is an activist, community organizer, and civil servant who has spent his life fighting to make the world a better place.

Mr. Chowdhury was born in rural Bangladesh. Beginning as a college student, he fought to better the lives of rural Bangladeshis in a whole host of areas, including education, infrastructure, healthcare, and communications. He also pushed for democratic reforms, fighting against autocratic government and ensuring that everyone would have the right to vote.

Upon moving to the United States, Mr. Chowdhury did not stop trying to better his communities. He has served as a civil servant in both the New York City and New York State systems. In both jobs, he was an active union member. He currently serves as the Council Leader for the New York State Public Employees Federation (PEF) Division 349.

Mr. Chowdhury has consistently fought on behalf of Staten Island's South Asian community. In 2015, he became the Staten Island Chapter Secretary of the Alliance of South Asian American Labor (ASAAL) in 2015. By 2016, he had risen to become the National Secretary of the ASAAL. Under his leadership, ASAAL has grown to include 12 chapters across five states.

Mr. Chowdhury's work to raise the voice for the voiceless and build coalitions between labor and community organizations should serve as an example to all of us. With a vision for the future, a desire to bring people together, and a tenacious work ethic, we truly can enact change.

So, Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues in the House to join me in honoring Mohammed Chowdhury's work to make communities across the world, from Staten Island to rural Bangladesh, a better place.

CELEBRATING TELEGRAM NEWSPAPER'S 75 YEARS OF LOCAL JOURNALISM

HON. RASHIDA TLAIB

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 5, 2019

Ms. TLAIB. Madam Speaker, I rise today in tribute to the Telegram Newspaper, a local paper serving the Wayne County communities of Detroit, Ecorse, and River Rouge.

Founded in 1944, the Telegram is a multi-cultural community newspaper that is distributed weekly with the goal of connecting citi-

zens within the region by publishing information that educates, enlightens, uplifts and empowers its readers. The Telegram has been in continuous publication since its inception and continues to be unique in its approach to providing news the community turns to for local, state and national information.

We are especially proud of the Telegram's legacy as an African American-owned and run business and its outstanding commitment to the communities it serves. Their staff has developed partnerships with local schools, businesses, non-profit organizations, and city governments. They also participate in volunteer opportunities and provide media sponsorships for community events. The Telegram is helping to prepare the next generation of media personnel by establishing internship programs with local colleges & high schools. They expose youth to newspapers through the Newspapers in Education Program and Write Steps Internship Program.

Please join me in saluting publisher Gina Steward and the Telegram Newspaper for seventy-five years of local reporting.

IN MEMORY OF MR. LARRY N. WOFFORD

HON. SANFORD D. BISHOP, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 5, 2019

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Madam Speaker, it is with a heavy heart and solemn remembrance that I rise to pay tribute to a great man and dear friend of longstanding, Mr. Larry N. Wofford. Larry passed away on Tuesday, December 3, 2019, and a funeral service will be held on Saturday, December 7, 2019, at 11:00 a.m. at the Chapel of Vance Brooks Funeral Home in Phenix City, Alabama.

A native son of Columbus, Georgia, Larry was born on August 1, 1944, to the union of the late Claude Newton Wofford and Zola Coker Wofford. He was retired from AT&T where he faithfully worked for over 47 years. During his distinguished career, he served as President, Communication Workers of America (CWA) Local No. 3212 for over 38 years; President, CWA Retirees for over five years; member of five Bargaining Committees; member of Telephone Pioneers of America; President, Chattahoochee Valley Labor Council for four years; and was actively involved with the Georgia Sheriff's Youth Homes in LaGrange, Georgia for over 25 years. Former Congresswoman Shirley Chisholm once said that "Service is the rent that we pay for the space that we occupy here on this earth." Larry paid his rent and he paid it well!

He will be remembered for his insightful and optimistic spirit, his passion for helping others, and his immense love for his family. He leaves behind a great legacy in how life should be lived and warm cherished memories in the lives of those who knew him.

While he was preceded in death by his parents, he is survived by his loving wife, Sue,

and a host of family, friends, and colleagues in the labor movement, who will miss him dearly. On a personal note, I am proud to have called Larry my friend. He was always encouraging and supportive of my career in the Georgia General Assembly and in the United States Congress and I will be forever grateful for his friendship, advice, and counsel over the years.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me, along with my wife, Vivian; and the more than 730,000 residents of Georgia's Second Congressional District in saluting Mr. Larry N. Wofford for his lifelong dedication to serving working men and women and humankind in general. I would also like to ask my colleagues in the House to join us in extending our deepest sympathies to Larry's family, friends, and loved ones during this difficult time. We pray that they will be consoled and comforted by an abiding faith and the Holy Spirit in the days, weeks, and months ahead.

RETIREMENT OF MS. PAULA KOCHER BARNES

HON. JOHN LEWIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 5, 2019

Mr. LEWIS. Madam Speaker, today, I rise to recognize Ms. Paula Kocher Barnes on her retirement from the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) and for her decades of public service.

For over 40 years, Ms. Barnes served our country—most recently as deputy associate general counsel for the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) in the Office of the General Counsel located in Georgia's Fifth Congressional District.

It took some time for Ms. Barnes to make her way to our wonderful city. A native daughter of Iowa, Ms. Barnes completed her undergraduate degree at Coe College in Cedar Rapids. She continued her studies at Emory University's School of Law, where I believe Metro Atlanta infused her spirit. Ms. Barnes began a career in federal service at the Department of Education in 1980 and joined the HHS Office of the General Counsel in the Region IV Atlanta Office a couple of years later.

After five years in the regional office, Ms. Barnes transitioned to the CDC's Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR), where she continued her federal career for the next 32 years. During her tenure with the ATSDR, Ms. Barnes served on the front lines of implementing policy at the intersection of environment and health policy, an issue that is near and dear to my heart. As an attorney-advisor, Ms. Barnes worked to implement the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act, a monumental bill which became public law the same year that I was elected to Congress.

As a senior attorney, Ms. Barnes continued this important effort by providing key counsel

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

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

for interagency initiatives and memoranda on environmental health policy. In January 2014, the Centers for Disease Control promoted Ms. Barnes to the prominent position of deputy associate general counsel for the CDC/ATSDR Branch. Over the years, she contributed to litigation efforts regarding the Agent Orange exposure studies, the Federal Advisory Committee Act-National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH) Diesel Study, Freedom of Information Act, ATSDR cost recovery, and the precedential Hanford Downwinders case.

Ms. Barnes also managed to find the time to advance scholarship and policy in her professional field by contributing to numerous publications, including two prominent public health law textbooks and several articles. In addition, she served as an adjunct professor at Georgia State University's and Emory University's law schools and as a guest lecturer at Duke University.

During her esteemed career, Ms. Barnes played a critical role in several significant public health activities and events, including emergency responses to the September 11th tragedy, anthrax threats, Ebola Virus, Zika, and several major natural disasters. Our nation and the global family are forever grateful for Ms. Barnes and so many other CDC employees who help keep us safe, healthy, and alive.

Today, I would like to thank Ms. Barnes for her 41 years of federal service, for her dedication to public health, public service, and education. As she prepares for a well-deserved retirement, I wish Ms. Barnes the very best as she embarks upon this next chapter.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JOE CUNNINGHAM

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 5, 2019

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Madam Speaker, on December 3–4, 2019, I was absent from the House chamber. I remained in my district in South Carolina to attend to a family matter. Accordingly, I was unable to vote on five legislative measures on the floor.

Had I been present and voting, I would have voted as follows:

Aye on Roll Call No. 643: H. Res. 546, On Motion to Suspend the Rules and Agree, Disapproving the Russian Federations inclusion in future Group of Seven summits until it respects the territorial integrity of its neighbors and adheres to the standards of democratic societies.

Aye on Roll Call No. 644 S. 178, On Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass, as Amended, Uighur Intervention and Global Humanitarian Unified Response Act.

Aye on Roll Call No. 645: H. Res. 739, On Motion Ordering the Previous Question on the Rule providing for consideration of H.R. 2534, the Insider Trading Prohibition Act.

Aye on Roll Call No. 646: H. Res. 739, On Agreeing to the Rule providing for consideration of H.R. 2534, the Insider Trading Prohibition Act.

Aye on Roll Call No. 647: S. 151, On Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass, as Amended, Pallone-Thune Telephone Robocall Abuse Criminal Enforcement and Deterrence Act.

HONORING THE SERVICE OF
WHITNEY DOTSON

HON. MARK DeSAULNIER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 5, 2019

Mr. DeSAULNIER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the service of long-time community advocate, Whitney Dotson.

Whitney Dotson's commitment to the good of his community is demonstrated by his career with the East Bay Regional Park District. Beginning as an appointed member of the Park District Advisory Committee, he later was elected to the Board of Directors where he worked on his passion for parks and health.

During his many years on the Board of Directors, Whitney has supported several significant projects, including the Atlas Road Bridge at Point Pinole, restoration of Albany Beach, and preservation of the North Richmond Shoreline. He also supported the completion of two Bay Trails, one between Pinole Shores and Bayfront Park and the other between Berkeley and Albany. Director Dotson fought to prevent commercial and residential development of the Breuner Marsh at Point Pinole, which was renamed the Dotson Family Marsh. Through this project, Director Dotson was able to continue the work of his father, Reverend Richard Dotson, to keep the marsh a natural place for everyone in the community to enjoy. Director Dotson has been described by his colleagues as tirelessly pursuing environmental protections in his community.

Director Dotson's service extends beyond his work with the East Bay Regional Park District. He is the president of the North Richmond Shoreline Open Space Alliance, Associate Director of the Neighborhood House of North Richmond, and Vice Chair of the Community Advisory Group. Throughout his tenure with the East Bay Regional Park District and through his philanthropic work, Director Dotson has fought to preserve open space and ensure a clean and healthy environment for generations to come.

Director Dotson departs the East Bay Regional Park District with a legacy of championing the environmental well-being of his community. We wish him great luck and joy in retirement.

IN HONOR OF LADY LIBERTY DAY

HON. LANCE GOODEN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 5, 2019

Mr. GOODEN. Madam Speaker, the following Proclamation is in honor of Lady Liberty Day:

Whereas, in 1986, the City started planning, a pavilion that would showcase three flag poles—one for the American flag, the State flag and initially the Texas Sesquicentennial flag; and

Whereas, the pavilion was to provide a base structure for the placement of the Lady Liberty statue and to light flag poles at night; and

Whereas, on December 7, 1986, with a deep sense of pride in our state's heritage, Forney held its Sesquicentennial Flag Dedication ceremony commemorating a new City landmark and gateway to the City; and

Whereas, due to highway reconfiguration and construction, the monument and flag poles had to be taken down until they could be placed in a new location; and

Whereas, today, 33 years later, the City is proud to be able to re-dedicate the redesigned and rebuilt Lady Liberty Monument, bringing back a much-loved City landmark and gateway to the City; therefore, be it

Resolved, I, Lance Gooden, representative of the 5th District of Texas, do hereby recognize the 7th day of December 2019, as Lady Liberty Day.

RECOGNIZING ILLINOIS STATE
TROOPER TODD HANNEKEN OF
ILLINOIS STATE POLICE DISTRICT 10

HON. JOHN SHIMKUS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 5, 2019

Mr. SHIMKUS. Madam Speaker, I rise to recognize Illinois State Trooper Todd Hanneken for his heroic service on May 8, 2018. On that day Trooper Todd Hanneken was on the scene of a previous accident on the northbound lane of Interstate 57 when suddenly a semi-truck slammed into the last vehicle in line. The vehicle, driven by Andrew Bergan, burst into flames as it was thrust forward into the car in front of it. When Mr. Bergan's truck came to rest, the cab was engulfed in flames and its doors were blocked. As others attempted to keep the fire at bay, Trooper Hanneken kicked out the windshield and, with the help of two others, pulled Mr. Bergan to safety. The quick response saved Mr. Bergan's life.

In recognition of Trooper Hanneken's actions that day, he was awarded the Medal of Honor on October 30, 2019. This honor is awarded to Illinois State Police personnel who "perform a heroic act that by its nature results in saving a life, preventing a serious crime or apprehending a person who committed a serious crime." Since the events of May 8, 2018, Trooper Hanneken has called Mr. Bergan several times, visited the hospital and met with his parents, while Mr. Bergan was present for the awarding of the Medal of Honor.

Madam Speaker, it is with great pleasure I stand to recognize Trooper Todd Hanneken for his heroism. His dedication to duty and to his fellow man is an inspiration to us all. I wish him the very best, along with all of the survivors of the crash that day.

TRIBUTE TO YOUNG STAFF MEMBERS FOR THEIR CONTRIBUTIONS ON BEHALF OF THE PEOPLE OF THE 18TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF TEXAS AND THE UNITED STATES

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 5, 2019

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, as Members of Congress we know well, perhaps better than most, how blessed our nation is to have in reserve such exceptional young men

and women who will go on to become leaders in their local communities, states, and the nation in the areas of business, education, law, government, philanthropy, the arts and culture, and the military.

We know this because we see them and benefit from their contributions every day. Many of them work for us in our offices as junior staff members, congressional fellows, or interns and they do amazing work for and on behalf of the constituents we are privileged to represent.

Madam Speaker, I believe there is no higher calling than the call to serve a cause larger than ourselves. That is why I ran for public office. I was inspired to serve by President Kennedy who said, "Ask not what your country can do for you, ask what you can do for your country," and by the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. who said:

"Everybody can be great because anybody can serve. . . . You only need a heart full of grace. A soul generated by love."

By this measure, there are several other great young men and women who served as volunteers this year in my offices. They may toil in obscurity but their contributions to the constituents we serve are deeply appreciated. That is why today I rise to pay tribute to three extraordinary young persons for their service to my constituents in the 18th Congressional District of Texas and to the American people. They are: Sheerine Karamzadeh, Texas Tech University; Elisabeth Foster, University of Texas; and Alejandro Izaguirre, St. Edward's University.

Madam Speaker, the energy, intelligence, and idealism these wonderful young people brought to my office and those interning in the offices of my colleagues help keep our democracy vibrant. The insights, skills, and knowledge of the governmental process they gain from their experiences will last a lifetime and prove invaluable to them as they go about making their mark in this world.

Because of persons like them the future of our country is bright, and its best days lie ahead. I wish them all well.

Madam Speaker, I am grateful that such thoughtful committed young men and women can be found working in my office, those of my colleagues, and in every community in America. Their good works will keep America great, good, and forever young.

CELEBRATING THE 80TH BIRTHDAY OF JEAN WEST

HON. RASHIDA TLAIB

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 5, 2019

Ms. TLAIB. Madam Speaker, I rise today in honor of Ms. Jean West, a long-time resident of Detroit, Michigan, who will celebrate her eightieth birthday on December 11, 2019.

Ms. West has always been an engaged and active member of her community. She draws her strength from her family and community. As the matriarch of her family, she has always strived to uphold values that reflect strength, dedication and community and serves as a role model for her children and loved ones. Her strong family values are reflected in the life she leads and her willingness to always do for others.

Ms. West has never shied away from standing up for what she believes in. As an advocate, she doggedly pursues better for her community. She has remained active in the fight for civil rights, working with organizations like the NAACP to ensure equity for people of color and for her community. She continues to fight for a better community. Whether it's advocating for resources or uplifting her neighbors, it is clear that she believes in the good of people and future of Detroit.

Please join me in wishing Ms. Jean West the happiest of birthdays.

CELEBRATING THE 100TH BIRTHDAY OF HATSUKO "SUSIE" KUSAKA

HON. J. LUIS CORREA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 5, 2019

Mr. CORREA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the 100th birthday of Hatsuko "Susie" Kusaka from the City of Anaheim, California.

Born on November 14, 1919 in Rexburg, Idaho, Mrs. Kusaka has lived a rich life: raising a family, tending to crops of potatoes and strawberries, and caring for guests at the Disneyland Hotel.

Susie spent most of her childhood in Southern California and Japan. After marrying Shuichi Kusaka, she moved to Idaho Falls, Idaho, where she and her husband ran a potato farm. During that time, their four children—Warren, Alice, Ted, and Naomi—were born.

In 1953, the family moved to California, settling in Anaheim, where they made a living as strawberry farmers.

In 1978, at age 59, Susie began a second career with Disneyland Hotel. In 1987, she was named national "Room Keeper of the Year" by the American Hotel Association. She retired in 2009 after 22 years of hard work and dedication. In June of 2016, she moved into Walnut Village Retirement Community in Anaheim.

Along with enjoying her community's many amenities, she delights in visits from her family members, including her grandson, Brian, and a granddaughter-in-law, Katharine.

Please join me in wishing my constituent, Susie Hatsuko a happy 100th birthday and many more years of good health and happiness.

RECOGNIZING JOHN DITSLEAR

HON. SUSAN W. BROOKS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 5, 2019

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize John Ditslear on his retirement from the Office of Mayor of Noblesville, Indiana. A well-respected public servant, Mayor Ditslear's career has been defined by his steadfast leadership of Noblesville. His many decades of public service in a number of different roles has greatly impacted the community and its citizens.

A native son of Dublin, Ohio, Mayor Ditslear graduated from my alma mater, Miami Univer-

sity in Oxford, Ohio, with a degree in finance. After graduation, Mayor Ditslear chose to serve his country by joining the United States Navy. Serving in the early 1960s, at a time of tumultuous international relations, Mayor Ditslear and his fellow sailors were tasked with transporting their Marine and Army counterparts to active theaters in Vietnam. During this time in the United States Navy, Mayor Ditslear rose to the rank of lieutenant while developing his leadership and situational management skills.

After completing his naval service, Mayor Ditslear moved to Noblesville in 1966, where he invested a great deal of time in his community as a volunteer. He served as a board member for many community organizations including the Chamber of Commerce, Noblesville Boys & Girls Club, Riverview Hospital Foundation, Hamilton East Public Library and the United Way of Hamilton County. Ever the leader, Mayor Ditslear is also a past president of the Indiana Association of Cities and Towns, the Noblesville Redevelopment Commission, the Life Underwriter's Association and the Indianapolis chapter of Chartered Life Underwriters. It is clear that Mayor Ditslear's service to the citizens of Noblesville has reached far beyond his time in public office.

After his service in the Navy, Mayor Ditslear entered into the business world joining the American United Life Insurance Company in Indianapolis. His success in the insurance business led him to start his own company Ditslear Insurance, with offices in Indianapolis and Noblesville. After many prosperous years, Ditslear Insurance merged into the Ditslear Elmer Group, where success continued.

Mayor Ditslear made his initial foray into elected office with three terms on the Noblesville School Board, from 1984 to 1992 and then again from 2000 to 2004. This experience helped to prepare Mayor Ditslear for the rigors of serving in higher public office. When the opportunity presented itself in 2003, he chose to run for mayor of Noblesville, a race that he would go on to win against four general election opponents.

After assuming the Office of Mayor of Noblesville in 2004, and later joining the Republican Party, Mayor Ditslear would lead the city in continued growth over his four terms and became the longest tenured mayor in the history of Noblesville. His successful stewardship of the local economy has had major impacts on both the operations of the city and its citizens. Since 2004, the assessed value of the taxable property increased 134 percent from \$2.4 billion to \$6.04 billion today. By 2016, the population of Noblesville grew by over 10,000 people to more than 60,000 residents. This growth led to the school system adding additional schools to support the younger population and helping to improve access to education.

Mayor Ditslear led several quality of life initiatives, resulting in the development of Hamilton Town Center, and Federal Commons in addition to four new parks. Mayor Ditslear also worked to increase the amount of outdoor walking trails 183 percent by extending the Midland Trace Trail from Westfield to the center of Noblesville. His focus on the heart of the city also included renovating the downtown area through facade grants and road improvements and a focus on the White River. The Riverwalk Trail project provides a walkway down to the White River and provides citizens

the opportunity to enjoy nature. Mayor Ditslear was also instrumental in attracting SMC, a Japanese pneumatic technology company, to make a massive investment in the Noblesville community creating over 600 new jobs by locating their North American headquarters to the city.

As Noblesville continued to grow and expand to new heights under Mayor Ditslear's leadership, the Mayor and his team also led initiatives with fellow civic leaders and local business owners to maintain the vitality and attractiveness of downtown Noblesville. A long-time sector of commerce in the city, and the location of the Hamilton County Seat since 1824, downtown Noblesville has been the epicenter of Hamilton County since its inception. Working with groups such as Noblesville Main Street and various local businesses, Mayor Ditslear was able to encourage continued growth and revitalization of downtown Noblesville. Initiatives such as First Fridays, Jazz on the Square, and Small Business Saturdays, helped to build a sense of community that has made downtown Noblesville the focal point of life in the city once again.

By focusing on the infrastructure of the city, improving parks and community spaces, promoting quality education, and even playing a role in founding the Roots of Life Community Church with his wife, Head Pastor Teri Ditslear, Mayor Ditslear has impacted his city as both a government official and a committed, longtime resident.

On behalf of all Hoosiers, I thank Mayor Ditslear for his many years of service to the city and people of Noblesville, Indiana. I wish him, his wife and fellow civic leader, Pastor Teri Ditslear, and his family the best in a well-deserved retirement.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. DEBBIE DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 5, 2019

Mrs. DINGELL. Madam Speaker, on S. 151, the TRACED Act, I was unable to cast my vote as I was giving a eulogy of a close friend and mayor in my district. Had I been present, I would have voted: YEA on Roll Call No. 647.

HONORING MAJOR JEREMY PARR

HON. C.A. DUTCH RUPPERSBERGER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 5, 2019

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Madam Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to Major Jeremy Parr for his exemplary dedication to duty and service as an Army Congressional Fellow and Congressional Budget Liaison for the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Financial Management and Comptroller). Major Parr is transitioning from his current assignment to serve as a Battalion Operations Officer at Fort Hood, Texas.

Hailing from Corpus Christi, Texas, Major Parr was commissioned as a Second Lieutenant in the Signal Corps from Army ROTC in 2007. He earned a Bachelor's Degree in Industrial Distribution from Texas A&M University and a Master's Degree in Legislative Affairs from The George Washington University.

Major Parr served in a broad range of assignments during his 12 years as an Army officer. He has served in one combat deployment to Iraq with Task Force 2-16 Infantry, 4th Brigade Combat Team, 1st Infantry Division.

I had the privilege of working with Major Parr, who served as a fellow in my office, throughout 2017 and during his succeeding assignment as a Congressional Budget Liaison for the U.S. Army. Major Parr diligently coordinated with Members of Congress and their staffs to articulate the Army's budget positions to the Appropriations Committees. His professionalism, performance and commitment to the mission, as both a fellow and liaison, are in keeping with the highest traditions of military service and made a lasting impression on members and staff of the United States Congress.

Throughout his career, Major Parr has positively impacted soldiers, peers and superiors. Our country has benefited from his leadership, judgment and passion for the Army profession.

The foundation of Jeremy's success is his family. His wife, Yulia, and his children, Joshua, Evan and Alexander, are the light of his life. In addition, Jeremy's parents, Debra and Earl, exemplify the selflessness and humility that characterize the families of all of our service members.

Madam Speaker, it has been a genuine pleasure to have worked with Major Jeremy Parr since the first session of the 115th Congress. It is with great appreciation that I recognize and commend Jeremy for service to our country and wish him all the best as he continues his service in the United States Army.

TRIBUTE TO THE LOBOSCO ASSOCIATION

HON. MIKIE SHERRILL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 5, 2019

Ms. SHERRILL. Madam Speaker, I rise to honor and recognize the history of the Lobosco Association, which will celebrate the 60th Lobosco Association Christmas Party on December 8, 2019 in Fredon, New Jersey. Four generations will gather to celebrate the strength of their family. They remain bound by the ideals of the first Loboscas who immigrated to this great nation and, through their sacrifices, enabled their descendants to attain the American Dream.

The Association has helped the Loboscas support one another, gather together, and strengthen the bonds of family. Family has been a constant throughout the years. The Association's dedication to Italian-American history and culture has kept its members deeply-rooted to their shared ties and able to continue growing towards the future.

The Association began on April 28, 1957, when the descendants of Michele and Vincenza Lobosco first organized the group. They formed the Lobosco Association to strengthen the bonds of family and lend support to one another. The family's journey to Paterson, New Jersey, began with the early death of the family's patriarch, Michele. From their humble beginnings in Sala Consilina, Italy, seven of the ten surviving children came to Paterson to establish new roots and provide their children with greater opportunities. An-

gelo came in 1912 at age 19, followed by Rosario, Michele, Luigi, Giuseppina, Attilio, and Emilio. They overcame language barriers and limited resources in a country that considered them foreigners. Their family cohesion, drive, and determination helped them to persevere and lay a foundation for a prosperous future for their descendants. As the family grew, the Association was formed to help maintain the close ties they shared.

To keep the family together, the Association has organized various festivities, picnics, and trips, the most enduring of which is now the annual Christmas Party. Since the first one on December 21, 1958, the Lobosco Association Christmas Party has been an opportunity for generations of Lobosco family members to share in the joy of the season and family company. For 60 years, the descendants of Michele and Vincenza have continued the tradition of a Christmas Party to instill in younger generations an appreciation for the meaning of family. They come to connect with seldom-seen family members, meet new ones, celebrate their heritage, instill pride, and keep the family spirit alive.

As Members of Congress, we have the deeply rewarding opportunity to learn about and recognize groups like the Lobosco Association. They represent great American stories. Their contributions have strengthened this country for many years and will continue to strengthen it for many years to come.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues in this chamber to join me in recognizing the members and friends of the Lobosco Association and wishing them a joyous 60th Lobosco Association Christmas Party this holiday season.

HONORING THE SERVICE OF JERRY BROWN

HON. MARK DeSAULNIER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 5, 2019

Mr. DESAULNIER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the service of an esteemed leader in Contra Costa, Jerry Brown.

After a decade of leadership at the Contra Costa Water District (CCWD) where he served the people of our county, Jerry will be leaving at the end of the year. His 18 years at CCWD were supported by his strong educational background in mechanical engineering, civil engineering, and business administration. Prior to joining us in the Bay Area, Jerry started his career with the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power.

During his tenure with CCWD, Jerry held various leadership positions and was appointed General Manager in September 2010. Throughout his career, he has worked in the water planning industry to ensure the proper management of water system facilities and secure water quality and supply to the public.

Jerry has influenced state and federal water policy through his participation on various boards and committees such as the Bay Area Council, the Association of Metropolitan Water Agencies, and the California Urban Water Agencies. Above all, Jerry has placed his focus on customer service. Some of his notable achievements during his time with CCWD include constructing resilient and climate-adapted facilities and cultivating a strong safety culture within the organization.

Jerry has been a strong partner and advocate for the needs of the Delta, and I have enjoyed our working relationship. Please join me in congratulating Jerry for his dedicated service, and in wishing him luck in his future endeavors.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JAMES P. McGOVERN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 5, 2019

Mr. McGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I was unavoidably absent on Tuesday, December 3rd, and Wednesday, December 4th.

On Roll Call Vote No. 643, on passage of H. Res. 546, disapproving the Russian Federation inclusion in future Group of Seven summits until it respects the territorial integrity of its neighbors and adheres to the standards of democratic societies, if I had been present, I would have voted YES.

On Roll Call Vote No. 644, on passage of S. 178, the Uighur Intervention and Global Humanitarian Unified Response Act (UGHUR Act), if I had been present, I would have voted YES.

On Roll Call Vote No. 645, on ordering the Previous Question to H. Res. 739, if I had been present, I would have voted YES.

On Roll Call Vote No. 646, on passage of H. Res. 739, the rule providing for consideration of H.R. 2534, the Insider Trading Prohibition Act, if I had been present, I would have voted YES.

On Roll Call Vote No. 647, on passage of S. 151, the Pallone-Thune Telephone Robocall Abuse Criminal Enforcement and Deterrence Act, if I had been present, I would have voted YES.

CELEBRATING THE 100TH BIRTHDAY OF FRANCES BARBER McCOMMONS

HON. J. LUIS CORREA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 5, 2019

Mr. CORREA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the 100th birthday of Frances Barber McCommons from the City of Anaheim, California.

Born on November 10, 1919 in McCrory, Arkansas, Frances has lived a rich and blessed life filled with raising her five children and serving others in her neighborhood and at her church where she was a Sunday School teacher of 4- and 5-year-olds for more than 50 years.

Frances spent her childhood in Arkansas as the eldest of seven children. She graduated at 16 as class salutatorian. At 18, Frances married her childhood sweetheart, J.R. McCommons, and started life as a farmer's wife. Frances, J.R., and their first four children were honored in 1949 as "The Farm Family of the Year for Woodruff County." Frances and J.R. were married 58 years and were true life partners.

In 1955, the family moved to California, settling in Anaheim, where they lived in a neighborhood in East Anaheim surrounded by or-

ange groves. It was here that they had another child. All five of their children would later attend and graduate from Anaheim High School.

Frances and J.R. were lay leaders in the Orange County Southern Baptist Association and helped start two churches: Crescent Southern Baptist Church in Anaheim and Lincoln Avenue Baptist Church in Orange.

In 1966, Frances and J.R.'s son, Michael McCommons, was killed in Vietnam while serving in the United States Army. He was posthumously awarded The Bronze Star with the V Device for Valor and Heroism in Combat and The Purple Heart. As a Gold Star Mother, Frances served veterans' organizations and worked with other Gold Star Mothers to support veterans and families of those who were killed in service to their country.

For many years, Frances's personal ministry was encouraging and celebrating others' achievements, birthdays, and other life events through personal notes, cards, and letters. Frances remained involved in the lives of the children she taught in Sunday School and continued to celebrate their lives with them through adulthood.

Her life revolves around her immediate family and her large extended family, including eight grandchildren and eight great-grandchildren. She is still an avid reader and remains interested in current events and the news. As someone whose livelihood was once dependent on the farm, Frances still loves watching the changes in the weather.

Please join me in wishing my constituent, Frances Barber McCommons, a happy 100th birthday and many more years of good health and happiness.

INTRODUCTION OF THE BANK MERGER REVIEW MODERNIZATION ACT

HON. JESÚS G. "CHUY" GARCÍA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 5, 2019

Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I rise today to support the Bank Merger Review Modernization Act.

When big banks get bigger, consumers and taxpayers usually end up losing.

Unprecedented concentration in the banking sector is hurting consumers, who pay more for critical financial services when their banks are merged out of existence. Since the 1980s, consolidation has swept the banking industry, with the number of FDIC-insured banks in the United States dropping from more than 15,000 in 1984 to less than 5,000 in 2018. Numerous studies have shown that bank mergers are associated with higher costs of credit, reductions in lending, and decreases in small business formation and local property prices.

Concentration in the banking sector also poses risks to financial stability. A wave of bank mergers by Bank of America, Citigroup, JPMorgan, and Wells Fargo in the late 1990s created the "too-big-to-fail" banks that became so central to the 2008 financial crisis.

Rather than scrutinizing the considerable risks that bank mergers pose, the regulatory agencies tasked with reviewing these mergers have increasingly "rubber stamped" them. Bank merger approval rates are at historic highs.

Last month, the Federal Reserve and FDIC approved the largest merger since the crash when they gave the green light to the merger between BB&T and SunTrust.

I am concerned that the reviewing agencies are not giving adequate attention to the systemic risks that these giant megabanks pose. I am also concerned that the considerable harms to consumers are not being considered when mergers are reviewed. The Bank Merger Review Modernization Act strengthens the bank merger review process to give the CFPB and consumers a voice, and to require that the systemic costs of too big to fail institutions are taken into full account.

I urge this body to curb the creation of too big to fail banks and pass this bill.

RECOGNIZING CHRISTOPHER FOSS

HON. ERIC SWALWELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 5, 2019

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Madam Speaker, I rise to recognize the dutiful work of my constituent, Dublin City Manager Christopher Foss, on the occasion of his retirement after nearly 40 years of service in local government.

Chris began his career in local government as a deputy city manager for Burbank, California, where he eventually served as the economic development director. In these roles, he enriched Burbank's economy and local business environment.

In 1999, Chris began serving as the economic development director for my hometown of Dublin. He implemented a variety of economic development programs to bolster and retain the business community. Under Chris, Dublin's economy flourished, and his work has had a lasting impact on the economic endurance and vitality of the Tri-Valley.

Chris served five years as assistant city manager before being promoted to city manager in 2014. His five-and-a-half-year tenure as city manager can be characterized by his superb relationship building, sound fiscal practices, and collaborative leadership style.

Under Chris' leadership, Dublin vastly expanded its network of parks, constructed a new affordable housing project as well as key commercial projects, and increased its footprint in the medical and biotech communities.

Our community also has Chris to thank for the construction of several community facilities. One such example is the School of Imagination, to serve children with special needs. The influx of new jobs and services through these projects supports the sustainability of economic progress in our community.

Chris draws support from his amazing family. That network includes his loving wife Lisa, son Jordan, daughter-in-law Lizzie, and grandson Henry.

I want to thank Chris for the contributions he has made to the communities he has served, especially Dublin. His passionate leadership and enduring commitment to our community are very much appreciated.

RECOGNIZING JERRY REVISH

HON. JOYCE BEATTY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 5, 2019

Mrs. BEATTY. Madam Speaker, on behalf of the residents of Ohio's Third Congressional District, I salute Jerry Revish on his illustrious broadcasting career of 42 years.

In 1972, Jerry got his start in his hometown of Youngstown, Ohio at WBBW Radio and in June 1980 he became a reporter for WBNS-TV.

Over the course of his more than four decades in journalism, Jerry won 13 Emmy awards, four Edward R. Murrow Awards, and the Silver Circle Award from the National Academy of Television Arts and Sciences.

In addition, he was recognized by the Associated Press for best feature, best documentary and best spot news coverage; honored with the Carl Day Award for Outstanding Achievement; and was the recipient of the Best International Reporting Award from the National Association of Black Journalists for a series of reports on the liberation of Haiti and a half-hour documentary on the new South Africa.

His reporting skills have taken him around the world.

He was the first Columbus TV reporter to go to Saudi Arabia to cover the Persian Gulf War, and he has reported from Haiti, Barbados, South Africa, Bosnia, Bahrain, Cuba, and Japan.

Among his numerous career highlights, Jerry covered many national political conventions, Ohio State University bowl games, the dedication of the Vietnam War Memorial Wall, the Lucasville State Prison Riot, and the September 11th terrorist attack. He also interviewed President Barack Obama and helped Columbus bodybuilder Walter Smith—wrongfully convicted of rape—win his freedom through DNA testing.

In 2005, Jerry was inducted into the Ohio Broadcasters Hall of Fame.

Outside of the newsroom, Jerry is the founder and senior pastor of the Unity Temple Church of God in Christ in Columbus, Ohio alongside his wife of 45 years, Danielle.

As he signs off at 10TV, I salute Jerry Revish for his commitment to excellence and service to Central Ohio—and wish him all the best as he begins the next chapter of his life.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF SEBASTIAN J. ARESKO

HON. ROSA L. DeLAURO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 5, 2019

Ms. DeLAURO. Madam Speaker, It is with the heaviest of hearts that I rise today to join the many family, friends, and colleagues who have gathered to pay tribute to a very special member of the Middlefield, Connecticut community, Sebastian J. Aresco, who lost his battle with cancer late last week. Public servant, veteran, friend, and mentor, Seb's loss will be felt by many.

Born in Middletown, Connecticut, Seb was a member of the United States Air Force and

proudly served our country with distinction during the Vietnam War. He did not speak a lot about his time in the service, however, he spent countless hours with his fellow veterans throughout his life. He could often be found at events and programs sponsored by the local VFW. Seb was also very dedicated member of the Saint Colman Church community. In his professional life, Seb was a proud employee of the State of Connecticut—an auditor with the State Treasurer's office for several decades before his retirement just a few years ago. In his spare time, he could often be found at the shore, enjoying a day of fishing, grabbing a lobster or whole belly clam roll at Lenny and Joe's Fish Tale, or simply enjoying the tranquil beauty of the ocean.

Seb took great pride in his military and state service, but he was perhaps best known for his work in the political arena. He was raised to understand the importance of our political process and his life experiences highlighted them even more so. He wanted to make a difference in his community, and he did so through the art of politics. He served on various Boards and Commissions in Middlefield, but it was his leadership as the Chair of the local Democratic Party—a position which he held for more than thirty years—where Seb excelled. Seb was one of those rare individuals who volunteered his time, energy, and even his home to ensure that every member of his community was encouraged to participate in the political process. He was a mentor to many as they became involved in local government and navigated elected office. He also had a unique understanding of how local, state, and federal government could work together to improve the quality of life for all. Though Middlefield is one of the smaller communities in Connecticut, Seb's dedication, passion, and commitment earned him the respect and admiration of political leaders across the state.

Put simply, Seb was one of the good ones. He had a quiet strength and heart of gold. I, like so many others, consider myself fortunate to have known him and to have called him my friend. He will be deeply missed by family, friends, and the community to which he dedicated so much of his time and energies. His tireless efforts as a veteran, state employee, and community leader made a real difference in the lives of others and I am honored to have this opportunity to stand and pay tribute to the life and legacy of Sebastian J. Aresco. I extend my deepest sympathies to his daughters, Amanda and Andrea, as well as his longtime companion, Joan, at this most difficult time, and hope that they can find comfort in knowing that Seb's legacy of public service, generosity, and kindness will continue to inspire all of those privileged enough to have known him.

CELEBRATING RIVER ROUGE HIGH SCHOOL FOOTBALL'S STATE CHAMPIONSHIP

HON. RASHIDA TLAIB

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 5, 2019

Ms. TLAIB. Madam Speaker, I rise today to give a hearty congratulations to the River Rouge High School Football on winning their first-ever state championship.

In a dramatic game, the River Rouge Panthers prevailed over setbacks early on to defeat a formidable opponent. This hard-earned victory is a testament to the countless hours of training put in by this dedicated team, as well as the support of its coaches and parents. As legendary basketball Coach Phil Jackson once said, "The strength of the team is each individual member. The strength of each member is the team."

Please join me in recognizing the River Rouge High School football team, Coach Corey Parker for this outstanding accomplishment.

HONORING THE SERVICE OF SEAN CASEY

HON. MARK DeSAULNIER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 5, 2019

Mr. DeSAULNIER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the service of long-time community advocate, Sean Casey as he begins retirement.

Sean Casey has dedicated his life and career to children and families. After graduating from Oberlin College and getting his master's degrees from UC Berkeley in both social welfare and public health, Sean worked at UC San Francisco, developing better data and analysis for maternal and child health programs. He also created Fetal/Infant Mortality Review programs in Contra Costa and Alameda Counties.

Quickly after joining First 5, Sean became Contra Costa's Executive Director. Throughout his tenure, First 5 Contra Costa provided life-changing services to over 500 families.

While he was Executive Director, Sean oversaw the development of a county-wide preschool planning process which implemented a Quality Rating and Improvement System. He supported the development of three parent advocacy groups, which identified and addressed issues related to early childhood development including affordable housing, immigrant and racial justice, and the safety of neighborhood parks.

Sean also worked to establish Contra Costa County's Help Me Grow system to help parents identify potential developmental challenges their children may have and connect them with the necessary resources and services. He also developed Ready Kids, which helps young children prepare for kindergarten and their academic lives. On top of that, he helped establish the Children's Leadership Council, the Family Economic Security Partnership, the Early Learning Leadership Group, the Budget Justice Coalition, and the Contra Costa Funders Forum. Sean also served as the Chair of the First 5 Association.

Sean has always been a leader in the community and someone I have enjoyed working with greatly. Over my years in public service, I have visited First 5 and many of the other programs he is associated with and am always impressed by the impact he has on the children and families he works with. As he retires from First 5, we wish him well knowing that his legacy will continue to enrich the lives of Contra Costa families. We wish him great luck and joy in retirement.

HONORING THE CAREER OF
GEORGE WOLFBERG

HON. TED LIEU

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 5, 2019

Mr. TED LIEU of California. Madam Speaker, I rise to celebrate Mr. George Wolfberg, a longtime community leader in California's 33rd Congressional District who will receive the Pride of the Palisades award from the Pacific Palisades Community Council. George worked for the City of Los Angeles for 37 years and played a hand in its bid for the 1984 Summer Olympics, divestment from South Africa over apartheid, and rewriting of the city charter.

Born on April 22, 1938 to Bernard Wolfberg and Leah Wolfberg, George was raised in Los Angeles, attending Los Angeles High School and the University of California, Los Angeles, where he received his degree in political science. George and his wife, Diane, married on February 9, 1964 and went on to have three children: Anya, David, and Michael, and four grandchildren.

George began working for the city of Los Angeles in 1961 in the City Administrative Office, where he eventually rose to Chief Administrative Analyst, the highest non-appointed position in the office. In that role, he prepared Los Angeles' successful bid for the 1984 Summer Olympics and worked to ensure infrastructure upgrades were completed for the event. He also administered the City's anti-apartheid program, overseeing the research necessary to ensure successful divestment from South Africa under apartheid. Even after he retired, George continued to play an out-sized role in city government, serving as City Charter Commission Research Director and co-authoring the City's administrative code.

The neighborhood of Pacific Palisades in some ways owes George a debt for its development. George helped craft and implement the Los Angeles Community Plan that has guided the growth and land use of Pacific Palisades and will for years to come. In addition to serving as Chair, Chair-Emeritus, and Vice Chair on the Pacific Palisades Community Council, he served on the board of the Santa Monica Canyon Civic Association and Portrero Canyon Park citizens advisory committee, calling attention to the importance of proper landscape design and infrastructure. Even from his bed in the ICU this past September, George has been contacting Los Angeles city staff and officials to support a new park in his neighborhood.

George's passion for engaging the youth is evident through his work on the Los Angeles

County Bicycle Advisory Committee, service as a Watts Friendship Sports League commissioner following the 1992 riots, and efforts with the local American Youth Soccer Organization, where he was a National Referee still overseeing games as recently as last year. George has also received numerous awards for his volunteer work, including the Pacific Palisades Community Council's Citizen of the Year award in 2011.

George's impact in Los Angeles and Pacific Palisades is remarkable and inspiring. I want to thank and recognize George for his efforts to improve his community and outstanding leadership throughout his career.

INTRODUCTION OF H. RES. 742

HON. JIM COSTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 5, 2019

Mr. COSTA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to mark the important successes of the Food for Peace Act. Since 1954, Food for Peace has provided life-saving food assistance to some of the world's most vulnerable people. While it has already saved the lives of millions, there is more work to be done. Tens of millions of children suffer from the effects of malnutrition, while natural disasters, civil strife and other crises put food supplies at risk every year.

I have introduced H. Res. 742 to mark these important achievements and call for continued appropriations prioritization of Food for Peace. This resolution has strong bipartisan support and also the support of a number of interested organizations, including Action Against Hunger, Alliance to End Hunger, American Maritime Congress, American Maritime Officers, American Maritime Officers Service, American Soybean Association, Bread for the World, Breedlove Foods, Inc., Bunge, CARE USA, Cargill, Incorporated, Didion Milling, Edesia, Feed the Children, Food for the Hungry, InterAction, Land O'Lakes Venture37, Land O'Lakes, Inc., Maritime Institute for Research and Industrial Development (MIRAID), Masters, Mates & Pilots Union, National Association of Wheat Growers, National Corn Growers Association, National Milk Producers Federation, Navy League of the United States, Seafarers International Union, The Borgen Project, The Port of Virginia, Transportation Institute, UNICEF USA, USA Rice, World Food Program USA, World Initiative for Soy in Human Health.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. DIANA DeGETTE

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 5, 2019

Ms. DeGETTE. Madam Speaker, on December 4, 2019, my vote did not register on the Pallone-Thune TRACED Act (S. 151) due to a technical malfunction. I wish the record to reflect my "AYE" vote for call No. 647.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO FRED
HAMPTON AND MARK CLARK

SPEECH OF

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 4, 2019

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise to honor the legacy of Fred Hampton.

Mr. Hampton was only 21 years old when he was murdered by the Chicago Police Department and the FBI as he slept in his bedroom. The Chicago Police fired between 82 and 99 rounds into his apartment the night of his murder.

Although we lost a powerful fighter for justice on December 4, 1969, Mr. Hampton's commitment to social, racial, and economic justice and his legacy of helping the disenfranchised did not die with him.

Working predominately on the South and West Sides of Chicago, Mr. Hampton and the Black Panther Party provided free medical services and implemented a free lunch program that fed 4,000 children daily. These social programs were valuable resources to these underserved communities.

The Black Panther Movement shed a spot light on the disparities between the races. Mr. Hampton understood that many of the social injustices stemmed from an unjust political system and fought hard to change it.

Mr. Hampton's cruel murder was the catalyst for a political awakening that resulted in the unprecedented election of several African-American mayors like Harold Washington of Chicago in 1983; Wilson Goode of Philadelphia in 1984; Kurt Schmoke of Baltimore in 1988; and David Dinkins of New York City in 1989.

Mr. Hampton was the champion for the disadvantaged and I am proud to honor his legacy.

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S6863–S6896

Measures Introduced: Fifteen bills were introduced, as follows: S. 2982–2996. **Page S6888**

Measures Reported:

S. 153, to promote veteran involvement in STEM education, computer science, and scientific research, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute. (S. Rept. No. 116–164)

S. 529, to establish a national program to identify and reduce losses from landslide hazards, to establish a national 3D Elevation Program, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute. (S. Rept. No. 116–165)

S. 906, to improve the management of driftnet fishing, with an amendment. (S. Rept. No. 116–166)

S. 908, to provide for an equitable management of summer flounder based on geographic, scientific, and economic data and for other purposes. (S. Rept. No. 116–167)

S. 914, to reauthorize the Integrated Coastal and Ocean Observation System Act of 2009, to clarify the authority of the Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration with respect to post-storm assessments, and to require the establishment of a National Water Center. (S. Rept. No. 116–168)

S. 1148, to amend title 49, United States Code, to require the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration to give preferential consideration to individuals who have successfully completed air traffic controller training and veterans when hiring air traffic control specialists, with an amendment. (S. Rept. No. 116–169) **Pages S6887–88**

Measures Passed:

FUTURE Act: Senate passed H.R. 2486, to reauthorize mandatory funding programs for historically Black colleges and universities and other minority-serving institutions, after agreeing to the following amendment proposed thereto: **Page S6865**

Scott (SC) (for Alexander) Amendment No. 1255, in the nature of a substitute. **Page S6865**

Merrill's Marauders Congressional Gold Medal Act: Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs was discharged from further consideration of S. 743, to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the soldiers of the 5307th Composite Unit (Provisional), commonly known as "Merrill's Marauders", in recognition of their bravery and outstanding service in the jungles of Burma during World War II, and the bill was then passed. **Pages S6895–96**

Bumatay Nomination—Cloture: Senate began consideration of the nomination of Patrick J. Bumatay, of California, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit. **Page S6877**

A motion was entered to close further debate on the nomination, and, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, and pursuant to the unanimous-consent agreement of Thursday, December 5, 2019, a vote on cloture will occur at 5:30 p.m. on Monday, December 9, 2019. **Page S6877**

Prior to the consideration of this nomination, Senate took the following action:

Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Legislative Session. **Page S6877**

Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Executive Session to consider the nomination. **Page S6877**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that at approximately 3 p.m., on Monday, December 9, 2019, Senate resume consideration of the nomination; and that the motions to invoke cloture filed during the session of Thursday, December 5, 2019, ripen at 5:30 p.m., on Monday, December 9, 2019. **Page S6896**

VanDyke Nomination—Cloture: Senate began consideration of the nomination of Lawrence VanDyke, of Nevada, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit. **Page S6877**

A motion was entered to close further debate on the nomination, and, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, a vote on cloture will occur upon disposition of the nomination of Patrick J. Bumatay, of California, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit. **Page S6877**

Prior to the consideration of this nomination, Senate took the following action:

Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Legislative Session. **Page S6877**

Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Executive Session to consider the nomination. **Page S6877**

Sullivan Nomination—Cloture: Senate began consideration of the nomination of John Joseph Sullivan, of Maryland, to be Ambassador to the Russian Federation, Department of State. **Page S6877**

A motion was entered to close further debate on the nomination, and, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, a vote on cloture will occur upon disposition of the nomination of Lawrence VanDyke, of Nevada, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit. **Page S6877**

Prior to the consideration of this nomination, Senate took the following action:

Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Legislative Session. **Page S6877**

Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Executive Session to consider the nomination. **Page S6877**

Hahn Nomination—Cloture: Senate began consideration of the nomination of Stephen Hahn, of Texas, to be Commissioner of Food and Drugs, Department of Health and Human Services. **Pages S6877–78**

A motion was entered to close further debate on the nomination, and, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, a vote on cloture will occur upon disposition of the nomination of John Joseph Sullivan, of Maryland, to be Ambassador to the Russian Federation, Department of State. **Page S6878**

Prior to the consideration of this nomination, Senate took the following action:

Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Legislative Session. **Page S6877**

Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Executive Session to consider the nomination. **Page S6877**

Skipwith Nomination—Cloture: Senate began consideration of the nomination of Aurelia Skipwith, of Indiana, to be Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior. **Pages S6878–83**

A motion was entered to close further debate on the nomination, and, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, a vote on cloture will occur upon disposition of the nomination of Stephen Hahn, of Texas, to be Commissioner of Food and Drugs, Department of Health and Human Services. **Page S6878**

Prior to the consideration of this nomination, Senate took the following action:

Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Legislative Session. **Page S6878**

Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Executive Session to consider the nomination. **Page S6878**

Nominations Confirmed: Senate confirmed the following nominations:

By 68 yeas to 21 nays (Vote No. EX. 383), Richard Ernest Myers II, of North Carolina, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of North Carolina. **Pages S6865–73**

By 76 yeas to 13 nays (Vote No. EX. 384), Sherri A. Lydon, of South Carolina, to be United States District Judge for the District of South Carolina. **Page S6873**

By a unanimous vote of 89 yeas (Vote No. EX. 385), Robert M. Duncan, of Kentucky, to be a Governor of the United States Postal Service for a term expiring December 8, 2025. **Pages S6873–77**

Messages from the House: **Page S6887**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S6888–90**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Pages S6890–94**

Additional Statements: **Pages S6886–87**

Amendments Submitted: **Pages S6894–95**

Authorities for Committees to Meet: **Page S6895**

Privileges of the Floor: **Page S6895**

Record Votes: Three record votes were taken today. (Total—385) **Pages S6873, S6877**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 3:57 p.m., until 3 p.m. on Monday, December 9, 2019. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today's Record on page S6896.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

NATIONAL DEFENSE STRATEGY IMPLEMENTATION

Committee on Armed Services: Committee concluded a hearing to examine strategic threats, ongoing challenges, and National Defense Strategy implementation, after receiving testimony from John C. Rood, Under Secretary for Policy, and Lieutenant General David W. Allvin, USAF, Director for Strategy, Plans and Policy, Joint Staff, both of the Department of Defense.

FINANCIAL REGULATORS OVERSIGHT

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: Committee concluded an oversight hearing to examine financial regulators, including S. 2563, to improve laws relating to money laundering, and S. 2839, to amend the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 to regulate industrial bank holding companies, after receiving testimony from Randal K. Quarles, Vice Chair for Supervision, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System; Jelena McWilliams, Chairman, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation; and Rodney E. Hood, Chairman, National Credit Union Association.

IMPLEMENTING MOBILE NOW

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Subcommittee on Communications, Technology, Innovation, and the Internet concluded a hearing to examine the evolution of next-generation technologies, focusing on implementing MOBILE NOW, after receiving testimony from Mayor Paul TenHaken, Sioux Falls, South Dakota; Jonathan Adelstein, Wireless Infrastructure Association, Arlington, Virginia; and Scott Bergmann, CTIA, Mary Brown, Cisco Systems, Inc., and Sarah Morris, New America's Open Technology Institute, all of Washington, D.C.

ILLICIT MINING

Committee on Foreign Relations: Subcommittee on Western Hemisphere, Transnational Crime, Civilian Security, Democracy, Human Rights, and Global Women's Issues concluded a hearing to examine illicit mining, focusing on threats to United States national security and international human rights, after receiving testimony from Patrick J. Lechleitner, Assistant Director, International Operations, Homeland Security Investigations, Immigration and Customs Enforcement, Department of Homeland Security; Jeffrey Haeni, Acting Deputy Assistant Administrator, Bureau of Economic Growth, Education and the Environment, United States Agency for International Development; Carrie Filipetti, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Western Hemisphere Affairs, and Richard H. Glenn, Deputy Assistant Secretary for International Narcotics and Law Enforcement Affairs, both of the Department of State; and Regina E. Thompson, Deputy Assistant Director, Criminal Investigative Division, Federal Bureau of Investigation, Department of Justice.

INTELLIGENCE

Select Committee on Intelligence: Committee met in closed session to receive a briefing on certain intelligence matters from officials of the intelligence community.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 26 public bills, H.R. 5305–5330; and 3 resolutions, H. Res. 742–744 were introduced. **Pages H9293–94**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H9295–96**

Report Filed: A report was filed today as follows: H.R. 2405, to reauthorize and amend the National Sea Grant College Program Act, and for other purposes, with an amendment (H. Rept. 116–323). **Page H9293**

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein she appointed Representative Cuellar to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H9259**

Recess: The House recessed at 10:34 a.m. and reconvened at 12 noon. **Page H9263**

Voting Rights Advancement Act of 2019 and expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding United States efforts to resolve

the Israeli-Palestinian conflict through a negotiated two-state solution—Rule for Consideration: The House agreed to H. Res. 741, providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4) to amend the Voting Rights Act of 1965 to revise the criteria for determining which States and political subdivisions are subject to section 4 of the Act, and for other purposes, and providing for consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 326) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding United States efforts to resolve the Israeli-Palestinian conflict through a negotiated two-state solution, by a yeas-and-nays vote of 226 yeas to 196 nays, Roll No. 651, after the previous question was ordered by a yeas-and-nays vote of 228 yeas to 196 nays, Roll No. 650.

Pages H9265–71, H9279–80

Insider Trading Prohibition Act: The House passed H.R. 2534, to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to prohibit certain securities trading and related communications by those who possess

material, nonpublic information, by a yea-and-nay vote of 410 yeas to 13 nays, Roll No. 649.

Pages H9271–79

Pursuant to the Rule, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 116–39 shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole, in lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Financial Services now printed in the bill. **Page H9275**

Agreed to:

McHenry amendment (No. 1 printed in H. Rept. 116–320) that clarifies “relating to the market,” adds an explicit personal benefit test, and strikes the Rule of Construction. **Pages H9275–76**

Rejected:

Huizenga amendment (No. 2 printed in H. Rept. 116–320) that sought to strike the term “aware of” included in the bill and replace the term “using” (by a recorded vote of 196 ayes to 231 noes, Roll No. 648). **Pages H9276–77**

H. Res. 739, the rule providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2534) and relating to consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 77) was agreed to yesterday, December 4th.

Senate Message: Message received from the Senate by the Clerk and subsequently presented to the House today appears on page H9265.

Quorum Calls—Votes: Three yea-and-nay votes and one recorded vote developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H9277–78, H9278–79, H9279–80, and H9280. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 5:07 p.m.

Committee Meetings

PRIVATIZED HOUSING: ARE CONDITIONS IMPROVING FOR OUR MILITARY FAMILIES?

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Readiness held a hearing entitled “Privatized Housing: Are Conditions Improving for Our Military Families?”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

MILITARY HEALTH SYSTEM REFORM: A CURE FOR EFFICIENCY AND READINESS?

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Military Personnel held a hearing entitled “Military Health System Reform: A Cure for Efficiency and Readiness?”. Testimony was heard from Thomas McCaffery, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Health Affairs, Department of Defense; Lieutenant General Ronald Place, U.S. Army, Director, Defense Health

Agency; Lieutenant General Scott Dingle, U.S. Army, Surgeon General of the Army; Lieutenant General Dorothy Hogg, U.S. Air Force, Surgeon General of the Air Force; Rear Admiral Bruce Gillingham, U.S. Navy, Surgeon General of the Navy; and Brigadier General Paul Friedrichs, U.S. Air Force, Joint Staff Surgeon, Joint Chiefs of Staff.

ACCOUNTABILITY AND OVERSIGHT OF THE FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Communications and Technology held a hearing entitled “Accountability and Oversight of the Federal Communications Commission”. Testimony was heard from the following Federal Communications Commission officials: Ajit Pai, Chairman; Michael O’Rielly, Commissioner; Brendan Carr, Commissioner; Jessica Rosenworcel, Commissioner; and Geoffrey Starks, Commissioner.

BUILDING A 100 PERCENT CLEAN ECONOMY: SOLUTIONS FOR ECONOMY-WIDE DEEP DECARBONIZATION

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Environment and Climate Change held a hearing entitled “Building a 100 Percent Clean Economy: Solutions for Economy-Wide Deep Decarbonization”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

PROMOTING FINANCIAL STABILITY? REVIEWING THE ADMINISTRATION’S DEREGULATORY APPROACH TO FINANCIAL STABILITY

Committee on Financial Services: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “Promoting Financial Stability? Reviewing the Administration’s Deregulatory Approach to Financial Stability”. Testimony was heard from Steven Mnuchin, Secretary, Department of the Treasury, and Chairperson, Financial Stability Oversight Council.

AN EXAMINATION OF THE FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION AND ITS IMPACT ON HOMEOWNERSHIP IN AMERICA

Committee on Financial Services: Subcommittee on Housing, Community Development, and Insurance held a hearing entitled “An Examination of the Federal Housing Administration and Its Impact on Homeownership in America”. Testimony was heard from Brian D. Montgomery, Commissioner, Federal Housing Administration.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Natural Resources: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 537, the “Bureau of Reclamation

Pumped Storage Hydropower Development Act”; H.R. 722, the “Miracle Mountain Designation Act”; H.R. 877, the “Modernizing the Pittman-Robertson Fund for Tomorrow’s Needs Act”; H.R. 2642, the “Wild Olympics Wilderness and Wild and Scenic Rivers Act”; H.R. 3742, the “Recovering America’s Wildlife Act of 2019”; H.R. 3977, the “Justice for Native Survivors of Sexual Violence Act”; H.R. 4479, the “Disaster Recovery Workforce Act”; H.R. 4957, the “Native American Child Protection Act”; and S. 209, the “PROGRESS for Indian Tribes Act”. S. 209, H.R. 3977, H.R. 877, and H.R. 722 were ordered reported, without amendment. H.R. 4957, H.R. 4479, H.R. 3742, H.R. 2642, and H.R. 537 were ordered reported, as amended.

EXPERTS NEEDED: OPTIONS FOR IMPROVED SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY ADVICE FOR CONGRESS

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “Experts Needed: Options for Improved Science and Technology Advice for Congress”. Testimony was heard from Tim Persons, Chief Scientist and Managing Director, Science, Technology Assessment, and Analytics, Government Accountability Office; and public witnesses.

WHERE’S MY STUFF? EXAMINING THE ECONOMIC, ENVIRONMENTAL, AND SOCIETAL IMPACTS OF FREIGHT TRANSPORTATION

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Subcommittee on Highways and Transit; and Subcommittee on Railroads, Pipelines, and Hazardous Materials held a joint hearing entitled “Where’s My Stuff? Examining the Economic, Environmental, and Societal Impacts of Freight Transportation”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

THE STATUS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS’ FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT BUSINESS TRANSFORMATION

Committee on Veterans’ Affairs: Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations; and Subcommittee on Technology Modernization held a joint hearing entitled “The Status of the Department of Veterans Affairs’ Financial Management Business Transformation”. Testimony was heard from Jon J. Rychalski, Assistant Secretary for Management and

Chief Financial Officer, Department of Veterans Affairs.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Veterans’ Affairs: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 4920, the “Department of Veterans Affairs Contracting Preference Consistency Act”; and H.R. 3495, the “Improve Well-Being for Veterans Act”. H.R. 3495 was ordered reported, as amended. H.R. 4920 was ordered reported, without amendment.

RULES AND PROCEDURES IN THE U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES: A LOOK AT REFORM EFFORTS AND STATE BEST PRACTICES

Select Committee on the Modernization of Congress: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “Rules and Procedures in the U.S. House of Representatives: A Look at Reform Efforts and State Best Practices”. Testimony was heard from Christopher M. Davis, Analyst on Congress and the Legislative Process, Congressional Research Service, Library of Congress; and public witnesses.

Joint Meetings

PUBLIC DIPLOMACY, DEMOCRACY, AND GLOBAL LEADERSHIP

Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe: Commission concluded a hearing to examine public diplomacy, democracy, and global leadership, after receiving testimony from Lora Berg, German Marshall Fund of the United States, Cordell Carter, II, Aspen Institute, and Stacie Walters Fujii, American Council of Young Political Leaders, all of Washington, D.C.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR FRIDAY, DECEMBER 6, 2019

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

No meetings/hearings scheduled.

House

Committee on Financial Services, Task Force on Artificial Intelligence, hearing entitled “Robots on Wall Street: The Impact of AI on Capital Markets and Jobs in the Financial Services Industry”, 9:30 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

3 p.m., Monday, December 9

Senate Chamber

Program for Monday: Senate will resume consideration of the nomination of Patrick J. Bumatay, of California, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit, and vote on the motion to invoke cloture thereon at 5:30 p.m.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

9 a.m., Friday, December 6

House Chamber

Program for Friday: Consideration of H.R. 4—Voting Rights Advancement Act of 2019. Consideration of H. Res. 326—Expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding United States efforts to resolve the Israeli-Palestinian conflict through a negotiated two-state solution.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Beatty, Joyce, Ohio, E1546
 Bishop, Sanford D., Jr., Ga., E1541
 Brooks, Susan W., Ind., E1543
 Correa, J. Luis, Calif., E1543, E1545
 Costa, Jim, Calif., E1547
 Cunningham, Joe, S.C., E1542
 DeGette, Diana, Colo., E1547

DeLauro, Rosa L., Conn., E1546
 DeSaulnier, Mark, Calif., E1542, E1544, E1546
 Dingell, Debbie, Mich., E1544
 Garcia, Jesús G. "Chuy", Ill., E1545
 Gooden, Lance, Tex., E1542
 Jackson Lee, Sheila, Tex., E1542
 Johnson, Eddie Bernice, Tex., E1547
 Lewis, John, Ga., E1541
 Lieu, Ted, Calif., E1547

McGovern, James P., Mass., E1545
 Rose, Max, N.Y., E1541
 Ruppersberger, C.A. Dutch, Md., E1544
 Sherrill, Mikie, N.J., E1544
 Shimkus, John, Ill., E1542
 Swalwell, Eric, Calif., E1545
 Tlaib, Rashida, Mich., E1541, E1543, E1546



Congressional Record

printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through the U.S. Government Publishing Office, at www.govinfo.gov, free of charge to the user. The information is updated online each day the *Congressional Record* is published. For more information, contact the GPO Customer Contact Center, U.S. Government Publishing Office. Phone 202-512-1800, or 866-512-1800 (toll-free). E-Mail, contactcenter@gpo.gov. ¶To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 979050, St. Louis, MO 63197-9000, or phone orders to 866-512-1800 (toll-free), 202-512-1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202-512-2104. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Publishing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.