



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 166

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 2020

No. 37

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
February 25, 2020.

I hereby appoint the Honorable JIMMY GOMEZ to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

Dr. Barry C. Black, Chaplain, United States Senate, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

O, God, our help in ages past, our hope for years to come, thank You for the spirit of contentment we can receive from You, bringing quietness and faith to our hearts.

Today, use our lawmakers for Your purposes, enabling them to live worthy of Your name. May the words they speak bring edification and unity, as our legislators build bridges of cooperation. Lord, give them the wisdom to depart from strife, remembering that soft answers turn away anger.

We pray in Your great name.
Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr.

JOYCE) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

RAISING AWARENESS OF THE IMPORTANCE OF THE UPCOMING CENSUS

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

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to a share story of the Ridley School District, which is leading the charge in our community to raise awareness of the importance of the upcoming Census.

Under the leadership of Kelli Mullany, the director of pupil services, the Ridley School District has launched a districtwide effort to ensure a complete and fair count in the 2020 Census.

Ten years ago, Pennsylvania undercounted over 25,000 children, resulting in a loss of nearly \$44 million in funding for critical programs like healthcare, SNAP, school lunches, affordable housing, teacher training, and classroom technology. These programs were all impacted by the undercount.

Since children are among those most likely to be undercounted, it is particularly important for schools like Ridley to promote a complete Census count. Community leaders like Kelli are working hard alongside local churches, preschools, shelters, housing authorities, public libraries and using social media to spread the word that we all count.

The Census is the basis for how the Federal Government distributes billions of tax dollars, so we need a complete count. Our children and our communities can't afford another

undercount this year. We all need to spread the word that the Census is easy, safe, and important.

RECOGNIZING ANDREA DEVORRIS COHEN

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

Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Andrea Devorris Cohen, a dedicated community leader whose work has benefited the people of Blair County.

As the president of Lakemont Park, Andrea has led the recent transformation of this amusement park into a renewed recreational epicenter for our community. From new playgrounds and walking trails to batting cages and basketball courts, Lakemont Park has been restored to a beautiful facility where families and friends can gather together.

A homegrown Altoona leader and the daughter of Nancy and Don Devorris, Andrea has spent her career working for our community and improving the quality of life in Blair County. This week, she will be honored by the Central Blair Recreation and Park Commission for her many contributions and achievements.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the 13th Congressional District of Pennsylvania, we thank Andrea Devorris Cohen for her leadership in the revitalization of this historic recreational center, as well as her continued service to our community.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

□ 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.

H1173

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, February 25, 2020.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
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 February 25, 2020, at 9:38 a.m.:

That the Senate passed S. 995.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

CHERYL L. JOHNSON.

HONORING ROSA NACCARATO

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

Mr. SUOZZI. Mr. Speaker, I have spoken in this Chamber before about my father's American success story as an Italian immigrant. Today, I rise to tell the story of another Italian immigrant success story, the story of my constituent's mother, Rosa Naccarato.

Rosa died unexpectedly this past Christmas, only 2 weeks shy of her 95th birthday.

In 1955, Rosa left Italy with her husband and six children, leaving behind her friends and family, all in pursuit of the American Dream. Think of the tears that were shed as family and a way of life were left behind and as they faced the unknown.

The Naccaratos arrived in America with only \$200 in their pocket. They worked hard and experienced tremendous hardships and personal affronts because they didn't speak English. But they refused to believe that they were second-class citizens.

They persevered, and their children all achieved tremendous success. Their son, Anthony Naccarato, my constituent, was recently installed as the New York State president of the Sons and Daughters of Italy.

Anthony asked me to speak up on behalf of his mother and all immigrants who make the leap of faith to leave everything behind and come to America to try and live the American Dream. Hopefully, Rosa Naccarato's story will inspire others to persevere through the hardships, the discrimination, and the outright disrespect.

Mr. Speaker, today, we honor Rosa Naccarato. God bless her, and God bless the United States of America.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 4:15 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 8 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1615

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro

tempore (Ms. SCANLON) at 4 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Miss Kaitlyn Roberts, one of his secretaries.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or votes objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

The House will resume proceedings on postponed questions at a later time.

GOLD STAR SPOUSES AND SPOUSES OF INJURED SERVICEMEMBERS LEASING RELIEF EXPANSION ACT OF 2019

Mr. TAKANO. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2227) to amend the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act to authorize spouses of servicemembers who incur a catastrophic injury or illness or die while in military service to terminate leases of premises and motor vehicles, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2227

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 "Gold Star Spouses and Spouses of Injured Servicemembers Leasing Relief Expansion Act of 2019".

SEC. 2. CLARIFICATION OF TERMINATION OF LEASES OF PREMISES AND MOTOR VEHICLES OF SERVICEMEMBERS WHO INCUR CATASTROPHIC INJURY OR ILLNESS OR DIE WHILE IN MILITARY SERVICE.

(a) CATASTROPHIC INJURIES AND ILLNESSES.—Paragraph (4) of section 305(a) of the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act (50 U.S.C. 3955(a)), as added by section 545 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2020 (Public Law 116-92), is amended to read as follows:

"(4) CATASTROPHIC INJURY OR ILLNESS OF LESSEE.—

"(A) TERMINATION.—If the lessee on a lease described in subsection (b) incurs a catastrophic injury or illness during a period of military service or while performing covered service, during the one-year period beginning on the date on which the lessee incurs such injury or illness—

"(i) the lessee may terminate the lease; or

"(ii) in the case of a lessee who lacks the mental capacity to contract or to manage his or her own affairs (including disbursement of funds without limitation) due to such injury or illness, the spouse or dependent of the lessee may terminate the lease.

"(B) DEFINITIONS.—In this paragraph:

"(i) The term 'catastrophic injury or illness' has the meaning given that term in section 439(g) of title 37, United States Code.

"(ii) The term 'covered service' means full-time National Guard duty, active Guard and

Reserve duty, or inactive-duty training (as such terms are defined in section 101(d) of title 10, United States Code)".

(b) DEATHS.—Paragraph (3) of such section is amended by striking "The spouse of the lessee" and inserting "The spouse or dependent of the lessee".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO) and the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DAVID P. ROE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TAKANO. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to insert extraneous material on H.R. 2227, as amended.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2227, as amended, the Gold Star Spouses and Spouses of Injured Servicemembers Leasing Relief Expansion Act of 2019.

This bill was introduced by Representative CHERI BUSTOS of Illinois. I thank her for her work with the committee. It expands on the work the committee did last Congress with Representative BUSTOS to improve the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act.

This bill ensures that active and reserve component servicemembers and their spouses or dependents who are catastrophically injured while in service to this Nation have the ability to break their home and vehicle leases up to a year after their injury so that the family can modify their living situation to what best suits their new needs.

Servicemembers and families undergo difficult life transitions because of catastrophic injuries. Families should have the flexibility to be at their servicemember's side during recovery and the ability to easily move closer to family, friends, or other support networks.

Families dealing with the catastrophic injury of their loved ones should not have to worry about leases and cancellation fees.

Madam Speaker, this bill is an outgrowth of the bill Mrs. BUSTOS led last Congress and was the suggestion of the Paralyzed Veterans of America. It also clarifies similar legislation that passed in the National Defense Authorization Act last year.

H.R. 2227, as amended, would make it clear that catastrophically disabled servicemembers who have the mental capacity to terminate a lease may do so. It is not only spouses and dependents who are protected by the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act.

Madam Speaker, I thank Dr. Wenstrup, a former member of this committee, for his focus on the issue

and for working with Mrs. BUSTOS on this bill. I also thank the Paralyzed Veterans of America for highlighting the need to include catastrophically disabled veterans and families in our work to improve the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act.

Finally, I applaud the bipartisan work of Congressmen Levin and Bilirakis on this bill and their work on the Economic Opportunity Subcommittee.

I encourage all of my colleagues to join me in voting for H.R. 2227, as amended.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, today I rise in support of H.R. 2227, as amended, the Gold Star Spouses and Spouses of Injured Servicemembers Leasing Relief Act of 2019.

This bill would build upon legislation enacted last Congress and in the fiscal year 2020 National Defense Authorization Act to amend the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act to allow a surviving spouse of a servicemember who died on active duty to terminate a property lease following the servicemember's death.

This bill would expand that allowance to include motor vehicle leases and provide the same protection for spouses of servicemembers who are catastrophically injured in service.

Madam Speaker, the last thing a husband or wife should have to worry about when their servicemember spouse dies or is grievously injured in service to our country are late fees or penalties for terminating a lease for a car or property. Ensuring that they don't have to is the very least we can do in exchange for their sacrifice.

I thank my colleagues, Congresswoman CHERI BUSTOS from Illinois, my friend Dr. BRAD WENSTRUP from Ohio, a fellow veteran and former senior committee member, as well as all the other Members of Congress who worked so hard on this bill in order to clarify these protections for these most deserving men and women.

I encourage and urge all my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 2227, as amended.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TAKANO. Madam Speaker, I have no further speakers. I am prepared to close, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WENSTRUP), my good friend, and Iraq war veteran. I commend him on his work on this bill.

Mr. WENSTRUP. Madam Speaker, it is a tragedy any time a United States servicemember is killed or gravely injured in the line of duty. Those events, however, don't happen in a vacuum. They have lasting impacts on that hero's family and their loved ones.

That is why I rise in support of this bill, H.R. 2227, which I introduced with Representative BUSTOS. Our legislation would give spouses and dependents of servicemembers who are killed or catastrophically injured in the line of duty the flexibility to move closer to family and friends for support, because no one enduring that type of life-altering event should go through it alone.

In 2018, Representative BUSTOS and I worked together to pass the Gold Star Spouses Leasing Relief Act and get it signed into law. It gave Gold Star spouses the ability to terminate their property leases without penalty if their servicemember was killed in the line of duty.

We expanded those protections to include auto leases, as well, in last year's National Defense Authorization Act.

Now, this bill builds upon the good work of those two efforts by extending those protections to dependents of servicemembers in addition to spouses.

I thank Representative BUSTOS and the members of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs for their work in bringing this important bill to the floor.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2227.

Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Speaker, I encourage all of my colleagues to support this bill.

This takes me back to when I was in college in 1965, and my scout master was killed in Vietnam leaving behind four children. They were responsible for all these things with no resources, no money. I think our lives then were worth, at the most, if you bought extra insurance, \$20,000, not much money.

This is the right thing to do. I am sorry it took 50 years to get it done. I certainly appreciate all of my colleagues, especially my good friend Dr. WENSTRUP and Representative BUSTOS who brought this to our attention and got it done.

I encourage all my colleagues to support this bill.

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

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

I associate myself with the remarks of the ranking member. A catastrophic medical condition associated with someone who has worn the uniform of our Nation in service of our Nation should not also be accompanied by his family or her family needing to worry about paying off a lease on a home or a car.

The law of the United States should reflect the gratitude that the people have for a servicemember's service to our country. This is the right thing to do, and I encourage all of my colleagues to, again, join me in passing H.R. 2227, as amended.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by

the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2227, as amended.

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

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act to clarify the authority of servicemembers who incur a catastrophic injury or illness while in military service to terminate leases of premises and motor vehicles, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

G.I. AND VETERANS EDUCATION EMPOWERMENT ACT

Mr. TAKANO. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4852) to amend title 38, United States Code, to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to make available to veterans certain additional information about postsecondary educational institutions, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4852

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 "G.I. and Veterans Education Empowerment Act" or the "GIVE Act".

SEC. 2. INFORMATION PROVIDED BY DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS ABOUT POSTSECONDARY EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS.

(a) ADDITIONAL INFORMATION TO BE PROVIDED.—Subsection (c) of section 3698 of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)(C)—

(A) in clause (xi), by striking "and" at the end;

(B) in clause (xii), by striking the period and inserting a semicolon; and

(C) by adding at the end the following new clauses:

"(xiii) whether the institution is listed on the College Navigator website as affiliated with a religion and, if so, which religious denomination;

"(xiv) whether the Secretary of Education or other head of a department or agency of the Federal Government has determined that the institution is a minority serving institution and, if so, which one or more types of minority serving institutions; and

"(xv) whether the institution is gender specific."; and

(2) in paragraph (2), by adding at the end the following new sentence: "To the extent practicable, the Secretary shall ensure that such information is provided in a searchable format."

(b) DEFINITION.—Subsection (f) of such section is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

"(3) The term 'College Navigator website' has the meaning given that term in section 132 of the Higher Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1015a).

"(4) The term 'minority serving institution' means any of the following:

"(A) A part B institution, as such term is defined in section 322(2) of the Higher Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1061(2)).

“(B) A Hispanic-serving institution, as such term is defined in section 502(a)(5) of such Act (20 U.S.C. 1101a(5)).

“(C) A Tribal College or University, as such term is defined in section 316(b)(3) of such Act (20 U.S.C. 1059c(b)(3)).

“(D) A predominantly Black institution, as such term is defined in section 318(b)(6) of such Act (20 U.S.C. 1059e(b)(6)).

“(E) A Native American-serving, nontribal institution, as such term is defined in section 319(b)(2) of such Act (20 U.S.C. 1059f(b)(6)).

“(F) An Alaska Native-serving institution or Native Hawaiian-serving institution, as such terms are defined in section 317(b) of such Act (20 U.S.C. 1059d(b)).

“(G) An Asian American and Native American Pacific Islander-serving institution, as such term is defined in section 320(b) of such Act (20 U.S.C. 1059g(b)).”

(c) APPLICATION.—The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to the information provided under section 3698 of title 38, United States Code, beginning on the date that is two years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO) and the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DAVID P. ROE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TAKANO. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to insert extraneous material on H.R. 4852.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4852, the G.I. and Veterans Education Empowerment Act, also known as the GIVE Act.

H.R. 4852, introduced by Representative TORRES, provides veterans with more information about educational institutions prior to their enrollment. Too often veterans find their educational institutions are not good fits for their educational goals and drop out or transfer to other institutions after wasting time and benefits.

After transferring, veterans lose credits from their transferring institutions or simply give up on acquiring a new skill set altogether because an institution does not meet their needs.

Madam Speaker, the GIVE Act addresses an overlooked cause for veterans dropping out or transferring to other institutions: cultural incongruence.

I have observed countless instances where veterans begin their studies only to find out that they are not comfortable on the campus of their educational institution.

Congress created the GI Bill Comparison Tool to provide veterans with more information when they consider where they will pursue a postsecondary education. While the GI Bill Compari-

son Tool provides veterans with data on tuition and costs, accreditation, and cautionary information, there are gaps in the information regarding campus culture.

For example, the GI Bill Comparison Tool does not inform a Catholic veteran, who may be interested in attending a Catholic institution, if an institution is affiliated with the Roman Catholic Church.

Madam Speaker, small pieces of information like that are critical to helping veterans assimilate to life on campus.

Data on campus culture are collected by the Department of Education but are not currently displayed on the GI Bill Comparison Tool website. Now, if enacted, the GIVE Act will require VA to provide prospective student veterans with information on whether an institution is minority serving, gender specific, or has a religious affiliation.

Madam Speaker, this bill will simply require the GI Bill Comparison Tool to display information to help veterans choose the right school the first time.

□ 1630

This bill will also help veterans choose a campus that is aligned with their values and reduce the number of transfers due to cultural incompatibility.

We owe it to our veterans to give them the most accurate and relevant information that will allow them to efficiently obtain a new skill set so they can reenter the labor force and find meaningful opportunities.

Madam Speaker, I thank Representative TORRES for her work on this important issue.

Madam Speaker, I encourage all of my colleagues to join me in passing H.R. 4852, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, today, I rise in support of H.R. 4852, the G.I. and Veterans Education Empowerment, or GIVE, Act.

This bill would require the Department of Veterans Affairs to provide additional information on schools listed on the GI Bill Comparison Tool. The tool was first authorized by legislation sponsored by Congressman GUS BILIRAKIS from Florida, the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Economic Opportunity, in 2013 to give service-members and veterans the opportunity to compare information on GI Bill-eligible schools to determine which school is right for them.

The tool is modeled off the Department of Education's College Navigator website, which contains information about tuition and fee costs, policies on transferring credits, and whether an institution is private, nonprofit, or public.

H.R. 4852 would add three additional data points to the tool to ensure that it captures information about whether an

institution is affiliated with a religion, serves a specific group of minorities, or is gender-specific.

As the old saying goes, information is power. I am sure that this additional information will help GI Bill users choose the right school to fit their specific needs and, ultimately, ensure their success in higher education and beyond.

Madam Speaker, I thank Congresswoman NORMA TORRES from California for her work on this legislation, and I urge all of my colleagues to support it.

Madam Speaker, having used the GI Bill myself many, many years ago, it is an invaluable tool for our veterans. We know that the GI Bill was really one of the major things that helped create the America we live in today, as post-World War II veterans left, came out, used the GI Bill, went to college, and really helped create this great country we live in.

Two years ago, we passed a bill that would make the GI Bill forever, so that if you lose your job when you are 45 years old or 50 years old, if you are a veteran, you can go back and use that GI Bill to retrain and continue your education.

This bill helps further clarify and helps veterans use that information better for themselves and their families.

Madam Speaker, I strongly encourage my colleagues to support this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. TAKANO. Madam Speaker, I again urge all of my colleagues to pass H.R. 4852.

Our veterans deserve to have the most accurate information available to them as they are making their choices about the institutions where they would like to use their GI Bill.

Madam Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4852.

The question was taken.

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

Mr. TAKANO. 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 motion will be postponed.

LEGAL SERVICES FOR HOMELESS VETERANS ACT

Mr. TAKANO. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3749) to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to make grants to entities that provide legal services for homeless veterans and veterans at risk for homelessness, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.
The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3749

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 “Legal Services for Homeless Veterans Act”.

SEC. 2. LEGAL SERVICES FOR HOMELESS VETERANS AND VETERANS AT RISK FOR HOMELESSNESS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 20 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 2022 the following new section:

“§ 2022A. Legal services for homeless veterans and veterans at risk for homelessness

“(a) GRANTS.—Subject to the availability of appropriations provided for such purpose, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall make grants to eligible entities that provide legal services to homeless veterans and veterans at risk for homelessness.

“(b) CRITERIA.—(1) The Secretary shall—
“(A) establish criteria and requirements for grants under this section, including criteria for entities eligible to receive such grants; and

“(B) publish such criteria and requirements in the Federal Register.

“(2) In establishing criteria and requirements under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall—

“(A) take into consideration any criteria and requirements needed with respect to carrying out this section in rural communities, Tribal lands, and the territories and possessions of the United States; and

“(B) consult with organizations that have experience in providing services to homeless veterans, including veterans service organizations, the Equal Justice Works AmeriCorps Veterans Legal Corps, and other organizations the Secretary determines appropriate.

“(c) ELIGIBLE ENTITIES.—The Secretary may make a grant under this section to an entity applying for such a grant only if the applicant for the grant—

“(1) is a public or nonprofit private entity with the capacity (as determined by the Secretary) to effectively administer a grant under this section;

“(2) demonstrates that adequate financial support will be available to carry out the services for which the grant is sought consistent with the application;

“(3) agrees to meet the applicable criteria and requirements established under subsection (b)(1); and

“(4) has, as determined by the Secretary, demonstrated the capacity to meet such criteria and requirements.

“(d) USE OF FUNDS.—Grants under this section shall be used to provide homeless veterans and veterans at risk for homelessness the following legal services:

“(1) Legal services related to housing, including eviction defense, representation in landlord-tenant cases, and representation in foreclosure cases.

“(2) Legal services related to family law, including assistance in court proceedings for child support, divorce, estate planning, and family reconciliation.

“(3) Legal services related to income support, including assistance in obtaining public benefits.

“(4) Legal services related to criminal defense, including defense in matters symptomatic of homelessness, such as outstanding warrants, fines, and driver's license revocation, to reduce recidivism and facilitate the overcoming of reentry obstacles in employment or housing.

“(5) Legal services related to requests to upgrade the characterization of a discharge

or dismissal of a former member of the Armed Forces under section 1553 of title 10.

“(6) Such other legal services as the Secretary determines appropriate.

“(e) FUNDS FOR WOMEN VETERANS.—For any fiscal year, not less than ten percent of the amount authorized to be appropriated for grants under this section shall be used to provide legal services described in subsection (d) to women veterans.

“(f) REPORTS.—On a biennial basis, the Secretary shall submit to the Committees on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Senate a report on grants under this section. To the extent feasible, each such report shall include the following with respect to the year covered by the report:

“(1) The number of homeless veterans and veterans at risk for homelessness assisted.

“(2) A description of the legal services provided.

“(3) A description of the legal matters addressed.

“(4) An analysis by the Secretary with respect to the operational effectiveness and cost-effectiveness of the services provided.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 2022 the following new item:

“2022A. Legal services for homeless veterans and veterans at risk for homelessness.”.

(c) CRITERIA.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall establish the criteria and requirements in the Federal Register pursuant to subsection (b)(1) of section 2022A of title 38, United States Code, as added by subsection (a).

SEC. 3. ADDITIONAL AMOUNT FOR SUPPORTIVE SERVICES FOR VETERAN FAMILIES GRANT PROGRAM TO SUPPORT ORGANIZATIONS THAT HAVE A FOCUS ON PROVIDING ASSISTANCE TO WOMEN VETERANS AND THEIR FAMILIES.

Section 2044(e) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(4) There is authorized to be appropriated \$20,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2022 through 2024 for the provision of financial assistance under subsection (a) to organizations that have a focus on providing assistance to women veterans and their families.”.

SEC. 4. GAP ANALYSIS OF DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS PROGRAMS THAT PROVIDE ASSISTANCE TO WOMEN VETERANS WHO ARE HOMELESS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall complete an analysis of programs of the Department of Veterans Affairs that provide assistance to women veterans who are homeless or precariously housed to identify the areas in which such programs are failing to meet the needs of such women.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 270 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives a report on the analysis completed under subsection (a).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO) and the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DAVID P. ROE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TAKANO. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members

may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to insert extraneous material on H.R. 3749, as amended.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3749, as amended, the Legal Services for Homeless Veterans Act.

Over the past decade, Congress and the Obama and Trump administrations have prioritized ending veteran homelessness. However, while rates of veteran homelessness have fallen, even one veteran without shelter is unacceptable.

This committee is committed to providing services to prevent homelessness and to assist veterans who become homeless by providing them housing and access to healthcare and social services.

According to the Project CHALLENGE, otherwise known as Community Homelessness Assessment, Local Education and Networking Groups, and VA survey, legal services are one of the top unmet needs for homeless veterans. H.R. 3749 directly addresses that need.

Madam Speaker, H.R. 3749, as amended, is sponsored by Congressman PARNETT and includes legislation authored by Congresswoman BEATTY, Congresswoman WILD, and Congressman LEVIN. It authorizes VA to provide grants or enter into cooperative agreements with eligible entities that provide legal services to homeless veterans and veterans at risk for homelessness.

The VA would be required to consult with organizations that have experience providing services to homeless veterans when establishing these criteria and requirements, and these grants or cooperative agreements would only be available to highly rated public or nonprofit entities.

Additionally, at least 10 percent of the funds made available each fiscal year for this grant program must be reserved for providing legal services to homeless women veterans. As we know, women veterans are the fastest growing population of homeless veterans.

Finally, this legislation authorizes \$20 million of the funding for the Supportive Services for Veteran Families grant program to go to organizations that assist homeless veterans with children. The SSVF program has been one of the most effective tools to address veteran homelessness since its creation by President Obama, and I thank this administration and Congress for supporting it.

Madam Speaker, southern California is ground zero for addressing veteran homelessness. Riverside, California, in my own district, reached functional zero veteran homelessness, but many communities surrounding my district need additional resources and programs

to reach functional zero. Providing legal services to veterans who need them also prevents those veterans who are at risk of becoming homeless.

Madam Speaker, I thank Congressman PANETTA, Congresswoman BEATTY, Congresswoman WILD, and Congressman LEVIN, the chair of our Economic Opportunity Subcommittee, for their advocacy and work to pass legislation that will end veteran homelessness.

Madam Speaker, I encourage all of my colleagues to support H.R. 3749, as amended, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, today, I rise in support of H.R. 3749, as amended, the Legal Services for Homeless Veterans Act.

This bill would authorize a new legal services grant program for homeless veteran providers.

The Department of Veterans Affairs would administer this grant program to organizations serving homeless veterans that provide legal services for issues regarding housing, family matters, criminal defense, and upgrading military discharges. Grantees would provide these services to veterans who are or who are at risk of becoming homeless.

This bill would also require that not less than 10 percent of grant funds go toward providing legal services for veterans who are women.

The committee's oversight of the homeless program has found that simple legal services can be a barrier to reintegration for the homeless or at-risk veterans because they can prevent them from gaining meaningful employment and stable housing.

I believe that providing grants to homeless veteran providers that offer legal services to this vulnerable population would be providing another avenue for these veterans to appropriately work through their legal issues and, hopefully, move closer to independence.

The bill would also direct \$20 million from VA's Supportive Services for Veteran Families program to grantees that provide services specifically for homeless women veterans.

It would further require an advanced study on what type of services are available for homeless women veterans and how to ensure these services are meeting their needs.

While I am supportive of this new program grant as well as the steps the bill would take to help homeless women veterans, I am concerned that there is no limit to the amount of medical service dollars that could be spent on this new program. I worry that if we continue to use the medical service account as a cash cow for new, unfunded priorities, other veteran programs eventually could be negatively impacted.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TAKANO. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. PANETTA), my good friend and also the author of H.R. 3749, a veteran himself.

Mr. PANETTA. Madam Speaker, I thank the chairman and ranking member. I appreciate this opportunity to talk about something that both of these gentlemen have discussed and support. I appreciate that, so I thank the gentlemen very much.

Madam Speaker, today, I rise in support as well of H.R. 3749, the Legal Services for Homeless Veterans Act.

This is a bill that directs the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide grants to organizations that provide legal services to homeless veterans and veterans at risk for homelessness.

The grant funds will be used to provide legal services related to housing, such as legal services related to family law; legal services related to income support; legal services related to criminal defense, including defense in matters symptomatic of homelessness; and legal services related to requests to upgrade discharge characterizations.

The legislation also authorizes appropriations of at least \$20 million for additional aid to women veterans experiencing housing instability and homelessness. As you heard from the chairman, women are the fastest growing group not just of homeless veterans but in the military and in our veterans' communities. And, as you heard, they are more likely to be single parents.

While serving as a local prosecutor, before my time here in Congress, in Monterey County, and working as a board member for the Veterans Transition Center of Monterey County, an organization which offers veterans not just transitional housing but, of course, case management programs to get them up on their feet and back into the communities where they can continue to serve, I worked firsthand with many veterans who had certain legal issues that brought them to the brink or pushed them right into, unfortunately, homelessness.

It is essential that Congress now ensure that our veterans are properly supported, have access to legal aid, and, yes, get the benefits that they have earned. We can then keep a roof over their heads.

For veterans in my district and across this country, this bill will provide them aid that really can help them during such events as Veterans Stand Down, a biennial event that we have in our district that provides much-needed legal assistance and helps our community's veterans get back on solid ground, be accepted into housing, drive legally, and make sure that they can find a job.

Madam Speaker, as a former veteran, I do urge my colleagues to support my bill to provide veterans the resources necessary to help them resolve legal issues and get back on their feet so that they can get back to being an integral part of our community and, of course, our country.

Finally, Madam Speaker, I thank the members of the For Country Caucus for endorsing this legislation. As a co-chair and founder of this caucus, the membership and I have worked to provide a platform for military veteran members to work across the aisle, to improve governance, and to enact productive policy, just like we have done here.

Madam Speaker, I am proud to have this bill introduced through the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, which I do believe does the exact same thing, and I thank both of these gentlemen for bringing this bill to the floor.

□ 1645

Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I strongly support this bill and appreciate Mr. PANETTA's leadership on it.

When I got to Congress in 2009, there were over 100,000 homeless veterans in this country. That number has been reduced by 70 percent. And, as the chairman said, zero is the right number; that is the correct number of homeless veterans.

This will go a long way to reestablishing many other things that the committee has done to help this, but this is a major step in helping when you are trying to get legal services with a lease or with many other things, with family issues.

I strongly encourage my colleagues to support this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I want to echo the sentiment of my colleague, Ranking Member ROE. We have both said in public and acknowledged the tremendous progress the VA has made in reducing homelessness. It began with the commitment under President Obama and has been continued under President Trump.

We have not done enough, I fear, to celebrate the tremendous reduction in homelessness across our country with respect to veteran homelessness. It still persists in my home State of California. We have a number of initiatives teed up, which, I trust, we are going to cooperate on.

The VA gets knocked around a lot for its shortcomings, but I have to say that this is one of the accomplishments that we have to celebrate more.

Mr. PANETTA's bill, H.R. 3749, is a continuation of this work. I urge all of my colleagues to join me in passing it, as amended, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3749, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VA REPORTING TRANSPARENCY ACT

Mr. TAKANO. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4613) to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to establish and maintain a website of the Department that allows the public to obtain electronic copies of certain legislatively requested reports of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4613

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 “VA Reporting Transparency Act”.

SEC. 2. REQUIRING PUBLIC ACCESS THROUGH DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS WEBSITE TO LEGISLATIVELY REQUESTED REPORTS OF THE DEPARTMENT.

(a) REQUIREMENT TO ALLOW ACCESS ONLINE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall establish and maintain a website of the Department that allows the public to obtain electronic copies of all legislatively requested reports required to be submitted after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) EXISTING RESOURCES.—To the extent possible, the Secretary shall carry out paragraph (1) by using existing online resources administered by the Secretary.

(b) CONTENT AND FUNCTION.—The Secretary shall ensure that the website includes the following:

(1) With respect to each legislatively requested report, each of the following:

(A) A citation to the statute requiring the report.

(B) An electronic copy of the report, including any transmittal letter associated with the report, that is platform independent and available to the public without restrictions, including restrictions that would impede the reuse of the information in the report. Where practicable, the report shall be in an open format.

(C) The ability to retrieve a report, to the extent practicable, through searches based on each, and any combination, of the following:

- (i) The title of the report.
- (ii) The date of publication.
- (iii) Any congressional committee or subcommittee receiving the report.
- (iv) The Act of Congress or conference report that requests the report.
- (v) Subject tags.
- (vi) A unique alphanumeric identifier for the report that is consistent across report editions.
- (vii) Any serial number, Superintendent of Documents number, or other identification number for the report.
- (viii) Key words.
- (ix) Full text search.
- (x) Any other information the Secretary determines appropriate.

(D) The date on which the report was required to be submitted to the website.

(E) The date on which the report was submitted to the website.

(F) To the extent practicable, a permanent means of accessing the report electronically.

(2) A means for bulk download of all legislatively requested reports.

(3) A means for downloading individual reports as the result of a search.

(4) In tabular form, a list of all legislatively requested reports that can be searched, sorted, and downloaded by—

- (A) reports submitted within the required time;
- (B) reports submitted after the date on which such reports were required to be submitted; and
- (C) reports not submitted.

(c) DEADLINE.—The Secretary shall ensure that information required to be published on the website under this Act with respect to a legislatively requested report submitted after the period under subsection (a)(1) is published not earlier than 30 days after the report is submitted and not later than 45 days after the report is submitted.

(d) NOTICE ON WEBSITE OF WITHHELD REPORTS.—If, at the time a requirement or request for a legislatively requested report is made pursuant to an Act of Congress or a conference report, Congress includes in such Act or conference report, as the case may be, specific language exempting the report from publication on a website under this section, the Secretary shall publish on such website the title of the report and notice that Congress exempted the report from publication.

(e) FREE ACCESS.—The Secretary may not charge a fee, require registration, or impose any other limitation in exchange for access to the website.

SEC. 3. RELATIONSHIP TO THE FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Nothing in this Act shall be construed to—

(1) require the disclosure of information, records, or reports that are exempt from public disclosure under section 552 of title 5, United States Code; or

(2) impose any affirmative duty on the Secretary to review legislatively requested reports submitted for publication to the website for the purpose of identifying and redacting such information or records.

(b) REDACTION OF INFORMATION.—The Secretary may redact information required to be disclosed under this Act if the information would be properly withheld from disclosure under section 552 of title 5, United States Code, and shall—

(1) redact information required to be disclosed under this Act if disclosure of such information is prohibited by law;

(2) redact only such information properly withheld under this subsection from the submission of information or from any legislatively requested report submitted under this Act;

(3) identify where any such redaction is made in the submission or report; and

(4) identify the exemption under which each such redaction is made.

SEC. 4. REPORTS REQUIRED.

(a) RECURRING REPORTS THAT THE SECRETARY RECOMMENDS DISCONTINUING.—The Secretary shall submit to Congress a report regarding recurring legislatively requested reports that the Secretary recommends discontinuing not later than—

(1) 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(2) two years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) COMPLIANCE OF VA WEBSITE WITH FEDERAL STATUTES, REGULATIONS, RULES, AND GUIDANCE.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report regarding the compliance of the website of the Department with Federal statutes, regulations, rules, and guidance regarding transparency for and access by the public and Congress, including requirements for links and information subject to section 552 of title 5, United States Code, and the Inspector General Act of 1978 (Public Law 95-452).

SEC. 5. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) LEGISLATIVELY REQUESTED REPORT.—The term “legislatively requested report” means a re-

port to be submitted by the Secretary to either house of Congress or any committee of Congress or subcommittee thereof pursuant to—

(A) an Act of Congress enacted not more than eight years before the date of the enactment of this Act; or

(B) a conference report adopted not more than eight years before the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) OPEN FORMAT.—The term “open format” means a file format for storing digital data based on an underlying open standard that—

(A) is not encumbered by any restrictions that would impede reuse; and

(B) is based on an underlying open data standard that is maintained by a standards organization.

(3) DEPARTMENT.—The term “Department” means the Department of Veterans Affairs.

(4) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Veterans Affairs.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO) and the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DAVID P. ROE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TAKANO. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to insert extraneous material on H.R. 4613, as amended.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4613, as amended, which would require the posting of congressionally mandated reports of the Department of Veterans Affairs on the Department's public website. The VA Reporting Transparency Act, introduced by Representatives ROSE and CISNEROS, will ensure easy public access to these reports.

Surprisingly, the Department of Veterans Affairs does not currently provide public access to many of its reports that are mandated by Congress. Rather than place its reports on its website, VA will often only transmit its reports to a few congressional committees, such as the House and Senate Committees on Veterans' Affairs. By contrast, the VA Office of Inspector General posts its reports online within 3 days of completion.

This legislation would allow veterans and the public to access these reports online, which contain critical information about agency activities and the effectiveness of services.

It would also improve accountability. For example, in 2019, VA provided reports to Congress on the activity of the Office of Accountability and Whistleblower Protection and on veterans being the target of Social Security fraud.

Americans should know what actions the VA should be taking to protect VA whistleblowers and what VA has done to prevent the fraudulent use of veterans' Social Security numbers. These

reports contain valuable information that should be made available to the public.

Madam Speaker, the bill is supported by the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, and Disabled American Veterans. I urge all of my colleagues to support H.R. 4613, as amended, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4613, as amended, the VA Reporting Transparency Act. This bill would require the Department of Veterans Affairs to make all of VA's congressionally mandated reports available on the Department's website.

During the committee markup on this bill, I registered my concern that this bill had not gone through regular order. Congress has not, to my knowledge, required any other Federal agency to publish congressionally mandated reports.

The concept of making congressionally mandated reports available is not, on its face, objectionable. However, we cannot always see the downstream consequences of a policy.

When the committee holds legislative hearings, we get an outside perspective on legislation from important stakeholders and can identify problems or potential enhancements that may not be readily apparent to lawmakers.

Madam Speaker, I would like to reiterate that our committee's work—and, by extension, our Nation's veterans—benefits from regular order, and I urge our committee to return to it.

That said, I thank the chairman for supporting an amendment I offered during the markup of this bill to address three concerns I had:

First, my amendment clarified that the requirement for VA to post reports would apply prospectively in order to avoid requiring VA to publish past reports.

Second, my amendment gave Congress 30 days to review the report before VA publishes it on the website. The Government Accountability Office gives us such a courtesy to review, and I believe the same courtesy is appropriate here.

Finally, my amendment clarified that Congress can, at the time of mandating the report, exempt it from publication. I was concerned that, as written, it was unclear when a report could be withheld, and I wanted the Congress mandating the report to make that decision.

With those changes, I believe the bill will result in a more transparent and publicly accessible VA. I encourage my colleagues to join me in supporting it, as amended, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TAKANO. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROSE), my good friend and member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, and also a member of the Oversight and Investigations Subcommittee and author of H.R. 4613.

Mr. ROSE of New York. Madam Speaker, I thank Chairman TAKANO for his extraordinary leadership and this opportunity, and I thank the gentleman from Tennessee, Ranking Member ROE, for always putting veterans first.

I rise today in support of H.R. 4613, the VA Reporting Transparency Act.

As my fellow veterans know, the VA is unparalleled in its commitment to serving our veterans, and that goes from our nurses to our physician assistants, our doctors, our VA police officers, and many other folks, veterans, themselves, who spend each and every day working at the VA. That certainly holds true for the VA in my district, New York's 11th Congressional District.

But for the largest integrated healthcare system in the United States and for an agency that holds the lives of our Nation's heroes in their hands, we must ensure accountability. Let's be very clear: There is no accountability without transparency.

When Congress mandates that the VA produce reports on the staffing levels of their nurses or how the VA prevents fraud, waste, and abuse or how the Office of Accountability and Whistleblower Protection truly keeps our VA employees safe, this information is useless if it is not made available to the general public in an accessible manner.

It is valuable to the nearly 9 million veterans enrolled in VA healthcare, and it is valuable to every American who wants to make sure that their tax dollars are being used for the best possible care that our veterans deserve.

That is exactly why I introduced this bill, the VA Reporting Transparency Act, which requires that the VA have public access to the legislatively requested reports that they produce. This access must be free, without any registration or limitations required, and the report must be posted no later than 45 days after it is submitted.

This is a no-brainer. It is common sense. It is an opportunity for the VA to set a precedent that other Federal departments will follow.

We made a promise to our soldiers that, when they came home, we would be there for them. This bill is a perfect case in point for how we can do just that.

Madam Speaker, I would like to thank my colleagues on the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, Congressman GIL CISNEROS from California and Congressman GREG STEUBE, a fellow Army vet, for their support of this legislation, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

You heard the old saying that the best disinfectant in the world is sunshine, and I could not agree more with that. I appreciate my colleague, Congressman ROSE from New York, for bringing this legislation forward. I

think it will allow everyone to see the reports that we see in a timely fashion.

I strongly encourage my colleagues to support it, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. TAKANO. Madam Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to join me in passing H.R. 4613, as amended, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4613, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROTECTING BUSINESS OPPORTUNITIES FOR VETERANS ACT OF 2019

Mr. TAKANO. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 561) to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the oversight of contracts awarded by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to small business concerns owned and controlled by veterans, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 561

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Protecting Business Opportunities for Veterans Act of 2019".

SEC. 2. LIMITATIONS ON SUBCONTRACTS UNDER CONTRACTS WITH SMALL BUSINESS CONCERNS OWNED AND CONTROLLED BY VETERANS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 8127 of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (k) as subsection (l); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (j) the following new subsection (k):

“(k) LIMITATIONS ON SUBCONTRACTING.—(1)(A) The requirements applicable to a covered small business concern under section 46 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 657s) shall apply with respect to a small business concern owned and controlled by veterans that is awarded a contract under this section.

“(B) For purposes of applying the requirements of section 46 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 657s) pursuant to subparagraph (A), the term ‘similarly situated entity’ used in such section 46 includes a subcontractor for a small business concern owned and controlled by veterans described in such subparagraph (A).

“(2) The Secretary may award a contract under this section only after the Secretary obtains from the offeror a certification that the offeror will comply with the requirements described in paragraph (1)(A) if awarded the contract. Such certification shall—

“(A) specify the exact performance requirements applicable under such paragraph; and

“(B) explicitly acknowledge that the certification is subject to section 1001 of title 18.

“(3)(A) The Director of Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization for the Department, established pursuant to section 15(k) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 644(k)), and the Chief Acquisition Officer of the Department, established pursuant to section 1702 of title 41, shall jointly implement a process using the systems described in section 16(g)(2) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 645(g)(2)), and any other relevant systems available, to monitor compliance with this subsection.

“(B) The Director of Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization and the Chief Acquisition Officer shall jointly refer any violations or suspected violations of this subsection to the Inspector General of the Department.

“(C) If the Secretary determines, in consultation with the Inspector General of the Department, that a small business concern that is awarded a contract under this section did not act in good faith with respect to the requirements described in paragraph (1)(A), the small business concern shall be subject to any or all of the following consequences—

“(i) referral to the Debarment and Suspension Committee of the Department;

“(ii) a fine under section 16(g)(1) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 645(g)(1)); and

“(iii) prosecution for violating section 1001 of title 18.

“(D) Not later than November 30 for each of fiscal years 2021 through 2025, the Inspector General shall submit to the Committees on Veterans’ Affairs of the Senate and House of Representatives a report for the fiscal year preceding the fiscal year during which the report is submitted that includes, for the fiscal year covered by the report—

“(i) the number of referred violations and suspected violations received under subparagraph (B); and

“(ii) the disposition of such referred violations, including the number of small business concerns suspended or debarred from Federal contracting or referred to the Attorney General for prosecution.”.

(b) APPLICATION.—Subsection (k) of section 8127 of title 38, United States Code, as added by subsection (a), shall apply with respect to a contract entered into after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO) and the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DAVID P. ROE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TAKANO. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to insert extraneous material on H.R. 561, as amended.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, H.R. 561, as amended, the Protecting Business Opportunities for Veterans Act of 2019, is sponsored by General BERGMAN and Congresswoman KUSTER. It establishes important oversight for VA small business contracting.

Under current law, a small business contractor cannot give a subcontractor

more than 50 percent of its contract work. The legislation requires veteran- and service-disabled veteran-owned small businesses to certify that they are performing at least half of the work. It also requires VA to refer contractors violating or suspected of violating the law to the VA Inspector General for investigation.

Madam Speaker, in addition, the legislation establishes an oversight process and penalties for fraudulently claiming to comply with the law.

Congress strongly supports creating business opportunities for veteran-owned small businesses and enforcing government contracting set-asides so that veteran-owned and service-disabled veteran-owned businesses can compete with larger government contractors.

It is unfair to veteran small business owners who play by the rules to lose out on business opportunities to bad actors who do not follow the rules and pass on most of the work to subcontractors, especially when those subcontractors are not veteran owned.

Madam Speaker, this bill is supported by the American Legion. Last Congress, the House passed identical legislation sponsored by my colleagues, General BERGMAN and Congresswoman KUSTER.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 561, as amended, and I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1715

Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 561, as amended, the Protecting Business Opportunities for Veterans Act.

H.R. 561, as amended, is contracting reform legislation sponsored by my good friend, Lieutenant General JACK BERGMAN from Michigan, who is the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations.

This bill would give the Department of Veterans Affairs and the Office of Inspector General badly needed tools to stop companies that exploit contracting loopholes to take work from legitimate veteran-owned small businesses. It is crucial that the Federal procurement be fair and that veteran entrepreneurs actually receive the business opportunities that the law created for them.

Unfortunately, there have long been some fly-by-night small businesses that obtain set-aside contracts only to pass on all of the work to large businesses while collecting the profits. This is illegal, but the law is difficult to enforce.

This legislation requires a written certification in every contract proposal that the company will comply with the law. A false statement constitutes fraud, and the bill makes it the Inspector General's explicit responsibility to investigate such suspected fraud.

This bill is a smart fix for a difficult problem, and I appreciate General BERGMAN as well as Dr. NEAL DUNN of Florida, my good friend and the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Health; and Congresswoman ANN KUSTER of New Hampshire for their work on it going back several years. I urge all Members to support H.R. 561, as amended.

Lieutenant General JACK BERGMAN is my good friend. I think General BERGMAN is the highest-ranking veteran in the U.S. Congress in either the House or the Senate. He represents the Upper Peninsula in Michigan and has been a great member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee.

Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BERGMAN).

Mr. BERGMAN. Madam Speaker, I give special thanks to the chairman and ranking member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee because we are here for the right reasons, and that is to serve veterans and enable them to be productive in their lives after their service to our country.

My bill, H.R. 561, the Protecting Business Opportunities for Veterans Act, gives the VA the tools it needs to fix a persistent problem in contracting that is labeled improper passsthroughs. These abuses occur when a small business obtains a contract under set-aside award conditions, but gives all, or substantially all, of the work to a large company while collecting profit for doing absolutely nothing. This practice has long been prohibited by law and wastes taxpayer dollars, but, unfortunately, in reality, agencies up until this point have had little ability to stop it.

As a veteran and a small business owner myself, I know how much work and dedication goes into building a successful company. The VA provides unparalleled opportunities for veteran-owned small businesses, but these opportunities are, unfortunately, wasted when unethical companies exploit loopholes to rip off the American taxpayer.

I am very proud of VA's Vets First Program which directed contracts worth \$6.3 billion to veteran-owned small businesses last year alone. However, bad actors have been taking away contracts from law-abiding veteran business owners in the Vets First Program for way too long.

My bill, the Protecting Business Opportunities for Veterans Act, requires all bidders on these contracts to certify that they will perform the percentage of work that the law already requires. The bill also directs the VA to work with the Office of the Inspector General in a more effective way to find, stop, and, where appropriate, punish these improper passsthroughs.

H.R. 561 addresses the gaps in implementation of existing law without adding new bureaucracy at the VA. I repeat: no additional new bureaucracy at the VA.

Madam Speaker, I strongly urge all my colleagues to support H.R. 561.

Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, just for the record, a lieutenant general, in case there are those who don't know what that is, has three stars. I salute this marine. Even though I was in the Army, I have to salute the general over here.

Before I close in support of this bill, Madam Speaker, I want to express my disappointment that we are not considering another bill, S. 3084, this afternoon as well.

S. 3084 would correct a technical error in current law that unless swiftly addressed will jeopardize the financial security of certain current and former senior leaders across the VA healthcare system and make it harder for VA to recruit and retain the necessary talent to serve our Nation's veterans.

In short, a provision of the Caregivers and Veterans Omnibus Health Services Act of 2010—and I remember that—is intended to raise the salary cap for employees serving our senior executive services-equivalent positions in the Veterans Health Administration. However, due to a recently realized error in the law, VA will have to cut pay and issue debts for 30 current and 10 former senior leaders in those positions unless Congress acts to make the necessary corrections which S. 3084 will do.

This was no fault of the Members. All of the employees who are impacted by this technical error serve in high-level, mission-critical leadership positions working on issues like suicide prevention, mental health, women's health, and more. We should be encouraging and supporting these leaders, not leaving them in limbo.

What is more, our failure to address this issue in a timely manner is actively making it harder for VA to recruit candidates to fill important vacancies across the country.

Madam Speaker, S. 3084 passed the Senate on January 16. We could have taken it up and passed it many times over by now. If we had, those leaders would be resting a lot easier, and those vacancies could have been filled. I urge Speaker PELOSI and Chairman TAKANO not to delay any longer and to schedule S. 3084 for floor time as soon as possible.

Madam Speaker, I want to thank Chairman TAKANO for his leadership on all these bills we brought here. They are all very needed, and I appreciate the gentleman bringing them up in a timely fashion. I absolutely endorse all of those today, and I encourage my colleagues to support H.R. 561, as amended.

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

Mr. TAKANO. Madam Speaker, in closing, I want to reiterate my support for H.R. 561. I want to appreciate the work with the minority. We have worked together to pass these five pieces of legislation on the floor. It is another demonstration of our commitment to put veterans above partisanship and to put the interests of America above partisanship.

Madam Speaker, I can't tell you what a privilege it is to chair this committee. I urge all my colleagues to pass H.R. 561, as amended, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 561, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO UKRAINE—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 116-102)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days before the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13660 of March 6, 2014, with respect to Ukraine is to continue in effect beyond March 6, 2020.

The actions and policies of persons that undermine democratic processes and institutions in Ukraine; threaten its peace, security, stability, sovereignty, and territorial integrity; and contribute to the misappropriation of its assets, and the actions and policies of the Government of the Russian Federation, including its purported annexation of Crimea and its use of force in Ukraine, continue to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States. Therefore, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13660 with respect to Ukraine.

DONALD J. TRUMP.
THE WHITE HOUSE, February 25, 2020.

CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO CUBA AND OF THE EMERGENCY AUTHORITY RELATING TO THE REGULATION OF THE ANCHORAGE AND MOVEMENT OF VESSELS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 116-103)

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. GARCIA of Texas) laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days before the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency with respect to Cuba that was declared on March 1, 1996, in Proclamation 6867, as amended by Proclamation 7757 on February 26, 2004, Proclamation 9398 on February 24, 2016, and Proclamation 9699 on February 22, 2018, is to continue in effect beyond March 1, 2020.

It continues to be United States policy that a mass migration from Cuba would endanger the security of the United States by posing a disturbance or threatened disturbance of the international relations of the United States. The Cuban government has not demonstrated that it will refrain from the use of excessive force against United States vessels or aircraft that may engage in memorial activities or peaceful protest north of Cuba. Further, the unauthorized entry of United States-registered vessels into Cuban territorial waters continues to be detrimental to United States foreign policy and counter to the purpose of Executive Order 12807 of May 24, 1992, which is to ensure, among other things, safe, orderly, and legal migration. The possibility of large-scale unauthorized entries of United States-registered vessels would disturb the international relations of the United States by facilitating a possible mass migration of Cuban nationals. For these reasons, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared with respect to Cuba and the emergency authority relating to the regulation of the anchorage and movement of vessels set out in Proclamation 6867, as amended by Proclamation 7757, Proclamation 9398, and Proclamation 9699.

DONALD J. TRUMP.
THE WHITE HOUSE, February 25, 2020.

INFRASTRUCTURE

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

Mr. GALLAGHER. Madam Speaker, I want to talk today about infrastructure, and I start with the confession that I was lied to as a child. In fact, my whole generation was lied to. We were told time and again by nearly every futuristic TV show or movie that by now we would all be traveling around on jetpacks and hoverboards. But we are still waiting.

And while we wait, we have to grapple with the fact that we need to use roads wherever we are going and that our outdated infrastructure is nowhere near where it needs to be.

□ 1715

Few issues we debate here in Washington, D.C., impact the day-to-day lives of our constituents more directly than infrastructure. Yet, fixing our infrastructure has become a running joke, with seemingly every week derisively dubbed infrastructure week.

It may be infrastructure week this week. We don't know. But infrastructure should not be an afterthought or a back-burner priority we deal with only when we have more money—which we don't—or when we are in a true infrastructure crisis. Even in December's \$1.4 trillion spending deal, in which seemingly every lobbyist in D.C. got a Christmas present, infrastructure was largely ignored.

Yet, infrastructure should not be impossible to tackle. Even as progress on a comprehensive package has eluded Congress in recent years, we have generated important bipartisan wins, like the 2-year Coast Guard reauthorization and reforms to better utilize the harbor maintenance trust fund to support critical projects at ports nationwide. There are plenty more easy bipartisan wins waiting on the sidelines—such as the Safe Routes Act, the Motorcyclist Advisory Council Reauthorization Act, and the Promoting Women in Trucking Workforce Act—that we could pass in the House tomorrow and make our roads safer and grow our workforce in key industries.

I know these are small fixes that will not solve all of America's infrastructure needs, but they would represent tangible progress in a divided Congress that would improve transportation in communities like mine in northeast Wisconsin. But we can't be content to stop there.

Even though now, in the midst of the craziness that comes with the Presidential election cycle, it is hard to imagine a comprehensive infrastructure bill passing both the House and the Senate, I think we should all agree that does not mean we should punt on thinking through more systemic infrastructure issues.

As we consider how the Federal Government can best support States, set

national standards, and promote infrastructure, there are three principles that we should keep in mind.

First, we need to better understand where Federal money goes. Before spending \$1 trillion on infrastructure, Congress needs to understand where and how Federal money is being spent. You may ask yourself: Don't we already know that? No, unfortunately, we have shockingly little definitive information about America's infrastructure needs and how much they cost.

Given this opacity, it is no wonder that we often see huge, exorbitant figures quoted for infrastructure costs. For instance, right now, there is no definitive estimate of the cost difference in building a highway with Federal as opposed to non-Federal dollars. This should not be difficult to determine. All it takes is finding projects of similar design and geography and comparing them.

Any Wisconsin family would compare relative costs before a big construction project. Why should the Federal Government be any different?

The problem is that what little top-line information we have on highways is based on data from 2007 to 2014. Now, the Federal Highway Administration reports only on what Congress has asked them to report. Up until now, that has not included cost analysis on highway projects. This has to change.

Congress should require the Department of Transportation to compare the costs of projects that use Federal funds and those that don't. We should know the breakdown of costs for planning and design, materials, labor, and compliance to understand how to better protect taxpayer money.

We should also require the Department to compare States so we can see which States are more efficient and figure out why they are more efficient.

What is more, we need up-to-date data on the comparative health of infrastructure across the country. Outside groups can provide a valuable perspective, but it is our responsibility as Congress to ensure we have validated, independent data from the States themselves.

For instance, we frequently hear that America has earned a D-plus grade on infrastructure. That is pretty bad. That is a failing grade on infrastructure, but compared to what standard and to what other country? We should have quantifiable comparisons to other developed nations. Are we getting relative bang for our buck compared to the U.K. or Canada? It is an open question. The answers might help us find efficiencies and new ideas for infrastructure partnerships.

China may have high-speed trains in its coastal cities, but they built them without respect to property rights or the environment. What is their return on investment? Does China have a plan to maintain their system as it decays in coming decades?

Unless we have reliable comparisons with peer nations, ratings that find

America has a D-plus in infrastructure lack context, lack meaning, and, therefore, lack all analytical value.

Before we try to prescribe solutions to our infrastructure challenges, we need to get useful, validated data to help us diagnose our problems.

Data is coming to define the modern economy—not jet packs, but data. Therefore, we should be able to fix this stuff. Yet, when it comes to the very engine that literally helps drive our economy from one location to another, we are stuck in the 20th century or even earlier when it comes to measuring need, progress, and required resources.

We have to do better before we sign up for potentially hundreds of billions of dollars in projects.

The second principle is that we need to recognize it is not how much money we spend on infrastructure but how that money is spent. One of the fundamental flaws in our infrastructure policy is that we tend to be enamored with shiny new projects while paying less attention to how we maintain existing roads, bridges, and ports.

The incentives make sense, right? Everyone wants to be there at the ribbon-cutting for a brand-new project, building something new. No one wants to be there at the much less exciting and non-ribbon-cutting ceremony for maintenance we are doing on roads every single day.

But the Department of Transportation's 2019 report to Congress on the status of the Nation's highways, bridges, and transit noted that nearly 60 percent of Federal money spent on highway infrastructure goes to rehabilitating our existing system. Although that sounds substantial, we should remember that the siren call of infrastructure spending in Washington is predicated on fixing our crumbling infrastructure.

If this is the case, then why is Congress not dedicating more resources to maintenance? If we truly want to fix our crumbling infrastructure, then any future infrastructure package must consider the long-term effect of deferring maintenance of existing projects for new construction.

For example, the foundations underneath many of Wisconsin's roads were laid in the 1960s and 1970s and are nearing the end of their lifespans. That means that, in some cases, the foundation of Wisconsin's roads predates Vince Lombardi's victories in Super Bowl I and II.

So why hasn't this been addressed over the years, particularly in the 2009 stimulus, which spent over \$100 billion on infrastructure? Rather than focusing on renewing existing roads, the stimulus bill prioritized Federal dollars for "shovel-ready projects," which tend to be new highways, interchanges, and frontage roads. So, despite receiving almost \$400 million in highway funds from the 2009 stimulus, Wisconsin's roads are still limping along with aging foundations.

Consider that in a recent report on repair priorities, Transportation for America and Taxpayers for Common Sense found that even after the stimulus, “The percentage of roads nationwide in poor condition increased from 2009 to 2017.”

After we spent hundreds of billions of dollars on infrastructure, the percentage of roads nationwide in poor condition increased. That should tell you something is fundamentally wrong with our approach.

Strong Towns, an infrastructure resiliency organization, has argued for years that governments need to consider roads as liabilities, not assets, because they eventually must be replaced for large sums of money.

Yet, from 2009 to 2017, we collectively built 223,000 miles of new roads, enough new lane-miles to crisscross the entire country 83 times, which Repair Priorities estimates will cost another \$5 billion a year just to keep in good condition. Think about this: \$5 billion is about 11 percent of the current size of Federal highway spending.

As Strong Towns asks, if we devoted 100 percent of all government spending to repair, would we even have enough to maintain what we have already built? Probably not. Yet, States, with Federal dollars, are building more.

The principle here is that growth of the system creates a future cost to the system, which explains much of our current infrastructure funding crisis.

Third, and finally, we need to think innovatively about the Federal role in infrastructure. I often hear that our infrastructure spending and programs are stuck in the 1950s. If this is true, then we need to make sure that our infrastructure proposals aren't rehashing spending and regulatory regimes from the 1950s. If we keep putting the same broken inputs into the system, we can expect the same broken result.

The most obvious place to start is funding. We can't just raise the gas tax and throw hundreds of billions of dollars at the problem. That is particularly true if we don't have basic data on the scale of the problem. That is a 1950s way of thinking.

Even beyond the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure's Ranking Member SAM GRAVES' call for proposals transitioning to a vehicle-miles traveled tax, there are plenty of ways that we can think innovatively and escape the prison of the past.

One place to look is the permitting process. Countless billions of dollars are wasted in delays and ridiculous budget overruns caused by a regulatory maze of permitting.

The potential for savings here is tremendous. For example, The New York Times recently reported that it costs the city of New York nearly seven times the cost to build a rail project than similar projects almost anywhere—seven times. When considering that just the first phase of the Second Avenue Subway costs \$4.5 billion, even savings of 25 percent would be enor-

mous. There are enormous savings to be found in cutting down on delays and budget overruns.

President Trump's Executive Order No. 13807 streamlines the permitting process by designating one Federal agency as the lead rather than forcing project managers to navigate through a dozen agencies. This should be codified into law.

We also need commonsense reforms, like limiting the length of environmental impact statements to 150 pages, with a time limit of 2 years for their completion. It should not take 10 years to do an environmental review, and no human being is going to read a 3,000-page technical document. We hurt our environment more by dragging the permitting process out for years while more and more cars pile up in traffic.

Another innovative idea comes from our Australian allies. I am proud to chair the Friends of Australia Caucus with my good, Democrat friend, JOE COURTNEY. In 2014, Australia launched an Asset Recycling Initiative, a 5-year program that set aside \$3.3 billion in federal funding, which states could access if they sold or leased underutilized public assets to private firms. Money generated from sales or leasing was then reinvested into infrastructure projects at the state level. If states met certain criteria, the federal government would then match those revenues with an additional 15 percent.

Under asset recycling, the untapped value of America's underutilized infrastructure could be recaptured and then recycled into other urgent infrastructure needs. Our Nation has more infrastructure than any other nation, including China. Consequently, we have perhaps untold billions in value frozen in underutilized assets. Leasing or selling these assets to private firms would not only free up that value but also transfer the maintenance costs to private industry.

The potential benefits of this concept are enormous, especially if leveraged toward maintenance and repair of our existing system. In fact, the Trump administration championed this idea by proposing a Federal Incentives Program, setting aside \$100 billion to be granted to States and localities that could meet the criteria of asset recycling. The Trump plan proposed a 20 percent Federal match—even higher than Australia's 15 percent.

This was a promising idea that should not simply vanish because infrastructure talks broke down last year between the Speaker and the President. Since the essential problem in infrastructure is how to pay for it, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure should include programs exactly like these in a future infrastructure package.

□ 1730

Now, I will close shortly. I can see my colleagues who are working on the modernization of Congress, which is essential to fixing the problems I am identifying, are waiting to speak.

But I will close by saying that I am a huge student and fan of Dwight Eisenhower. I spent 3 months of my life in Abilene, Kansas, staying at the Holiday Inn Express, doing research there—very exciting for a man in his twenties. But I like Ike, and I believe, like Ike, that the Federal Government has a role to play in infrastructure.

During the Eisenhower administration, in partnership with Canada, the United States built the Saint Lawrence Seaway. His most ambitious domestic project, the interstate highway program, created a 41,000-mile road system.

When I look at Wisconsin, I see the impact that world-class infrastructure has had in keeping us economically competitive, so there should be no doubt that we need infrastructure.

There should also be no doubt that the current way of delivering, funding, and planning for infrastructure is not working. It is time to bring the way we think about infrastructure into the 21st century.

By focusing on infrastructure transparency and reporting, by repairing what we have first before constructing anew, and by innovating the way we fund and construct infrastructure, we can finally build a sustainable 21st century foundation across the Nation, even as we await the coming of hoverboards and jetpacks.

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

SELECT COMMITTEE ON THE MODERNIZATION OF CONGRESS

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. KILMER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of my Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KILMER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to speak about the work of the Select Committee on the Modernization of Congress.

As chair, I am extremely proud of what the select committee has accomplished in the past year. I am also proud of how we have accomplished our work.

In addition to unanimously passing 45 recommendations to improve the way Congress works, the select committee is establishing a new and meaningful precedent for bipartisan collaboration.

For those watching on C-SPAN, your television is not broken. We are actually proving that it is possible for Members of Congress from both sides of

the aisle to sit down together, engage in tough discussions, listen and learn from one another, and reach consensus. And I am fortunate and grateful to serve on this committee with such thoughtful and dedicated Members, including Vice Chair TOM GRAVES, whom we will hear from later this evening.

The select committee's guiding principle is to make Congress work better so that the institution and its Members can better serve the American people. That simple but profound goal guides all of our work. It helps us identify institutional problems and develop helpful solutions.

Last year, we held hearings on important topics like improving transparency in Congress, bettering constituent engagement, cultivating staff diversity and retention, developing next-generation leadership, technology best practices used in the States, the congressional schedule and calendar, and rules and procedures.

We kicked off this year with two hearings on Article I of the Constitution. The first focused on restoring congressional capacity, and the second focused on debate and deliberation.

While this may not have set any ratings records on C-SPAN, the reality is these hearings actually helped us dig deeper into the many challenges facing Congress and helped us identify innovative solutions to have this institution function better on behalf of the American people. As we continue to examine the range of issues in our mandate, we are going to continue to listen closely to what our colleagues and staff have to say about making Congress work better for the American people.

Many Members and staff have generously devoted their time and knowledge to helping the select committee think about policies to modernize Congress. We are grateful for their support and thrilled by the amount of interest our House colleagues have expressed in our work.

If one thing is clear, it is this: The desire to make Congress a more effective and efficient institution is actually devoid of partisanship. Modernizing Congress helps all Members to do a better job on behalf of their constituents.

So far, the select committee has reported three sets of recommendations containing a total of 45 unanimously approved recommendations out of committee. The committee reports containing these recommendations were reported to the House today, pursuant to section 201(f)(2) of H. Res. 6, and will be made publicly available at govinfo.gov.

Our first set of recommendations was reported favorably by the select committee last May and focused on improving transparency in Congress. Transparency increases accountability and, ultimately, improves the way Congress serves the American people.

While a lot of legislative information is public, it is often not made available in a format that is easy to access or to

review or to digest. These recommendations address transparency and accessibility problems and encourage the continuous public posting of new legislative information, including bill status, committee votes, program authorizations, and lobbying disclosures.

Ultimately, it is the people who pay for the data Congress collects, so they should be able to access basic information about what Members of Congress do here, whether it is following a bill through the process, seeing how we vote in committee and on the floor, or tracking what bills Members of Congress sponsor and cosponsor. Improving public access to legislative data is wholly consistent with making Congress work better for the American people.

Our second set of 24 recommendations were reported favorably by the committee last July. These recommendations fit into four broad categories.

The first set updates policies governing House human resources and consolidates the many H.R.-related offices in the House into a one-stop shop to help Members and staff with questions about recruitment, retention, diversity, legal counsel, training, and benefits. These recommendations recognize that attracting and retaining a diverse and highly qualified workforce requires offering competitive benefits and a motivating work environment.

The second set overhauls the onboarding process for new Members and provides continuing education for all Members.

The select committee has heard a lot about how new Member orientation should be nonpartisan and should include courses emphasizing the necessity of civility and respect. Rather than divide new Members by party as soon as they arrive here for orientation, we should encourage more relationship building.

Whether at the start of someone's service or later, Members should also have the opportunity to continue learning best practices so they can better serve those they represent.

The third set of recommendations modernizes House technology resources and emphasizes quality IT services to reduce reliance on outside vendors, to leverage bulk purchasing power, and to save taxpayer dollars.

Congress has been described by one of our colleagues as an 18th century institution using 20th century technology to solve 21st century problems. To address that, we also recommend reestablishing and reenvisioning the Office of Technology Assessment to help Congress address modern science and technology challenges.

Our fourth set of recommendations establishes that all proceedings and functions of the House should be made accessible to all Americans.

This year, we celebrate the 30th anniversary of the signing of the Americans with Disabilities Act. While much

progress has been made, there is still a lot of work to do to ensure that Americans with disabilities do not face discrimination. Our recommendations seek to address the equal access challenges persons with disabilities face when working for, visiting, or interacting with Congress.

Before I continue and dive into some of the other work of the select committee, I want to invite my colleague and the vice chair of the committee, the gentleman from Georgia, TOM GRAVES, to say a few words.

TOM has been a terrific partner, and I value the way that he has approached this committee, approaching these as problems to be solved, not working to score political points and, like every member of this committee, has really had his oar in the water trying to move our effort forward.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GRAVES), and I invite him to say a few words.

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. Madam Speaker, let me first thank Chairman KILMER for his great work. How he has led this committee has been remarkable and an example for all committees, so I thank him for that example.

Madam Speaker, I rise today not only to commend my good friend from Washington State, but to echo his remarks and also the pride and the joy that each of us on the committee share in the work that has been done.

I guess tonight I am representing the six Republican members of this completely bipartisan committee, and we have all committed to work together in a great way. So, on behalf of our side, I thank the chairman for his good work.

In the last year, as Mr. KILMER shared, we have passed 45 recommendations to make Congress work better for the American people. Now, he has highlighted the way we have worked together to get that job done, and I want to commend him for leading us in an environment of bipartisanship and true collaboration. It is through his commitment to success and thinking outside of the box that we have been able to break the mold and to get this job done. This is an opportunity that comes around about every couple of decades, and to see the work that the chairman has done and how he has led this committee is really a great thing to be a part of.

When the select committee first started, we chose to work together and combine our resources as one team. Instead of separating the staff and office by party line, we chose to just join together and work to get the job done as one team.

As Mr. KILMER often says: We decided to put the committee not in red jerseys and in blue jerseys but, instead, "fix Congress" jerseys. Thanks to him, this experiment has created a bipartisan bond of trust and collaboration unlike anything I have seen in my 10 years here in Congress.

In fact, our committee was only supposed to last for 1 year, through 2019.

But thanks to the support of our colleagues throughout the House, from freshman Members to Republican Study Committee members, to House leadership in both parties, to the new Democrat members of that Caucus and many other caucuses, we were able to get our committee extended through the end of this Congress.

Now, I know I speak for both of us when I say that we are grateful for the opportunity to build on last year's work and dive a little bit deeper into the issues affecting the legislative branch. Every recommendation we make aims to strengthen the capacity of the House so that we can better serve all Americans.

Our goal is simple. It was something we set out early on in an early retreat that we had together. The goal is simple, but it is critical, and that is we are to make Congress work better for the American people. It is that simple but yet that critical.

So, as the chairman shared, our first round of transparency-focused recommendations in May aimed to "open up" Congress for the American people. The work we do here in Washington is for our constituents, and they should be able to easily access information about our votes, about the bills and who is lobbying Congress.

What happens here should just be a click away, as the chairman said a minute ago, just one click, one-stop shopping. We want to make sure that the American people can truly view the inner workings of Congress.

While exploring ways to improve transparency and access, we heard from many of our colleagues and staff about the need for better technology and better processes here in the House. This also included giving offices the flexibility to hire more staff and to meet the needs of their constituents, as it is individual in each and every office.

We also recommended creating a Congressional Leadership Academy to offer training for Members, not just any ordinary training, but professional development training, because each and every Member deserves that opportunity to better prepare themselves in how to manage their offices and better represent their districts.

Every day that we are here, we should be asking the questions and learning about the issues that matter most to our constituents. Continued learning is an important part and an important piece of our representation here in Congress.

Another one of our recommendations that I think is incredibly important is that Members of Congress should receive mandatory cybersecurity training. Now, this idea came from one of our colleagues on our Member listening day, Miss KATHLEEN RICE from New York. She has a bill that requires this practice, and it is something that we have pushed forward as a recommendation in the House. Congressional staff must undergo cybersecurity training,

so our thought is that Members of Congress should do the same.

In September, we held a hearing to discuss improving civility throughout the Halls of Congress. At times, it felt like we were going against the grain just a bit on this issue. Recommendations on civility and bipartisanship are not something that I think the American people have heard from much here in Congress, but I think that is why this committee's work matters so much.

Even during times of division, we have to find a path forward. We recommended creating a bipartisan, Members-only space here in the Capitol to encourage more collaboration across party lines and instituting biennial bipartisan retreats for Members and their families at the start of each Congress so that Members and their families can begin to get to know each other.

I have often said that the breakdown in civility and bipartisanship here in Washington is because of the breakdown in relationships; and, in fact, maybe it is because many relationships haven't even begun yet. So it is important that we can talk to each other but, most importantly, that we can listen to one another.

So when it comes to communicating, we recognize the importance of good, robust communication with the American people as well. That is why we recommended increasing opportunities for constituents to communicate with their Representatives and allowing for faster correspondence between our offices and our constituents.

□ 1745

Now, we aren't finished yet. We have more work to do before the year is over. And I can think of no better capstone to my legislative career than to leave Congress in better shape for future Representatives.

Through the partnership of this committee with the Committee on House Administration, we have crafted legislation that will turn our bipartisan recommendations into results. This ongoing work is so important because it is the first time a committee like ours has seen its work move through the legislative process in this way.

So, as I close, no idea is too big or too small, and we encourage everyone to continue sharing their ideas with us to reform Congress. Together, we are giving the House a roadmap for a brighter future, and it wouldn't be possible without the great leadership of Chairman KILMER.

Mr. KILMER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his kind words and for his partnership. This has been a true partnership with every member of the committee, but I particularly appreciate Mr. GRAVES' leadership as our vice chair.

Madam Speaker, I want to just dive in a bit on where he ended, which is we are the first select committee in several decades to propose and adopt rec-

ommendations on a rolling basis. Put simply, when we have consensus, we move.

We are also the first select committee in recent history to introduce our recommendations as legislation, to ensure that they actually get implemented further on down the road.

We introduced legislation in December, H. Res. 756, that incorporates the first two sets of recommendations passed by the select committee, and we are expecting a committee markup soon.

The select committee unanimously approved a third set of recommendations in December, and those recommendations fit into three broad categories.

The first set emphasizes the necessity of civility and the importance of bipartisan collaboration in Congress. Select committee members believe that Congress is stronger when Members find ways to work together to solve problems, and civility is key to making Congress a more productive institution that better serves the American people. That is especially important now. And the select committee intends to continue pushing for improved civility through further recommendations.

The second set addresses various administrative inefficiencies in Congress: to update Member cosponsorship powers, procurement and bulk purchasing policies, the travel card program, and Member emergency preparedness training.

And the third set, modernize the House Franking Commission on mailing standards and its regulations governing all Member communications. The select committee worked closely with the Franking Commission to develop these recommendations, and we were pleased to see the Commission implement updated communication standards for Members in January. The new guidelines modernize franking rules by including digital communications, improving transparency, expediting the review process, and allowing for more seamless interaction with constituents across platforms.

As with our first two sets of recommendations, the select committee will introduce legislation that incorporates our third set of recommendations to ensure further implementation. We don't want to just make recommendations for the sake of making recommendations; we want to make recommendations that actually improve Congress and its function on behalf of the American people.

The select committee has accomplished a great deal in the past year, but there is still a lot more work to do. I believe I speak for all of the members of the committee when I say we are ready for that challenge. Our plan is to build on our success thus far and continue issuing recommendations over the next several months.

Working to build a more efficient and effective Congress that will better

serve the American people is a mission I am proud to lead, and I am lucky to lead this committee alongside Vice Chair TOM GRAVES, who has been a great and steadfast partner in this effort. I am lucky to have a terrific set of committee members who are working to make Congress function better on behalf of the American people.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. MULLIN (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today and the balance of the week on account of supporting his son's continuing recovery.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 49 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 26, 2020, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for Official Foreign Travel during the fourth quarter of 2019, pursuant to Public Law 95-384, are as follows:

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2019

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Daniel Lindholm	10/6	10/10	England & Malta		704.00						704.00
Phil Poe	10/6	10/12	England & Malta		704.00						704.00
Clement Abonyi, Jr.	10/9	10/10	Bahamas		397.00		2398.75		636.00		3431.75
Esther Kahng	10/9	10/10	Bahamas		397.00		2398.75		636.00		3431.75
Hon. Maxine Waters	10/10	10/10	Bahamas		238.00		2398.75		318.00		2954.75
Hon. Al Green	10/9	10/10	Bahamas		397.00		2398.75		636.00		3431.75
Committee total					2,837.00		9,595.00		2,226.00		14,658.00

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. MAXINE WATERS, Feb. 5, 2020.

(AMENDED) REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2019

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Karen Bass *	9/30	10/1	Germany		284.62		(³)	*		924.21	1,208.83
	10/1	10/3	Djibouti		762.00			*		817.30	1,579.30
	10/3	10/4	Niger		358.00			*		208.00	566.00
	10/4	10/5	Burkina Faso		233.00			*		1,345.10	1,578.10
Janette Yarwood	9/30	10/1	Germany		284.62						284.62
	10/1	10/3	Djibouti		762.00		(³)				762.00
	10/3	10/4	Niger		358.00						358.00
	10/4	10/5	Burkina Faso		233.00						233.00
Hon. Ilhan Omar	9/30	10/1	Germany		284.62		(³)				284.62
	10/1	10/3	Djibouti		762.00						762.00
	10/3	10/4	Niger		358.00						358.00
	10/4	10/5	Burkina Faso		233.00						233.00
Hon. James Sensenbrenner **	**	**	Germany		163.46		**	**	**		163.46
Meghan Gallagher	9/30	10/1	Germany		284.62		(³)				284.62
	10/1	10/3	Djibouti		762.00						762.00
	10/3	10/4	Niger		358.00						358.00
	10/4	10/5	Burkina Faso		233.00						233.00
Corey Holmes	9/30	10/1	Germany		284.62		(³)				284.62
	10/1	10/3	Djibouti		762.00						762.00
	10/3	10/4	Niger		358.00						358.00
	10/4	10/5	Burkina Faso		233.00						233.00
Hon. Ami Bera *	9/29	9/30	Philippines		925.00		14,102.23	*		1,175.90	16,203.13
	9/30	10/2	Malaysia		522.50			*		311.42	833.92
	10/2	10/5	Singapore		699.00			*		1,037.00	1,736.00
Nikole Burroughs	9/29	9/30	Philippines		925.00		10,736.33				11,661.33
	9/30	10/2	Malaysia		522.50						522.50
	10/2	10/5	Singapore		699.00						699.00
Chad Obermiller	9/29	9/30	Philippines		925.00		10,736.33				11,661.33
	9/30	10/2	Malaysia		522.50						522.50
	10/2	10/5	Singapore		699.00						699.00
Hon. William Keating *	9/30	10/4	Portugal		2,130.00		7,180.73	*		1,746.00	11,056.73
**	**	**	Azores		**		**	**	**		**
Hon. David Cicilline	9/30	10/4	Portugal		2,130.00		2,916.73		**		5,046.73
	**	**	Azores		**		**	**	**		**
Hon. Juan Vargas	9/30	10/4	Portugal		2,130.00		4,697.93		**		6,827.93
	**	**	Azores		**		**	**	**		**
Gabrielle Gould	9/30	10/4	Portugal		2,130.00		2,364.03		**		4,494.03
	**	**	Azores		**		**	**	**		**
Hon. Gregory Meeks	9/30	10/1	The Bahamas		431.72		1,254.23				1,685.95
Hon. Abigail Spanberger	10/3	10/4	Afghanistan		66.00		12,266.03				12,332.03
	10/4	10/6	Jordan		704.01						704.01
Janice Kaguyutan	10/6	10/9	Colombia		983.00		2,641.00				3,624.00
	10/9	10/10	Curacao		300.00						300.00
	10/10	10/12	Trinidad and Tobago		754.00						754.00
Sajit Gandhi *	10/9	10/12	Pakistan		447.00		9,292.45	*		509.72	10,249.17
Theresa Lou	10/9	10/12	Pakistan		452.00		9,362.45				9,814.45
Mariana Cruz Munoz *	11/4	11/6	Guatemala		460.10		999.03	*		105.00	1,564.13
	11/6	11/10	Mexico		1,260.00						1,260.00
Alex Sadler	11/4	11/6	Guatemala		460.10		999.03				1,459.13
	11/6	11/10	Mexico		1,260.00						1,260.00
Lesley Warner *	11/2	11/10	Sudan		1,422.50		8,365.38	*		390.00	10,177.88
Taylor Redick	11/2	11/10	Sudan		1,422.50		8,365.38				9,787.88
John Stapleton	11/2	11/10	Sudan		1,422.50		8,365.38				9,787.88

(AMENDED) REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2019—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. John Curtis	11/22	11/23	Kuwait		423.18		(³)				423.18
	11/23	11/25	Afghanistan		121.00						121.00
	11/25	11/26	Belgium		338.08						338.08
Hon. Ted Deutch *	11/22	11/25	Bahrain		2,038.77		11,929.15	*		218.28	14,186.20
Casey Kustin	11/22	11/25	Bahrain		1,202.39		11,586.15				12,788.54
Hon. Joe Wilson	11/22	11/25	Bahrain		2,038.77		11,587.95				13,626.72
Gabriella Zach	11/22	11/25	Bahrain		1,202.39		11,587.95				12,790.34
Hon. David Cicilline*	12/23	12/24	Kuwait		422.00		(³)			1,997.00	2,419.00
	12/24	12/25	Bahrain		376.86			*		1,876.60	2,253.46
	12/25	12/25	Qatar		322.84			*		342.03	664.87
	12/25	12/27	Italy		549.50			*		3,113.08	3,662.58
Hon. Lee Zeldin	12/23	12/24	Kuwait		422.00		(³)				422.00
	12/24	12/25	Bahrain		376.86						376.86
	12/25	12/25	Qatar		322.84						322.84
	12/25	12/27	Italy		549.50						549.50
Hon. Brian Fitzpatrick	12/23	12/24	Kuwait		422.00		(³)				422.00
	12/24	12/25	Bahrain		376.86						376.86
	12/25	12/25	Qatar		322.84						322.84
	12/25	12/27	Italy		549.50						549.50
Hon. Susan Wild	12/23	12/24	Kuwait		423.00		(³)				423.00
	12/24	12/25	Bahrain		376.86						376.86
	12/25	12/25	Qatar		322.84						322.84
	12/25	12/27	Italy		599.12						599.12
Hon. Dean Phillips	12/23	12/24	Kuwait		423.00		(³)				423.00
	12/24	12/25	Bahrain		376.85						376.85
	12/25	12/25	Qatar		322.84						322.84
	12/25	12/27	Italy		599.12						599.12
Jaclyn Cahan	12/23	12/24	Kuwait		423.00		(³)				423.00
	12/24	12/25	Bahrain		376.85						376.85
	12/25	12/25	Qatar		322.84						322.84
	12/25	12/27	Italy		549.50						549.50
Matt Finkel**	**	**	Italy		435.50		**	**	**		435.50
Hon. Albio Sires**	**	**	Guyana		202.00		**	**	**		202.00
Hon. Gregory Meeks**	**	**	Guyana		202.00		**	**	**		202.00
Alexander Brockwell**	**	**	Guyana		202.00		**	**	**		202.00
Mariana Cruz Munoz	**	**	Guyana		202.00		**	**	**		202.00
Jennifer Hendrixson-White*	12/14	12/16	Hong Kong		958.41		1,735.85	*		1,770.70	4,464.96
Theresa Lou	12/14	12/16	Hong Kong		955.41		1,735.85				2,691.26
Bryan Burack	12/14	12/16	Hong Kong		967.41		1,735.85				2,703.26
Committee total					56,775.22		166,543.42			17,887.34	241,205.98

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

³ Military air transportation.

* Indicates Delegation costs.

** Indicates a cancelled mission.

HON. ELIOT L. ENGEL, Feb. 13, 2020.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

3857. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Nomenclature Changes; Technical Amendment [Doc. No.: AMS-LRRS-19-0099] received February 18, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3858. A letter from the Regulatory Officer, Foreign Agricultural Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Technical Assistance for Specialty Crops Program (RIN: 0551-AA98) received February 20, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3859. A letter from the Regulatory Officer, Foreign Agricultural Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Foreign Market Development Program (RIN: 0551-AA96) received February 20, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3860. A letter from the Regulatory Officer, Foreign Agricultural Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Market Access Program (RIN: 0551-AA97) received February 20, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3861. A letter from the Regulatory Officer, Foreign Agricultural Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Emerging Markets Program (RIN: 0551-AA95) received February 20, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3862. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Nuclear, Chemical, and Biological Defense Programs, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter stating that by June 2020 the National Nuclear Security Administration will submit certification that the Administration's budget meets nuclear stockpile and stockpile stewardship requirements; to the Committee on Armed Services.

3863. A letter from the Deputy Chief, Disability Rights Office, Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Structure and Practices of the Video Relay Service Program [CG Docket No.: 10-51]; Telecommunications Relay Services and Speech-to-Speech Services for Individuals with Hearing and Speech Disabilities [CG Docket No.: 03-123] received February 20, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3864. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Venezuela that was declared in Executive Order 13692 of March 8, 2015, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); Public Law 94-412, Sec. 401(c); (90 Stat. 1257) and 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); Public Law 95-223, Sec 204(c);

(91 Stat. 1627); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3865. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Addition of Entities to the Entity List, and Revision of Entry on the Entity List [Docket No.: 200211-0050] (RIN: 0694-AH96) received February 20, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3866. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a 6-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Iran that was declared in Executive Order 12957 of March 15, 1995, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); Public Law 94-412, Sec. 401(c); (90 Stat. 1257) and 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); Public Law 95-223, Sec 204(c); (91 Stat. 1627); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3867. A letter from the Auditor, Office of the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting a final report titled "Twenty Percent of ODCA Recommendations Implemented; 49% In Progress", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 455(d); (87 Stat. 803); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

3868. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's 2019 Annual Performance Report and FY 2021 Annual Performance Plan, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1115(b); Public Law 111-352, Sec. 3; (124 Stat. 3867); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

3869. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric

Administration, transmitting the Administration's final specifications — Pacific Island Pelagic Fisheries; 2018 U.S. Territorial Longline Bigeye Tuna Catch Limits [Docket No.: 180208146-8946-01] (RIN: 0648-XG025) received February 18, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3870. A letter from the Assistant Deputy Director for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Technical Amendment To Update Internet Web Addresses in Marine Mammal Protection Act and Dolphin Protection Consumer Information Act Regulations [Docket No.: 170803723-8016-01] (RIN: 0648-BH09) received February 18, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3871. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — International Fisheries; Pacific Tuna Fisheries; Fishing Restrictions for Tropical Tuna in the Eastern Pacific Ocean for 2018 to 2020 [Docket No.: 170815763-8270-02] (RIN: 0648-BH13) received February 18, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3872. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands; Final 2019 and 2020 Harvest Specifications for Groundfish [Docket No.: 180713633-9174-02] (RIN: 0648-XG356) received February 18, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3873. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Magnuson-Stevens Act Provisions; Fisheries Off West Coast States; Pacific Coast Groundfish Fishery; 2019-2020 Biennial Specifications and Management Measures; Correction [Docket No.: 190913-0028] (RIN: 0648-BJ21) received February 18, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3874. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Herring Fishery; Adjustments to 2018 Management Area Annual Catch Limits [Docket No.: 171213999-8128-01] (RIN: 0648-XY898) received February 18, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3875. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting the annual report on bankruptcy statistics mandated by the Bankruptcy Abuse Prevention and Consumer Protection Act of 2005, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 159(b)(3); Public Law 109-8, Sec. 601(a); (119 Stat. 119); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3876. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety

Zone; Isle of Wight Bay, Ocean City, MD [Docket Number: USCG-2019-0897] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received February 18, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3877. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; Delaware River, Hamilton Township, NJ [Docket No.: USCG-2020-0072] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received February 18, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3878. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Coast Guard Sector Virginia; Technical Amendment [Docket Number: USCG-2019-0943] received February 18, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3879. A letter from the Chief, Office of Policy and Regulatory Development and Research, Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Fees for the Unified Carrier Registration Plan and Agreement [Docket No.: FMCSA-2019-0066] (RIN: 2126-AC26) received February 18, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3880. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Office of Chief Counsel, Federal Railroad Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Risk Reduction Program [Docket No.: FRA-2009-0038, Notice No. 7] (RIN: 2130-AC11) received February 19, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3881. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final regulation — Determination of the Maximum Value of a Vehicle for Use with the Fleet-Average and Vehicle Cents-Per-Mile Valuation Rules [TD 9893] (RIN: 1545-BP14) received February 14, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3882. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Reconsideration of Revenue Ruling 2009-13 and Revenue Ruling 2009-14 (Rev. Rul. 2020-05) received February 14, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3883. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulations and Reports Clearance, Social Security Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Advance Designation of Representative Payees for Social Security Beneficiaries [Docket No.: SSA-2018-0028] (RIN: 0960-AI33) received February 18, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3884. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Special Operations/Low Intensity Conflict, Department of Defense, transmitting a report on Procedures for Status Review of Detainees outside the United States, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 801 note; Public Law 109-163, Sec. 1405(d)(1); (119 Stat. 3477); jointly to the Committees on Armed Services and the Judiciary.

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. 315. A bill to amend the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 to authorize partnerships between States and nongovernmental entities for the purpose of reclaiming and restoring land and water resources adversely affected by coal mining activities before August 3, 1977, and for other purposes (Rept. 116-404). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GRIJALVA: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 3399. A bill to amend the Nutria Eradication and Control Act of 2003 to include California in the program, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 116-405). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. KILMER: Select Committee on the Modernization of Congress. Recommendations to Improve Transparency in the U.S. House of Representatives (Rept. 116-406). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. KILMER: Select Committee on the Modernization of Congress. Recommendations to Streamline House Human Resources, Overhaul the Onboarding Process, Improve Member Continuing Education Opportunities, Modernize House Technology, and Improve Accessibility (Rept. 116-407). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. KILMER: Select Committee on the Modernization of Congress. Recommendations to Encourage Civility and Bipartisanship in Congress, Streamline Processes and Save Taxpayer Dollars, and Increase the Quality of Constituent Communication (Rept. 116-408). 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. LAHOOD (for himself, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, and Mr. BILIRAKIS):

H.R. 5952. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve access to skilled nursing facility services for hemophilia patients; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GRAVES of Missouri (for himself, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. PLASKETT, Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico, and Mr. CARBAJAL):

H.R. 5953. A bill to amend the Disaster Recovery Reform Act of 2018 to require the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency to waive certain debts owed to the United States related to covered assistance provided to an individual or household, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. SLOTKIN:

H.R. 5954. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 108 West Maple Street in Holly, Michigan, as

the "Holly Veterans Memorial Post Office"; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. CARSON of Indiana:

H.R. 5955. A bill to posthumously award a Congressional gold medal to Muhammad Ali, in recognition of his contributions to the Nation; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 5956. A bill to reduce Federal spending and the deficit by terminating taxpayer financing of Presidential election campaigns; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on House Administration, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GREEN of Tennessee (for himself and Mr. LYNCH):

H.R. 5957. A bill to direct the Secretary of Defense to conduct a study regarding toxic exposure by members of the Armed Forces deployed to Karshi Khanabad Air Base, Uzbekistan, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to establish a registry regarding such exposure, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HIGGINS of New York (for himself and Mr. STEUBE):

H.R. 5958. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to create senior health planning accounts funded by the proceeds of the sale or assignment of life insurance contracts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HUIZENGA:

H.R. 5959. A bill to amend the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 to require the authorization of members of a labor organization before such organization may make certain political expenditures, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio:

H.R. 5960. A bill to require the Secretary of the Army to convey certain Federal property in the State of Ohio to the Friends of Barker House; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. KHANNA (for himself and Mr. FITZPATRICK):

H.R. 5961. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to support apprenticeship programs; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KHANNA (for himself, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. CICILLINE, Mrs. DAVIS

of California, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. HAALAND, Ms. NORTON, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KILMER, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. NEGUSE, Mr. PAPPAS, Mr. POCAN, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. ROUDA, Ms. SCANLON, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ):

H.R. 5962. A bill to require the Secretary of State to require the inclusion of a gender neutral designation in a passport, passport card, or Consular Report of Birth Abroad, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY (for himself and Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York):

H.R. 5963. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to reporting of consumer complaints by electronic nicotine dispenser system manufac-

turers and importers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LUJÁN:

H.R. 5964. A bill to establish a technology-based job training and education program; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LUJÁN (for himself, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. SWALWELL of California, and Mr. FOSTER):

H.R. 5965. A bill to direct the Secretary of Energy to award grants to establish Lab-Embedded Entrepreneurship Programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. LUJÁN (for himself, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. UNDERWOOD, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. HAALAND, and Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN):

H.R. 5966. A bill to direct the Secretary of Energy to fund projects to restore and modernize the National Laboratories, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. LUJÁN (for himself and Mr. TAKANO):

H.R. 5967. A bill to amend the Museum and Library Services Act to authorize grants to support the use of public libraries for community economic development; to the Committee on Education and Labor, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LUJÁN (for himself and Ms. HAALAND):

H.R. 5968. A bill to require the Secretary of Energy to establish a program to increase participation in community solar and the receipt of associated benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Reform, 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. ROSE of New York (for himself, Mr. KING of New York, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H.R. 5969. A bill to establish a grant program to provide amounts to public housing agencies to install automatic sprinkler systems in public housing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. SCANLON:

H.R. 5970. A bill to amend titles II and XVI of the Social Security Act to direct the Commissioner of Social Security to consider linguistic limitations in disability determinations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TED LIEU of California:

H. Con. Res. 91. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for a ceremony to present the Congressional Gold Medal collectively to the Chinese-American veterans of World War II; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. ESPAILLAT (for himself, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. OMAR, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, and Ms. TLAIB):

H. Res. 863. A resolution reaffirming the importance of ensuring justice is provided to Malcolm X and the need to reopen the investigation into the assassination of this profound and fearless civil rights leader; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANGEVIN (for himself, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Ms. CRAIG, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. BRINDISI, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. BALDERSON, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. CARTER

of Texas, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. NORMAN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. MORELLE, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. KELLER, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. COMER, Mr. UPTON, Ms. WILD, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. CASTEN of Illinois, Ms. FINKENAUER, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. POCAN, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. BOST, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. HOULAHAN, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. STEIL, Mr. BARR, Ms. BLUNT ROCH-ESTER, Mr. LATTA, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. WOODALL, Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico, Mr. COX of California, Mrs. AXNE, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. GARAMENDI, and Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma):

H. Res. 864. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of Career and Technical Education Month; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. TAKANO (for himself and Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee):

H. Res. 865. A resolution recognizing the 100th anniversary of Disabled American Veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule II 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. LAHOOD:

H.R. 5952.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. GRAVES of Missouri:

H.R. 5953.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically Clause 1 (relating to providing for the common defense and general welfare of the United States) and Clause 3 (related to regulation of Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with Indian tribes) and Clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress).

By Ms. SLOTKIN:

H.R. 5954.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8

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 Mr. CARSON of Indiana:

H.R. 5955.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 18 of section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:
H.R. 5956.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution
By Mr. GREEN of Tennessee:
H.R. 5957.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States
By Mr. HIGGINS of New York:
H.R. 5958.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8
By Mr. HUIZENGA:
H.R. 5959.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.
By Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio:
H.R. 5960.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2
The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to Prejudice any Claims of the United States, or of any particular State.
By Mr. KHANNA:
H.R. 5961.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8
By Mr. KHANNA:
H.R. 5962.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8
By Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY:
H.R. 5963.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.
By Mr. LUJÁN:
H.R. 5964.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I Section 8
By Mr. LUJÁN:
H.R. 5965.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8
By Mr. LUJÁN:
H.R. 5966.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8
By Mr. LUJÁN:
H.R. 5967.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I Section 8
By Mr. LUJÁN:
H.R. 5968.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8
By Mr. ROSE of New York:
H.R. 5969.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8 US Constitution: "To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof."
By Ms. SCANLON:
H.R. 5970.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section VIII.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 38: Mr. HUIZENGA.
H.R. 41: Ms. JAYAPAL.
H.R. 85: Mr. BANKS.
H.R. 96: Mr. TONKO.
H.R. 273: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H.R. 445: Mr. SIRES.
H.R. 446: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
H.R. 463: Mr. DEFAZIO and Mr. LANGEVIN.
H.R. 467: Mrs. LURIA.
H.R. 530: Mr. NEAL.
H.R. 587: Mr. HICE of Georgia, Ms. TORRES SMALL of New Mexico, Mr. CISNEROS, Mr. ROY, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, and Mr. CLEAVER.
H.R. 613: Mr. MURPHY of North Carolina.
H.R. 808: Mr. TRONE.
H.R. 838: Ms. SHALALA.
H.R. 873: Mrs. TRAHAN.
H.R. 879: Ms. WILSON of Florida.
H.R. 913: Mrs. LURIA.
H.R. 924: Mr. KIM.
H.R. 929: Mr. KEVIN HERN of Oklahoma, Mr. STEUBE, Ms. STEVENS, Mr. HARDER of California, and Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 941: Mr. BANKS.
H.R. 945: Mr. RUIZ.
H.R. 955: Mrs. DEMINGS.
H.R. 1034: Mr. KELLY of Mississippi.
H.R. 1078: Mr. CORREA and Mr. LUJÁN.
H.R. 1109: Mr. MORELLE, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Ms. DEAN, and Mr. COOPER.
H.R. 1133: Mr. SWALWELL of California and Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 1166: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 1266: Ms. SHERRILL and Mr. COURTNEY.
H.R. 1366: Mr. EMMER.
H.R. 1374: Mr. WOMACK and Mr. FLORES.
H.R. 1379: Mr. HORSFORD and Mr. NADLER.
H.R. 1400: Ms. STEVENS and Mr. STANTON.
H.R. 1443: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
H.R. 1444: Mr. NORMAN.
H.R. 1454: Mrs. HAYES.
H.R. 1529: Mrs. TRAHAN.
H.R. 1530: Ms. HOULAHAN.
H.R. 1549: Mr. SMITH of Washington.
H.R. 1554: Mr. BALDERSON.
H.R. 1629: Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. VELA, Mrs. ROBY, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. MURPHY of North Carolina, Mr. NEAL, Mr. CROW, and Mr. NORMAN.
H.R. 1643: Mr. WELCH, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. PAYNE, and Ms. PORTER.
H.R. 1661: Mr. SHERMAN and Mr. LEVIN of Michigan.
H.R. 1694: Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL.
H.R. 1695: Mr. LANGEVIN.
H.R. 1735: Mr. SARBANES.
H.R. 1753: Mr. WEBER of Texas.
H.R. 1754: Mr. VEASEY, Mr. STANTON, and Mr. RICHMOND.
H.R. 1767: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut and Ms. SLOTKIN.
H.R. 1824: Ms. UNDERWOOD.
H.R. 1873: Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. STAUBER.
H.R. 1885: Mr. WATKINS.
H.R. 1948: Mr. BEYER and Mr. ALLEN.
H.R. 1992: Mr. WELCH.
H.R. 2062: Mr. CASE.
H.R. 2073: Mrs. LURIA.
H.R. 2086: Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. YARMUTH, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. GOLDEN, Mr. HARDER of California, Mr. YOHIO, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, and Mr. LEVIN of Michigan.
H.R. 2094: Mr. TONKO.
H.R. 2117: Mr. STAUBER and Mr. LANGEVIN.

H.R. 2155: Mr. HASTINGS.
H.R. 2158: Mr. BROOKS of Alabama.
H.R. 2164: Mr. ESPAILLAT.
H.R. 2191: Mrs. LURIA.
H.R. 2200: Mr. MASSIE.
H.R. 2201: Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana and Mr. O'HALLERAN.
H.R. 2208: Ms. HAALAND.
H.R. 2264: Mrs. DAVIS of California.
H.R. 2305: Mr. LEVIN of Michigan.
H.R. 2328: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.
H.R. 2344: Mr. RESCHENTHALER.
H.R. 2350: Mr. LYNCH, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. BOST, and Mr. BURCHETT.
H.R. 2393: Mr. PASCRELL.
H.R. 2420: Mr. WITTMAN.
H.R. 2438: Mr. CROW, Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL, Mr. STAUBER, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. STANTON, and Mr. TED LIEU of California.
H.R. 2487: Mr. COLE.
H.R. 2491: Ms. LEE of California.
H.R. 2506: Mrs. LESKO.
H.R. 2650: Mrs. AXNE.
H.R. 2651: Mr. DEFAZIO.
H.R. 2693: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
H.R. 2720: Mr. GALLEGGO and Mr. LEVIN of California.
H.R. 2733: Mr. CROW, Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL, and Mr. TED LIEU of California.
H.R. 2771: Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana.
H.R. 2775: Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 2825: Ms. SCHRIER.
H.R. 2854: Mrs. DAVIS of California.
H.R. 2891: Mr. HARDER of California.
H.R. 2895: Mrs. WAGNER.
H.R. 2937: Mr. CISNEROS.
H.R. 2974: Ms. HOULAHAN.
H.R. 2989: Mrs. LESKO.
H.R. 2999: Mr. BACON, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, and Mr. DEFAZIO.
H.R. 3061: Mr. POCAN, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. SPANO, and Mr. HIMES.
H.R. 3077: Mr. HASTINGS.
H.R. 3107: Mr. GOHMERT and Mr. CASTRO of Texas.
H.R. 3138: Mr. CLAY.
H.R. 3165: Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY and Mrs. DEMINGS.
H.R. 3214: Mr. DEUTCH.
H.R. 3250: Mr. MCEACHIN.
H.R. 3296: Mr. PETERS.
H.R. 3297: Mr. POSEY.
H.R. 3332: Ms. WILD and Mr. SHERMAN.
H.R. 3463: Ms. HOULAHAN.
H.R. 3495: Mr. GROTHMAN.
H.R. 3509: Mr. LYNCH.
H.R. 3510: Mr. FOSTER, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. BACON.
H.R. 3559: Mr. FLORES.
H.R. 3570: Mr. GALLEGGO.
H.R. 3627: Ms. SCANLON.
H.R. 3663: Ms. DEAN.
H.R. 3666: Mr. GOODEN.
H.R. 3681: Mrs. DINGELL.
H.R. 3742: Mr. CROW and Ms. GABBARD.
H.R. 3762: Mrs. LAWRENCE.
H.R. 3794: Mr. SIRES and Mr. POSEY.
H.R. 3801: Mr. HARDER of California.
H.R. 3874: Mr. SUOZZI.
H.R. 3923: Mr. CARBAJAL.
H.R. 3929: Mr. RYAN, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. TED LIEU of California, and Mr. KILDEE.
H.R. 3957: Mr. TED LIEU of California.
H.R. 3961: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
H.R. 3964: Mr. WATKINS.
H.R. 3969: Mr. NEGUSE and Mr. SUOZZI.
H.R. 3975: Mr. FLORES.
H.R. 3980: Mr. NORMAN.
H.R. 4070: Mrs. WALORSKI.
H.R. 4101: Mrs. DEMINGS.
H.R. 4104: Mr. HARDER of California, Mr. NEGUSE, and Mr. LYNCH.
H.R. 4129: Ms. WILSON of Florida and Mr. DEFAZIO.
H.R. 4138: Ms. DELBENE.
H.R. 4144: Mr. RUIZ.

- H.R. 4189: Ms. ESCOBAR.
H.R. 4228: Mr. CASTEN of Illinois.
H.R. 4230: Mr. ROONEY of Florida.
H.R. 4248: Mr. LOEBSACK.
H.R. 4296: Mrs. LURIA.
H.R. 4339: Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 4348: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SWALWELL of California, and Ms. SANCHEZ.
H.R. 4370: Mr. KINZINGER.
H.R. 4374: Mr. SIRES.
H.R. 4420: Ms. WILD.
H.R. 4439: Mrs. RODGERS of Washington and Mrs. LURIA.
H.R. 4451: Mrs. DEMINGS.
H.R. 4456: Mrs. WAGNER and Mrs. LURIA.
H.R. 4474: Ms. SEWELL of Alabama.
H.R. 4519: Mr. WELCH.
H.R. 4526: Mr. HORSFORD.
H.R. 4540: Ms. ESHOO, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. KIM, and Ms. DEAN.
H.R. 4549: Mr. SMITH of Missouri.
H.R. 4560: Mr. CASTEN of Illinois and Mr. YARMUTH.
H.R. 4574: Mr. RASKIN, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. PHILLIPS, Mr. TRONE, and Mr. DEFAZIO.
H.R. 4613: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 4681: Mr. THOMPSON of California and Mr. CUELLAR.
H.R. 4684: Ms. LEE of California.
H.R. 4735: Mrs. MILLER.
H.R. 4762: Mr. DAVIDSON of Ohio.
H.R. 4817: Mr. PANETTA.
H.R. 4820: Ms. TORRES SMALL of New Mexico.
H.R. 4822: Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 4870: Mr. BILIRAKIS.
H.R. 4901: Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 4926: Ms. SHERRILL.
H.R. 4932: Mr. BACON, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Ms. WILD, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. RYAN, and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.
H.R. 4940: Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas.
H.R. 4945: Mr. TED LIEU of California and Mr. HASTINGS.
H.R. 5046: Ms. JACKSON LEE.
H.R. 5050: Ms. BONAMICI and Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 5051: Mr. HUIZENGA.
H.R. 5075: Ms. SPEIER and Mr. NADLER.
H.R. 5104: Mr. SMITH of Washington and Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 5117: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H.R. 5170: Mr. LEVIN of Michigan and Mr. SWALWELL of California.
H.R. 5172: Mr. SOTO, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mr. STIVERS, and Mr. GROTHMAN.
H.R. 5234: Mr. SENSENBRENNER and Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 5248: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia and Mr. VEASEY.
H.R. 5265: Mrs. DAVIS of California.
H.R. 5312: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. DEFAZIO, and Mr. TED LIEU of California.
H.R. 5319: Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL.
H.R. 5325: Mr. PAYNE, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. NADLER, Mr. RICHMOND, Ms. NORTON, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Ms. CRAIG.
H.R. 5408: Mr. ADERHOLT, Mrs. AXNE, and Mr. BOST.
H.R. 5413: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 5435: Mrs. DINGELL.
H.R. 5453: Mr. TONKO.
H.R. 5485: Mr. CISNEROS.
H.R. 5491: Mrs. BUSTOS.
H.R. 5494: Mr. CISNEROS.
H.R. 5534: Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. RYAN, Mr. BUCSHON, and Mr. LONG.
H.R. 5544: Mr. CONNOLLY and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 5549: Mrs. RODGERS of Washington, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. GAETZ.
H.R. 5552: Ms. JACKSON LEE.
H.R. 5596: Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina.
H.R. 5598: Mr. MCGOVERN and Mr. SIRES.
H.R. 5599: Mr. FOSTER.
H.R. 5602: Mr. NEGUSE, Mrs. LURIA, and Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 5605: Mr. MURPHY of North Carolina, Mr. HUDSON, and Mrs. DAVIS of California.
H.R. 5631: Mrs. TRAHAN and Mr. TONKO.
H.R. 5698: Mr. RIGGLEMAN.
H.R. 5706: Mr. BURCHETT.
H.R. 5711: Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. RUIZ, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. COX of California, and Mr. SCHIFF.
H.R. 5739: Mr. SIRES.
H.R. 5747: Mr. SABLAN.
H.R. 5768: Ms. JACKSON LEE.
H.R. 5771: Mr. PALAZZO.
H.R. 5774: Mr. HARRIS.
H.R. 5790: Mr. TRONE.
H.R. 5813: Mr. TED LIEU of California.
H.R. 5814: Ms. HAALAND and Ms. BARRAGÁN.
H.R. 5826: Mrs. MURPHY of Florida.
H.R. 5845: Mr. NEGUSE, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.
H.R. 5856: Mr. BABIN.
H.R. 5859: Ms. FOXX of North Carolina, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. GOSAR, and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 5860: Mr. MORELLE.
H.R. 5874: Mr. ROUDA.
H.R. 5875: Mr. NORMAN, Mr. BUDD, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. WEBER of Texas, and Mr. GOSAR.
H.R. 5886: Mr. MALINOWSKI.
H.R. 5887: Mrs. BUSTOS and Mrs. DAVIS of California.
H.R. 5902: Mr. STEUBE and Mrs. RADEWAGEN.
H.R. 5909: Mr. HARDER of California.
H.R. 5915: Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. TLAIB, and Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 5916: Mrs. RODGERS of Washington.
H.R. 5920: Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. KHANNA, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Mr. SIRES.
H.R. 5921: Mr. PALAZZO.
H.R. 5929: Mr. RASKIN, Mr. HECK, Mr. CLEAVER, and Mr. LYNCH.
H.R. 5931: Ms. TLAIB.
H.R. 5935: Mr. MARSHALL and Mr. ADERHOLT.
H.R. 5937: Ms. HOULAHAN.
H.R. 5950: Mr. SAN NICOLAS.
H. Con. Res. 20: Mr. HOLDING.
H. Con. Res. 27: Mr. KING of New York.
H. Con. Res. 37: Mr. HARDER of California.
H. Con. Res. 49: Ms. WILSON of Florida.
H. Con. Res. 85: Mr. WALTZ and Mr. LAWSON of Florida.
H. Res. 114: Ms. WEXTON.
H. Res. 149: Mr. SMITH of Missouri and Mr. COLLINS of Georgia.
H. Res. 189: Mrs. DEMINGS.
H. Res. 255: Mr. BYRNE and Mr. ADERHOLT.
H. Res. 374: Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina and Mr. WOMACK.
H. Res. 512: Mr. CASTEN of Illinois.
H. Res. 642: Mr. BUDD and Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H. Res. 659: Mr. MEUSER.
H. Res. 742: Mr. GRIJALVA.
H. Res. 759: Mr. MOULTON.
H. Res. 803: Mr. SPANO.
H. Res. 810: Mrs. BUSTOS.
H. Res. 823: Mr. HUFFMAN and Mr. THOMPSON of California.
H. Res. 835: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H. Res. 840: Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mrs. LEE of Nevada, and Mr. SWALWELL of California.
H. Res. 843: Mr. BALDERSON.
H. Res. 862: Mr. HILL of Arkansas, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. DEAN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. SIMPSON, Ms. HOULAHAN, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. TRONE, Mr. RUSH, Mrs. BUSTOS, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. GALLEGGO, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. LAMB, Mr. COMER, and Mr. FOSTER.



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 166

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 2020

No. 37

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.

O Lord our God, how excellent is Your Name in all the Earth. From dawn to sunset, Your mercies sustain us.

Today, inspire our Senators to embrace Your promises. May they remember Your promises to supply their needs, to never forsake them, and to prevent anything from separating them from Your love.

Lord, bestow Your blessings upon our lawmakers, making them wiser, stronger, and better, glorifying You in their labors. Use them to advance Your Kingdom in our Nation and world, as they attune their will to Your purposes.

We pray in Your blessed 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 speak for 1 minute in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRESCRIPTION DRUG COSTS

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, I would like to bring my colleagues up to date on a bipartisan bill to lower drug prices and also, at the same time, give an update on the pharmaceutical industry's opposition to this legislation.

Beware the next time Big Pharma claims what we are trying to do to lower drug prices, in their words, "undermines the free market." Just remember this. The pharmaceutical industry supported ObamaCare.

Big Pharma doesn't want a free market. Take note that this industry opposes every proposal that would cost it money and supports every proposal that ensures another government revenue stream. That is exactly what ObamaCare did and that is what Medicare and Medicaid do now.

Big Pharma has become so big and entitled that they have the gall to claim that limiting taxpayer subsidies is somehow socialism. ObamaCare has a stream that does that, as does Medicare and Medicaid. In fact, this is what ending corporate welfare and demanding accountability to taxpayers is all about. It seems to me that ending those subsidies would be a very conservative principle.

The Grassley-Wyden prescription drug bill saves tens of billions of dollars of taxpayer money and has no negative impact on pharmaceutical innovation. That is exactly what the CBO has said and that is why even the free-market, libertarian CATO Institute has endorsed this legislation.

So I encourage my Republican colleagues to join me and Senator WYDEN in that bipartisan effort.

I yield the floor.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

ABORTION

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, today, every Senator will be able to take a clear moral stand. We will have the chance to proceed to commonsense legislation that will move our Nation closer to the international mainstream

with respect to defending innocent human life. There are only seven nations left in the entire world where an unborn child can be killed by elective abortion after 20 weeks, and the United States of America, unfortunately, is one of them.

Set aside all of the far-left rhetoric that will greet Senator GRAHAM's straightforward legislation and consider this simple fact: Do our Democratic colleagues really believe that what our country needs is a radical fringe position on elective abortion that we only share with China, North Korea, and four other countries in the entire world?

The American people don't seem to think that is what we need. One recent survey found that 70 percent of all Americans believe that at a minimum—at a minimum—elective abortion should be limited to the first 3 months of pregnancy. That even includes about half of the respondents who self-identify as pro-choice.

I hope this body will proceed to Senator GRAHAM's Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act later today. I see no reason why at the very least our Democratic colleagues should vote against even proceeding to this legislation and having a debate. If there is a persuasive and principled case why America should remain on the radical international fringe on this subject, let us hear it. Let us have the debate. Few Americans agree with that radical position, but let's have the debate.

If my Democratic colleagues block the Senate from even proceeding to consider this legislation here today, the message they will send will be chilling and clear. The radical demands of the far left will drown out common sense and the views of most Americans.

The same goes for Senator SASSE's legislation, the Born-Alive Survivors Protection Act. Even if most Washington Democrats persist in their resistance to any commonsense protections for the unborn, surely, we must

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



Printed on recycled paper.

S1123

be able to agree that children who are born deserve protection. Surely, that much cannot be controversial.

There is currently no Federal mandate that children who are delivered alive following an attempted abortion should receive medical care. There is no clear guarantee that every child born alive in the United States, whether they were intended to be or not, is entitled to the same life-giving medical attention.

The Kentuckians whom I speak with cannot comprehend why this could be some hotly debated proposition. It almost defies belief that an entire political party can find cause to object to this basic protection for babies. Yet, today, we will see if our Democratic colleagues will even permit the Senate to proceed to this legislation. We will see whether even something this simple and this morally straightforward is a bridge too far for the far left.

I would urge all of my colleagues: Let's advance these bills. Let's take these modest steps. Let's have the courage to say that the right to life must not exclude the most vulnerable among us.

TRIBUTE TO JAY KHOSLA

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, on a totally different matter, I have a duty this morning that somehow ranks among my most favorite activities and least favorite activities simultaneously. The good news is that I get to recognize a key member of my staff whom I have come to know and admire a great deal. The bad news is the occasion. This week, after 15 years of outstanding service, he is bidding farewell to the Senate. So I am unhappy with the circumstances, but I could not be more happy to talk about Jay Khosla.

For just shy of 2 years, Jay has served as my chief economic policy counsel. Trade, taxes, banking, and financial services; pensions and retirement; housing—for 2 years, any answer I needed on any of these subjects was one phone call, one email, or one quick meeting away. You can go a long way in this town if you master either the policy details of big issues or the politics surrounding those issues. Jay has mastered both.

When you have a lot of talent and intelligence, major projects tend to find their way to your desk. So consider the fact that Jay has been at the center of practically every major economic policy achievement over the past decade-plus.

Jay arrived as a young healthcare staffer for then-Majority Leader Bill Frist. Talk about an opening act—not just working for a majority leader, but one who is also an M.D. and who is focused on healthcare. The bar was set high, but Jay, of course, exceeded it.

He moved to the Budget Committee and then crafted policy for Senator McCain's Presidential campaign. Then, he returned to work for Senator Hatch and the Finance Committee. Before

long, Jay was Senator Hatch's secret weapon. As he rose through the ranks to policy director and then to staff director, he rapidly became a not-so-secret weapon. He was an invaluable asset to the chairman, to the committee, and, really, to our entire conference.

His relationships extended across the aisle as well. Our Democratic colleagues respect him greatly. His colleagues on the committee remember that, even when it might have been easier to pull back behind party lines and just try to craft a bill within the majority, Jay stayed stubbornly dedicated to the bipartisan process as long as possible.

A team player, an honest broker, Jay doesn't want to just get big things done, he wants to get them done the right way. From trade promotion authority in 2015 and historic tax reform in 2017, to USMCA this past year, these huge accomplishments and many more, like fighting the opioid epidemic and fixing the dysfunctional sustainable growth rate that has plagued Medicare—all of these issues had this staff leader right at the center. In many cases, his work started months or years in advance, meeting with leaders, pouring the foundation for new policy, and staying on the case right through to the finish line.

Needless to say, this is a resume that, basically, anyone in Washington would kill for, but effectiveness is only part of Jay's magic. The colleagues whom Jay supervised at the Finance Committee remember a boss who was kind, generous, patient, and unflappable, even as he guided them through legislation of the highest consequence.

More recently, we in the majority leader's office have relished his laugh-out-loud punch lines, his deadpan sarcasm, and his creative nicknames. Jay is willing to take everyone down a peg when they need it, including himself.

I have worked with all kinds of talented staff, but I have to say that the demeanor that Jay brings to work is somewhat unique. Despite being so knowledgeable, connected, and hard-working, Jay seems to flow through all the challenges with a confidence and calmness that almost borders on relaxation. If you didn't know better, you would almost be suspicious. Somehow, you never see Jay sweat—well, at least not in the office, anyway.

Jay's colleagues like to rib him about the personal training regimen he maintains, along with the ultra-healthy diet and other enviable aspects of work-life balance that he somehow manages to carve out in this place that is so notorious for none of that. It is all part of the unique Jay Khosla magic.

This is someone who has been known to reply to serious email inquiries with a funny photo of a cat dangling from a tree branch, captioned "Hang In There!"

Jay is someone who frequently concludes his answers to pressing ques-

tions, including from Senators, with a smile and this catchphrase: "I have a feeling it's all going to work out."

Somebody less accomplished would never get away with this. From someone with less mastery of the details, you would scoff and find someone else to talk with, but when it is Jay, you know everything will actually work out because he is the one on the case. Jay helps make everyone around him as calm, confident, and cheerful as he is. It is not just because of his charisma. It is because he is so good at what he does. So, look, it is never fun to bid farewell to someone who is a big part of the brains of your operation, and it is never fun to say goodbye to someone who is a big part of the heart of your team either, and it is really no fun to say goodbye to somebody who has managed to be both.

Jay has only formally worked for me for a couple of years, but he has been a trusted advisor and an honorary part of my team for a lot longer. He has been a big part of the Senate for more than a decade.

When I say that Jay knows how to prioritize, I mean it, and his real bottom line is family. He and his beloved wife Lisa have two boys, Shya and Asher. They form a tight-knit unit together with Jay's parents, Vijay and Suman, and his sister Anchal and beyond. Jay may have made it look suspiciously easy all these years, but jobs like this are never easy, least of all on your family. It turns out that the Khosla clan would like to see a little more of this guy, and Jay doesn't mind the sound of a new chapter and some new challenges either.

We are really going to miss him. We thank him for everything. We feel certain his next chapters will bring new happiness all their own. As a wise man once told me, "I have a feeling it's all going to work out."

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 Robert Anthony Molloy, of the Virgin Islands, to be Judge for the District Court of the Virgin Islands for a term of ten years.

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

CORONAVIRUS

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, the coronavirus has already spread to 30 countries, including South Korea, Italy, Iran, and 53 confirmed cases here in the United States. Officials at the World Health Organization are now warning world governments to begin preparing for a pandemic—a pandemic.

Here in the United States, the Trump administration has been caught flat-footed. The administration has no plan to deal with the coronavirus—no plan—and seemingly no urgency to develop one. Even now, after the virus has already become a worldwide health crisis, with rapidly growing economic risks, the Trump administration is scrambling to respond. We have a crisis, and the Trump administration is trying to build an airplane while already in midflight. The harsh fact of the matter is, the Trump administration has shown towering and dangerous incompetence when it comes to the coronavirus.

Coronavirus testing kits have not been widely distributed to our hospitals and public health labs. Those without these kits must send samples all the way to Atlanta rather than testing them on site, wasting precious time as the virus spreads.

The administration has eliminated—eliminated—the global health security teams. That is global health security, just what we need now. They have eliminated the teams from both the National Security Council and the Department of Homeland Security. And thanks to years of cuts to the global health division at the Centers for Disease Control by the Trump administration, the CDC has been forced to reduce the number of countries it operates in from 49 to 10.

These are our frontlines. If we can deal with these diseases before they get to the United States, we are a lot safer, and the administration has mercilessly and thoughtlessly cut, cut, cut these teams. And then, only a month ago, even as we began to hear about the coronavirus in China, the administration sent us a budget that proposed cutting the CDC budget by 16 percent. The CDC is the agency on the frontlines that keeps us safe, keeps us healthy, and prevents American lives from being lost.

Four words describe the administration's response to the coronavirus: towering and dangerous incompetence. When officials at the CDC rec-

ommended that infected passengers from a cruise ship not be flown to the United States alongside the non-infected passengers, the State Department overruled them. Shockingly, they put infected and noninfected on the same plane. Was this because of politics? Did somebody call President Trump or someone else? There are rumors to that effect. We don't know if they are true. They should be checked out.

Typical of the administration, though, or certainly typical in so many different instances, decisions were made based on politics and optics rather than on the informed opinion of our scientists and doctors. It is like the Soviet apparatchiks overruling the nuclear scientists at Chernobyl to avoid embarrassment to the regime.

Federal agencies have been so hollowed out that one of the key figures in responding to the coronavirus in our government is Ken Cuccinelli, an immigration hard-liner ideologue with no public health expertise. Yesterday, Mr. Cuccinelli posted a tweet actually asking for information about the spread of the coronavirus. The one person the administration can come up with to help deal with the issue then emails and asks for information. This is, of course, because he has no knowledge. He is not a scientist. He is not a disease preventer. This is towering and dangerous incompetence.

President Trump, meanwhile, has said that the coronavirus might “miraculously” fade once the weather gets warmer—towering and dangerous incompetence. With no plan to deal with this potential health crisis, the administration last night issued an emergency budget request. It was too little and too late. It asked Congress to reprogram funding dedicated to fighting Ebola—still considered an epidemic in the Democratic Republic of the Congo—to deal with coronavirus. That is robbing Peter to pay Paul. It is further evidence that the administration is not taking the coronavirus as seriously as it should. I said as much last night here on the floor.

The President seemed upset about my criticism of the budget proposal this morning. I am glad he has noticed. Maybe he will start taking this issue more seriously. Now that I have gotten the President's attention, I want to lay out five things the Trump administration must do to get a handle on the coronavirus.

The administration must, at a minimum, restore the cuts to the CDC budget. Trump's cuts to the CDC budget have had dramatic effects, shrinking the agency's footprint abroad to help combat pandemics. The administration must commit now to reverse it.

The Trump administration must appoint a point person—a czar—to implement a real plan to manage the coronavirus: an independent, non-partisan, global health expert with real expertise, not a political appointee like Cuccinelli—somebody who is a sci-

entist who knows these issues and can coordinate the myriad Federal agencies to fight the fight and prevent American lives from being lost.

The administration must increase its emergency budget request to at least \$3.1 billion with no cuts—no cuts—for Ebola funding, which is still raging in Africa. The \$3.1 billion is the amount our public health organizations say is necessary. The funding must also include a commitment to reimburse States and localities for all expenses related to addressing the outbreak.

The Trump administration must expedite delivery of diagnostic testing kits to all 50 States and public health laboratories so the tests don't have to be sent—these samples don't have to be sent to Atlanta and people wait, wait, and wait for a result as the disease spreads.

And finally, the administration must stop the proliferation of junk insurance plans that do not even cover coronavirus tests and other related healthcare services. This is typical of why we have opposed these junk plans. They cover hardly anything. Now that we have this crisis—the coronavirus—so many people who have these junk plans will not get tested because they can't afford it and because their plans don't cover it, a glaring example of why junk health plans—the administration's solution, it seems, to the health crisis—are totally inadequate and dangerous.

These are five basic steps that any competent administration would have already taken in preparation for the pandemic. There may be others as well, but this is what happens when you have an administration and a President so skeptical of science, so contemptuous of expertise, so practiced in obscuring inconvenient facts, and so disdainful of organization and preparation.

Madam President, you need to get your act together now. This is a crisis. We need you to act. We need this administration to finally do the right thing after weeks of dithering and exhibiting towering and dangerous incompetence.

WOMEN'S HEALTHCARE

Madam President, on another matter also related to healthcare, today Leader McCONNELL and Senate Republicans have scheduled votes on two divisive, anti-choice, anti-women, and anti-family bills. The Senate has voted them down before; it will again.

After weeks of complaining that the impeachment trial of President Trump was preventing the Senate from doing the people's business, this is what the Senate Republicans have proposed: fake, dishonest, and extreme legislation that has nothing to do with improving the lives of ordinary Americans. I say “fake” because these bills pretend we don't already have laws on the books that protect infants. Additional legislation is completely unnecessary, irrational, a show with no positive effect on the women of America who need healthcare. Healthcare, Mr.

President. Healthcare, Republican Senators. Healthcare. That is what women want, not these show bills that appeal to an extreme view. The American people know it. The American women know it.

Additional legislation such as proposed today is at best unnecessary and irrational. But it is dishonest because these bills are not intended to fix real problems faced by real Americans; they are intended to provoke fear and misunderstanding about a very difficult issue so Republicans can score political points with their far-right base. Any Senator who thinks this is going to appeal to the mainstream of their constituents—women throughout their States—is missing the point.

I say “extreme” because these bills would, in effect, criminalize women’s reproductive care and intimidate healthcare providers—another example of the Senate Republicans’ war on *Roe v. Wade* and a woman’s constitutionally protected right to make her own private healthcare decisions and to not have politicians tell a woman what to do.

Putting these already defeated bills up for a show vote is not a good-faith attempt to improve the lives of everyday Americans—particularly everyday American women—as Republicans claim they want to desperately do. Every single Senate Republican knows these bills cannot and will not pass, but they are putting them on the floor anyway to pander to the hard right and to cover up the fact that they will not provide good healthcare for women, that they are voting day in and day out to take away the right to healthcare of women throughout America and letting the administration, led by President Trump, do just that.

If Republicans were serious about getting back to the people’s business, there is no shortage of bipartisan legislation we could consider. Nearly 400 bills have passed the House, hundreds of them on a bipartisan basis, and they have collected dust in this Chamber. They have gone into Leader McConnell’s legislative trash can. On healthcare alone, we have legislation to protect Americans with preexisting conditions, legislation that would eliminate junk insurance plans, and legislation to reduce maternal and infant mortality rates, which my colleague from Illinois will talk about, I believe, shortly. All of these bills have languished in Leader McConnell’s legislative junkyard.

When Leader McConnell or any Republican says “Oh, impeachment stopped us from doing things,” look at what we are not doing today—not only what we are doing, which is meaningless to women, but what we are not doing—protecting their healthcare, protecting *Roe v. Wade*, which two-thirds of American women want protected.

Any of the proposals that are in McConnell’s legislative graveyard would be better than this anti-choice, anti-

women, and anti-family legislation, but, typical of Leader McConnell, Republicans have chosen once again to play politics on the Senate floor.

Leader McConnell should stop wasting the few votes he does schedule with these shameless political stunts and instead bring legislation to the floor that would actually improve the healthcare of the American people and of American women in particular.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. LOEFFLER). The Democratic whip is recognized.

CORONAVIRUS

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I would like to note that this morning at 8 a.m., an unusual meeting took place in this Capitol Building. It was in the area of the building that is reserved for top-secret classified briefings. All Members of the Senate were invited. The issue at that briefing was the coronavirus.

I sat through the major part of that briefing before I had to leave for another meeting. There wasn’t anything in there that should have been classified or top secret. If there were ever a time when we need to be open, honest, and complete in telling the whole story to the American people, it is this moment when we face the coronavirus, which started, we believe, in China and is now spreading across the world.

I back up what the Democratic leader said earlier because the request was made at this meeting for some \$2 billion in the United States to respond to this coronavirus threat. When we questioned the administration as to why that number and what they were going to do with it, the answers were limited. In fact, when it came to the source of the money, they had no answer at all.

Remember, this is an administration which has consistently asked to cut the funding for the Centers for Disease Control. It has been a low priority of the Trump administration until we faced this threat, and now they have suddenly awakened. It turns out that even in the next fiscal year, which begins on October 1, the Trump administration has asked to cut the money for the Centers for Disease Control again.

You ask yourself, who is in charge over there? Who is making the basic decisions? Well, it could be the person who has decided that every available dollar needs to be put into a wall on the Mexican border.

Think of this for a moment: Ten billion dollars currently sits in an account for the building of this wall—unspent. They can’t spend it. Yet the President recently asked for \$3.8 billion more for building his almighty wall—which I thought Mexico was going to pay for—and now comes at the last minute asking for some \$2 billion for the coronavirus.

As one Senator said in the meeting this morning, when it comes down to it, if our business is to protect the American people, isn’t the highest priority to stop the spread of this virus in

the United States? Of course it is, and that is why it should be a higher priority. No wall is going to stop that virus from coming into the United States. The President ought to wake up to that reality.

When you look at the efforts that are being made here in the United States and around the world, we can and should do more. I support this request for a dramatic increase in funding for this purpose now—now, before it spreads across the United States, which God forbid it ever does. We don’t want it to. We want to make sure we have done everything in our power to stop it, and that means empowering those in charge with the knowledge, with the expertise, and with the authority to protect our families. First and foremost, protect American families. That is a much higher priority than any campaign promise this President made about a wall on our southern border.

I support the effort by Senator SCHUMER asking for some top doc or some individual with management authority, management experience, and the knowledge of the public health threat we face with this coronavirus, to be put in charge to coordinate the myriad agencies that will be touched by this campaign to protect America. Now is the time to do it. The time to do it—at least now, but it should have been much earlier, with more money dedicated to this purpose rather than cutting back on these key agencies.

WOMEN’S HEALTHCARE

Madam President, on a related topic, related to health, this morning Senator MITCH MCCONNELL came to the floor and said that today, this afternoon, we are likely to take up two votes on motions to proceed. This is so typical now of what we do in the Senate. Instead of bringing a measure to the floor with an understanding of an amendment process so that we can discuss it fully, vote on it in many different aspects, and then come to a conclusion with a majority vote in this body, Senator McConnell comes to the floor with another drive-by political hit on the issue of women’s reproductive health.

We know what this issue is all about. Many of us who have served for years know there is a fundamental difference among those of us here in the Senate, and we know what the outcome of this vote will be because at least one of these votes was cast last year on exactly the same topic. So why would Senator McConnell bring it back? It is to get that drive-by shooting when it comes to this political issue. To me, that is unfortunate, and I would like to suggest there is a better alternative.

BLACK HISTORY MONTH

Madam President, this is Black History Month, and I want to take the time to celebrate a person who made history when it came to healthcare.

Helen Octavia Dickens was born in Dayton, OH, in 1909, a daughter of a former slave. She attended Crane Junior College in Chicago, now Malcolm X

College. In 1934, she graduated from the University of Illinois College of Medicine, Chicago, as the only African-American woman in her class of 137 students. She was the university's first Black woman physician graduate.

Dr. Dickens became a specialist in obstetrics, eventually moving to Philadelphia to work in a birthing center, where she provided care for the poor. While there, she broke barriers by becoming the first African-American woman to be admitted into the American College of Surgeons, receive board certification in obstetrics and gynecology, and practice medicine in Philadelphia.

Her work to help heal and guide women of all ages was nothing short of inspiring and her efforts to shine light on the troubling issue of health disparities in the United States that continues to this day. Let me be specific.

America has a long history of medical inequality. Sadly, we know that history has not ended. From premature births to premature deaths, people of color disproportionately bear the brunt of America's troubled healthcare system. On average, they live sicker, die sooner, and go without needed medical care more often. Communities of color suffer disproportionately from HIV, heart disease, stroke, diabetes, kidney failure, prostate cancer, and other medical conditions.

President Obama signed the Affordable Care Act into law nearly 10 years ago. It is still one of my proudest votes. Thanks to that law, 20 million Americans gained health insurance—more than 1 million in my home State of Illinois.

I am proud to say that law has taken strong steps to address racial inequalities in healthcare across America. A report last month found that the Affordable Care Act helped narrow racial and ethnic disparities in healthcare access and coverage, especially in States like mine—Illinois—that expanded the reach of Medicaid. Yet we know that better is not nearly good enough when it comes to healthcare. Nearly half of Black Americans—46 percent—live in the 15 States that did not expand Medicaid coverage after the Affordable Care Act was passed.

Another area of racial disparity is maternal and infant health. I raise this issue because instead of these drive-by issue votes, which Senator McCONNELL insists on without debate and without amendment, we should be addressing an issue that should have bipartisan support. Let me be specific about what I mean.

The United States ranks 32nd out of the 35 wealthiest nations when it comes to infant death, infant mortality. Let me repeat that. Our Nation ranks 32nd out of the 35 wealthiest nations when it comes to infant mortality, and babies of color are the hardest hit.

If you are an African-American infant born in America today, you are twice as likely to die in the first year of birth compared to White infants.

And the mother giving birth? In the United States, African-American women are three to four times more likely to die giving birth than other women in this country. In Illinois, sadly, they are six times more likely to die.

The United States is one of only 13 countries in the world where the maternal mortality rate is worse now than it was 25 years ago. Instead of impaling ourselves politically on the issues that divide us, can we come together on an issue that could unite us: that we are going to do something in America to reduce the infant and maternal mortality, particularly among African Americans.

I have given a lot of thought to what we can do to try to bridge this racial divide to help women and babies of color. For the past two Congresses, I have introduced a bill with Illinois Congresswoman ROBIN KELLY called the MOMMA Act. The bill would expand Medicaid coverage for new moms from 60 days after birth to a full year postpartum to ensure adequate care after the child is delivered. The bill would also ensure implicit bias and cultural competency training for healthcare providers to help address health disparities in communities of color and increase access to doulas.

We are simply not doing enough to correct this injustice and save the lives of new moms and babies across the country. Instead, Senate Republicans are pushing two anti-choice bills this day that will do nothing—nothing—to help improve maternal and infant outcomes in America nor to help address racial disparities that currently exist. If they actually wanted to save and improve the lives of new moms and babies, they should consider passing legislation like the MOMMA Act, which I have just described. I am going to try to call this to the floor this afternoon. Wouldn't it be a breath of fresh air in the U.S. Senate if, on a bipartisan basis, we could agree to do something about this public health crisis affecting infants and mothers across America?

The fact that we rank so low in the world standings of safety when it comes to delivering a baby among African-American parents in this country is just unacceptable and unforgivable. Can we muster the courage to stop the political shootings here on the floor, this drive-by shooting of political issues, and instead address an issue which truly is a life-and-death matter that we all should agree on? The Republicans have a choice this afternoon to join me in this effort.

I am proud to stand here today and to honor Helen Dickens, the African-American doctor I described earlier who passed away in 2001. Her fierce advancement in the medical field helped pave the way for future doctors, particularly women of color, and led to important discoveries in women's health.

Today, much of what we know about the importance and effectiveness of an-

nual OB/GYN visits was influenced by Dr. Dickens' work. With a grant from the National Institutes of Health, she helped train general practitioners to give women the exams they need to note early detection of cervical and uterine cancer. In 1982, the University of Illinois honored Dr. Dickens with the Distinguished Alumni Award.

While the United States has a troubled past in addressing racial inequality, we need to learn from the mistakes of the past to ensure that all Americans receive the healthcare they deserve in the future.

Dr. Helen Dickens and many other African-American pioneers give me hope for a brighter future.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ABORTION

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, today we will vote on two pro-life bills: the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act and the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act.

These bills should be completely uncontroversial. Every one of us in this Chamber ought to be able to agree that infants who are born alive during an abortion procedure should receive the same care that a baby born alive in a hospital would receive.

Every one of us ought to agree that, at the very least, we should not be aborting babies after the point that they can feel pain, but unfortunately the abortion extremism in the Democratic Party is such that it is unlikely that these two bills will even get a chance to be debated.

We shouldn't even need the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act. It should be obvious that any baby born alive, wherever he or she is born, ought to receive care, but with more than one leading Democrat over the past year refusing to rule out infanticide, it has become clear that we need to underscore that being born alive in an abortion clinic instead of a hospital doesn't eliminate a baby's right to medical care.

Like the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act, the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act should be a no-brainer. This legislation would ban abortions beginning in the sixth month of pregnancy, a point at which science has clearly demonstrated that the unborn child is able to feel pain—and not only able to feel pain. By this point in a pregnancy, approximately 20 weeks, babies are almost able to survive outside of their mothers. Babies have survived after being born at 25 weeks, at 24 weeks, at 23 weeks, and, like Ellie Schneider, who attended the State of the Union Address with her mom, at 21 weeks.

It is unthinkable that we are killing babies who are so far advanced that it is possible for them to survive outside of their mothers, but we are. In 2016, somewhere around 11,000 babies were aborted at or after the 21-week mark in pregnancy—11,000 in one year.

Democrats like to point to European countries to support their push for government-run healthcare and other socialistic policies, but they never mention—they never mention—that almost every European country has more limits on abortion than we have here in the United States. In fact, the United States is one of just seven countries in the entire world that allow elective abortions after 20 weeks of pregnancy. Among the other countries are China and North Korea—not exactly the kind of company we want to be in when it comes to keeping and protecting human rights because—make no mistake—that is what we are talking about with abortion: human rights.

Abortion denies unique, individual human beings, with their own fingerprints and their own DNA, the most basic of human rights: the right to life. It is happening on a massive scale. Every year, in the United States alone, hundreds of thousands of irreplaceable human beings are killed by abortion. That is not some number that the pro-life movement has cooked up. That is straight. That is straight from the pro-abortion Guttmacher Institute, formerly affiliated with Planned Parenthood, which reports, “Approximately 862,320 abortions were performed in 2017”—862,320. Most of us can’t even fathom a number that big.

To put it in perspective, 862,000 is roughly equivalent to the population of the entire State of South Dakota, my home State. That is right. Think about that. In 2017 alone, the number of babies killed by abortion was roughly equivalent to the population of the entire State of South Dakota.

We can do better. Americans are better than this. Our country was founded to safeguard human rights, not to take them away. While we haven’t always lived up to that promise, we have never stopped trying. It is time for us, as a country, to stand up and to start protecting the rights of unborn human beings. The Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act and the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act will not stop all, or even most, abortions, but they are an important step, a chance for us, as Americans, to draw a line in the sand and to start standing up for the rights of babies who are able or nearly able to survive outside of their mothers. It is time for us to join the vast majority of the global community in prohibiting elective abortions past 20 weeks. It is time for us to make it clear that, no matter what some extreme Democrats may say, Americans believe that all children, whether born alive in a hospital or in an abortion clinic, deserve protection and basic medical care.

I hope my colleagues across the aisle will take a stand for human rights and

for human decency and allow debate to move forward on these two important pro-life bills.

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.

Mrs. FISCHER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

VOTE ON MOLLOY NOMINATION

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Molloy nomination?

Mrs. FISCHER. 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 legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that 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 (Mr. CRUZ). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 97, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 54 Ex.]

YEAS—97

Alexander	Gardner	Peters
Baldwin	Gillibrand	Portman
Barrasso	Graham	Reed
Bennet	Grassley	Risch
Blackburn	Harris	Roberts
Blumenthal	Hassan	Romney
Blunt	Hawley	Rosen
Booker	Heinrich	Rounds
Boozman	Hirono	Rubio
Braun	Hoeven	Sasse
Brown	Hyde-Smith	Schatz
Burr	Inhofe	Schumer
Cantwell	Johnson	Scott (FL)
Capito	Jones	Scott (SC)
Cardin	Kaine	Shaheen
Carper	Kennedy	Shelby
Casey	King	Sinema
Cassidy	Lankford	Smith
Collins	Leahy	Stabenow
Coons	Lee	Sullivan
Cornyn	Loeffler	Tester
Cortez Masto	Manchin	Thune
Cotton	Markey	Tillis
Cramer	McConnell	Toomey
Crapo	McSally	Udall
Cruz	Menendez	Van Hollen
Daines	Merkley	Warner
Duckworth	Moran	Whitehouse
Durbin	Murkowski	Wicker
Enzi	Murphy	Wyden
Ernst	Murray	Young
Feinstein	Paul	
Fischer	Perdue	

NOT VOTING—3

Klobuchar Sanders Warren

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.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the

Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Silvia Carreno-Coll, of Puerto Rico, to be United States District Judge for the District of Puerto Rico.

Mitch McConnell, Mike Crapo, Thom Tillis, Mike Rounds, Lamar Alexander, John Hoeven, Roger F. Wicker, Rob Portman, John Thune, Cindy Hyde-Smith, John Boozman, Tom Cotton, Chuck Grassley, Kevin Cramer, Steve Daines, Todd Young, John Cornyn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Silvia Carreno-Coll, of Puerto Rico, to be United States District Judge for the District of Puerto Rico, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from 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 yeas and nays resulted—yeas 96, nays 1, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 55 Ex.]

YEAS—96

Alexander	Fischer	Perdue
Baldwin	Gardner	Peters
Barrasso	Gillibrand	Portman
Bennet	Graham	Reed
Blackburn	Grassley	Risch
Blumenthal	Harris	Roberts
Blunt	Hassan	Romney
Booker	Hawley	Rosen
Boozman	Heinrich	Rounds
Braun	Hoeven	Rubio
Brown	Hyde-Smith	Sasse
Burr	Inhofe	Schatz
Cantwell	Johnson	Schumer
Capito	Jones	Scott (FL)
Cardin	Kaine	Scott (SC)
Carper	Kennedy	Shaheen
Casey	King	Shelby
Cassidy	Lankford	Sinema
Collins	Leahy	Smith
Coons	Lee	Stabenow
Cornyn	Loeffler	Sullivan
Cortez Masto	Manchin	Tester
Cotton	Markey	Thune
Cramer	McConnell	Tillis
Crapo	McSally	Toomey
Cruz	Menendez	Udall
Daines	Merkley	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Moran	Warner
Durbin	Murkowski	Whitehouse
Enzi	Murphy	Wicker
Ernst	Murray	Wyden
Feinstein	Paul	Young

NAYS—1

Hirono

NOT VOTING—3

Klobuchar Sanders Warren

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 96, the nays are 1.

The motion is agreed to.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Katharine MacGregor, of Pennsylvania, to be Deputy Secretary of the Interior.

Mitch McConnell, John Boozman, John Cornyn, Mike Crapo, Kevin Cramer, Tim Scott, Mike Rounds, James E. Risch, Roger F. Wicker, Steve Daines, John Barrasso, John Hoeven, Todd Young, Pat Roberts, John Thune, David Perdue, Lisa Murkowski.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Katharine MacGregor, of Pennsylvania, to be Deputy Secretary of the Interior, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that 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 or change their vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 59, nays 38, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 56 Ex.]

YEAS—59

Alexander	Graham	Paul
Barrasso	Grassley	Perdue
Blackburn	Hawley	Portman
Blunt	Heinrich	Risch
Boozman	Hoeven	Roberts
Braun	Hyde-Smith	Romney
Burr	Inhofe	Rounds
Capito	Johnson	Rubio
Cassidy	Jones	Sasse
Collins	Kennedy	Scott (FL)
Cornyn	King	Scott (SC)
Cotton	Lankford	Shelby
Cramer	Lee	Sinema
Crapo	Loeffler	Sullivan
Cruz	Manchin	Thune
Daines	McConnell	Tillis
Enzi	McSally	Toomey
Ernst	Moran	Wicker
Fischer	Murkowski	Young
Gardner	Murphy	

NAYS—38

Baldwin	Feinstein	Rosen
Bennet	Gillibrand	Schatz
Blumenthal	Harris	Schumer
Booker	Hassan	Shaheen
Brown	Hirono	Smith
Cantwell	Kaine	Stabenow
Cardin	Leahy	Tester
Carper	Markey	Udall
Casey	Menendez	Van Hollen
Coons	Merkley	Warner
Cortez Masto	Murray	Whitehouse
Duckworth	Peters	Wyden
Durbin	Reed	

NOT VOTING—3

Klobuchar Sanders Warren

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 59, the nays are 38. The motion is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Katharine MacGregor, of Pennsylvania, to be Deputy Secretary of the Interior.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:59 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mrs. BLACKBURN).

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

PAIN-CAPABLE UNBORN CHILD PROTECTION ACT—MOTION TO PROCEED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume legislative session to consider the motion to proceed to S. 3275, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 420, S. 3275, to amend title 18, United States Code, to protect pain-capable unborn children, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time until 3:30 p.m. will be equally divided between the two leaders or their designees.

The Senator from Alaska.

NOMINATION OF KATHARINE MACGREGOR

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Madam President, very briefly, here this afternoon, beginning at 3:30, we will have a series of votes that include the nomination of Katharine MacGregor to be the Deputy Secretary of the Department of the Interior. I would like to provide my support for this nomination.

I want to thank my colleagues on the Energy and Natural Resources Committee for working with me to report then re-report Ms. MacGregor's nomination, which moved out on a bipartisan basis.

I thank the majority leader for filing cloture on her nomination before the recess so we could confirm her this week.

She has a lot of work to do at Interior, and we need her on the job. She did very well at her confirmation hearing last year. She has significant experience on the issues she will face as Deputy Secretary, having worked here on Capitol Hill for 10 years, as the principal deputy and Assistant Secretary for Land and Minerals Management, as well as the Department's Deputy Chief

of Staff, and, most recently, exercising the authority of the Deputy Secretary.

Ms. MacGregor's nomination has drawn the support of dozens of groups, including some in my State: Alaska Federation of Natives, Arctic Slope Regional Association, Doyon Limited, American Wind Energy Association, Congressional Sportsmen's Foundation, Theodore Roosevelt Conservation Partnership, National Cattlemen's Beef Association, Public Lands Council, and many others.

I personally share those groups' confidence that Ms. MacGregor will do a good job as Deputy Secretary. I think she is well qualified. She has the right experience to succeed in this role. I think she will be a fine asset for Secretary Bernhardt and the rest of the Interior team. I would urge my colleagues to support her full confirmation.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 916

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, later this afternoon, we are going to have two votes on motions to proceed. They are procedural votes to go forward on two pieces of legislation relative to the issue of abortion. Those of us in public life know full well that this is a very controversial issue. There are people who feel very strongly on one side and very strongly on the other.

These votes this afternoon will not resolve that conflict. They don't try to. What the Republican majority under Senator MCCONNELL has decided to do is to bring back for a vote two items we already voted on. We know the outcome. We can virtually predict within one or two votes what it is going to be.

At the end of the day, Republicans will turn to a special interest group and say: We told you we could call this every year. We did it.

We will have Members who will vote their conscience on both sides of the aisle, but the net result of that is not going to be to change anything for the better in the United States, when it comes to the issues that challenge us.

What I would like to do is to come to this floor with a radical idea. I have an idea how we can come together, regardless of our position on that issue, and do something constructive for this country. Let me tell you what I have in mind. The United States currently ranks 32 out of 35 industrial nations when it comes to infant mortality. That is right—32 out of 35 when it comes to the survival of babies in the United States once born.

A 2018 report published in Health Affairs by Global Health characterized the United States of America as "the most dangerous of wealthy nations for a child to be born into." What they found was that U.S. babies—babies born in the United States—are three times as likely to die of premature birth and more than twice as likely to die of SIDS than babies in comparably rich countries. Every year, more than

23,000 infants die in the United States, largely due to factors that in many cases could have been prevented: low birth weight, maternal health complications, prematurity.

Babies of color are particularly at risk. Black infants are twice as likely to die in America as White infants, a disparity that is greater than it was in the year 1850 in this country.

We are not only losing babies, we are losing mothers, as well. Listen to this statistic. The United States is one of only 13 countries in the world where the rate of maternal mortality—mothers dying during the birth process, related to pregnancy or childbirth, for up to a year postpartum—is worse than it was 25 years ago. We haven't moved forward. We have moved backward when it comes to mothers surviving child birth.

Nationwide, more than 700 women die every year as a result of pregnancy and more than 70,000 suffer near-fatal complications. More than 660 percent of these deaths are preventable.

Sadly, much like with babies, the tragedy of maternal mortality is even more pronounced when you look at communities of color. In the United States of America, women of color are three to four times more likely than White women to die as a result of pregnancy. If you think it has something to do with poverty and wealth—that is what I thought—there is no correlation. The only correlation is race.

In my State of Illinois, I am sorry to report that if you are an African-American woman, you are six times more likely than a White woman to die in childbirth. That is why Congressional Representative ROBIN KELLY, in the House, and my colleague Senator TAMMY DUCKWORTH and I, in the Senate, have joined in introducing the MOMMA's Act.

First and foremost, more than anything, this bill would expand the length of time that a new mother can keep her Medicaid health coverage. Currently, Medicaid only has to cover women for 2 months after the child is born. Our bill would expand that to a full year. The Medicaid Program pays for 50 percent of all births nationwide—44 percent in Illinois. It is a big part of the treatment of women who are giving birth to children. This program is vital for new moms and babies, and it makes no sense that a new mom's health coverage is terminated 2 months after she has given birth. Why don't we stick with her so she can live? Why don't we do something affirmative to say that we are committed to mothers and children on a bipartisan basis, regardless of our position on any other issue?

The MOMMA's Act would also provide access to doulas, as well as improve implicit bias and cultural competency training among healthcare providers. Too often Black women are ignored or not taken seriously by healthcare providers. Doula's can help provide education advocacy and support for women whose voices today are

being ignored. Our bill would establish national obstetric emergency protocols and ensure dissemination of the best practices for healthcare providers dealing with moms and babies. Finally, it would help to standardize maternal and infant health data collection reporting so we have a better idea of what is happening and why.

Our bill is supported by the American Medical Association, Families USA, the March of Dimes, the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists, the Society for Maternal-Fetal Medicine, and the Black Mamas Matter Alliance. Our bill is supported by these and many other public health and provider organizations because it would save the lives and improve the lives of moms and babies.

We can debate the issue of abortion back and forth all day. We know how the votes are going to turn out, and we know nothing is going to occur. Why don't we come together on something bipartisan that says we are all dedicated to reducing the incidence of infant mortality and maternal mortality in this country? Isn't that one thing we can agree on? That is my challenge to this Senate Chamber.

Leader MCCONNELL has made it clear that he has no intention of allowing the Senate to debate and pass legislation that will actually help families in need. I hope he is wrong. Instead, he wants us only to vote on controversial judicial nominees and politically charged anti-choice legislation that has no chance of passing. If he is serious about wanting to save the lives of babies and their mothers, I hope that he will make an exception for the MOMMA's Act.

I would like to make a unanimous consent request.

I ask unanimous consent that the Finance Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. 916, the Mothers and Offspring Mortality and Morbidity Awareness Act, also known as the MOMMA's Act; that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration; 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 with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. SASSE. Madam President, reserving the right to object, I would like to address Senator DURBIN's comments and his unanimous consent request through the Chair.

First, I am glad the Senator from Illinois wants to reduce infant mortality rates and wants to reduce maternal mortality rates. I agree on both of these goals.

On the subject of infant mortality, the Senate is going to vote on one infant mortality bill in about an hour. The senior Senator from Illinois said a moment ago that there are two anti-choice pieces of legislation this afternoon. For reporters and the public pay-

ing attention, LINDSEY GRAHAM's bill is about abortion. I support Senator GRAHAM's bill. I don't exactly agree with the characterization of it as leading with the anti-choice language, but it is an abortion bill.

The second piece of legislation we are considering today is not in any way an abortion bill. The anti-choice legislation rhetoric that you are using doesn't have anything to do with the actual legislation that we are considering this afternoon.

Yet I hope that you would consider on the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act the fact that it is addressing some cases of mortality by making sure babies who have survived abortion get care. These are babies who are already born and outside the mother.

The Senator's passionate speech about infant mortality suggests that either we are doing more cynical posturing around here or that folks plan to actually support this bipartisan piece of legislation. I hope it is the latter. I sincerely hope that the Senator would vote in accord with the positions he took earlier in his career and that we would vote in favor getting important stuff done on this legislation.

In addition, as for the comments he made on the subject of maternal mortality rates, I agree with him. Many of these tragedies are preventable and, I believe, despite being the second or third or fourth most conservative Member of the Senate by my voting record and believing in small government, I agree we underfund a lot of these pieces of public health investment, and I would like us to do more to address preventable maternal tragedies as well.

Therefore, in a moment, I am going to ask if the senior Senator from Illinois would agree to modify his unanimous consent request to include the Grassley amendment. I will use all of the appropriate parliamentary language at the end but, for public understanding, this amendment, the Grassley amendment, would give States \$2.5 billion new dollars to address maternal health and at-risk communities. In addition, this amendment would give \$200 million to address maternal mortality under the Maternal and Child Health Services Block Grant Program. We are talking about more funding, fully offset, for at-risk moms—no politics, no gimmicks. It is in line with the policies that the senior Senator from Illinois was just advancing.

It is my belief the pro-life position is pro-baby, pro-mom, and pro-science. If the Senator from Illinois wants to spend another \$2.7 billion to help moms, I am aligned with him. It would be great if we could get that done forever. If, however, we are trying to change the subject from the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act and that means we can't advance a deal to protect these moms and babies, that would be disappointing.

I ask unanimous consent that the Senator modify his request to include

the Grassley substitute amendment, which is No. 1240. I ask unanimous consent that the Finance Committee be discharged from its consideration and that the amendment be considered agreed to; that the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time and passed; and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DURBIN. Reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. I do not question the sincerity of my colleague. I know you come to this issue with a sincere heart. I don't question that at all. What I am saying to you is that you and I could spend the rest of this day and the next on this floor debating the issue of abortion, and we are not going to resolve it—not in this Chamber, not in this country.

What I am asking you to do is look beyond the current issues that are coming to the floor this afternoon and try to find some common ground—Republicans and Democrats—on the issue of maternal mortality.

You have to be shocked, as I am, to read these numbers about the babies and mothers who are dying, particularly babies and mothers of color. If we can do something as a nation to show we truly do care about this, even though we have differences on this issue of abortion, wouldn't that be a breakthrough for this Chamber? I think the people across this country would applaud us and say: They finally did something. They finally came to an agreement.

What I propose is the MOMMA's Act, which is a good bill and is one that I think should pass. The Senator has proposed an alternative. Here is an idea. Listen to this radical idea: What if we bring the MOMMA's Act to the floor and agree that we will debate an amendment—any amendment one would want to offer? Do you know what it would be? It would be like the U.S. Senate. It would be the Senate. Think of it. The Senator as a Republican and I as a Democrat would actually be debating an issue that would make a difference in America. We would be putting our best ideas up for a vote on the Senate floor. How about that for a motion?

We are not going to get anywhere with the Senator's proposal this afternoon, because we have passed it before. We know the outcome. We know the final vote. I would say the Senator's alternative proposal, which was once offered by Senator GRASSLEY on the floor when I tried this before, is just inadequate. The resources aren't there to deal with the scope and gravity of the problem.

So why don't we do this? Why don't we act like Senators? Why don't we do something on a bipartisan basis and bring an issue to the floor that truly

counts and that people care about? It would be a breakthrough. It might make a headline. It might even make a tweet somewhere. This is not the way to do it—that it is the Senator's way or my way.

What I would suggest to the Senator, though, is to bring it to the floor and to join me in doing it on a bipartisan basis. Appeal to Senator MCCONNELL to finally let the Senate be the Senate. The Senator knows we have people who come to the Galleries here who look down at these desks and say: You know, I think there used to be Senators who sat at those desks who actually legislated, who actually debated, who actually had amendments. Last year, under Senator MCCONNELL, we had 22 amendments on the floor of the Senate. Why not more than 22?

That is it. We are not talking about anything else. If the Senator truly wants to join me on this floor in a bipartisan debate on this issue of infant and maternal mortality, let's do it. For the time being, I have to object to what the Senator has proposed. Please, I didn't question the Senator's sincerity in bringing up this issue, and I hope he won't question mine in suggesting we ought to be the Senate and debate this issue.

I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Is there an objection to the original request?

The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. SASSE. Madam President, in reserving the right to object and in turning this all the way around, we have an objection to an objection to an objection, but let me just agree to the last point my colleague from Illinois made.

I think it would be great if this Chamber had 80 or 90 or 95 or 100 people in it instead of how it is now. We are at three today, which is a high-water mark. Usually, there are one or two people in here. Senator BARRASSO is here. We have four. We are setting a record.

I don't think a lot of us think that the month we all spent here was ideal. Last month, during the impeachment, there was one thing that was new in that a lot of Senators spent time talking to each other. So, to the Senator's grand point of wishing we were debating, we are aligned.

I do want to say one more thing before I object, which is the Senator said he is not questioning my sincerity. I appreciate that. The Senator asked that I not question his sincerity, and I am not. I am questioning his logic, though, because he summarized it as if there were two issues at play. He said anti-abortion legislation and maternal health funding. Yet there are three issues at play on the floor today.

One of them is LINDSEY GRAHAM's pain-capable bill, which is a pro-life piece of legislation. One of them is Senator DURBIN's funding request about maternal delivery health. Those things are true, but there is a third

thing which, again, he obscured by saying the debate here is that of funding maternal health or of having anti-abortion legislation. The piece of legislation we are voting on today—the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act—is not about abortion. I am pro-life, and I am going to support LINDSEY GRAHAM's bill. Yet the bill we are voting on does not change anyone's access to abortion. It doesn't have anything to do with *Roe v. Wade*. It is about babies who are already born. This morning on TV, those on CNN made up this insane phrase. They said it was a fetus that had been born. What the heck is that? It is another way of saying they don't want to debate the actual debate we are having on the floor today.

We are going to vote once on LINDSEY GRAHAM's pro-life legislation, and I am going to support it. We are also going to vote on a piece of legislation called the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act. These are about babies who are born, who are outside their mothers. What is actually happening is that the senior Senator from Illinois is wanting to obscure the debate because he wants to use euphemisms about choice so that we don't have to admit to the American public that what is actually happening on the floor today is probably going to be like it was last year—with 44 Democrats filibustering an anti-infanticide bill.

There is nothing in the bill that is about abortion—nothing. It is about infanticide. That is the actual legislation. We have 44 people over there who want to hide from it and talk in euphemisms about abortion because they don't want to defend the indefensible because they can't defend the indefensible. We are talking about killing babies who are born. That is the actual legislation we are voting on today in the Senate. That is what the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act is. Is it OK in the eyes of the U.S. Senate for us to say: "Well, you can't actively kill the little baby. You can't take a pillow and put it over her face and smother her to death, but you can back away and kill her that way"?

That is what Ralph Northam—the disgraced Governor of Virginia—was talking about when he said: Well, once the baby is born, if she survives an abortion—and we wish that it would not happen—then we will figure out a way to keep her calm for a little while, while the doctors debate what they want to do. What he means is, kill the baby, and that is the legislation we are voting on today.

There are three buckets. LINDSEY GRAHAM's Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act is a bill about abortion. There is another bill that is about babies who have already been born.

News flash, CNN: If you are a baby and if you have been born and if you are outside of Mama, nobody calls that a fetus. You just want to call it a fetus because you don't want to cover the actual story that is being voted on in the Senate today.

Then there is a third piece of legislation, which is Senator DURBIN's counterproposal about maternal preventable deaths and investments in that category. I am interested in that category as well, but the Senator from Illinois doesn't actually want to talk about the legislation that is on the floor, so he is changing the subject.

Therefore, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, infanticide should be a crime, and it is. That is what the Senator from Nebraska will not concede. He thinks he has come up with a novel idea—that you shouldn't be able to kill a baby with impunity in America. It is not novel. It has been in Federal law for over a decade, and it is in State laws all across the United States. If one has any doubt about it, be prepared to write down a name—the name of Kermit Gosnell. Thirteen years ago, I believe it was, this physician was convicted of infanticide. He is now serving life without parole, plus 30 years. To argue that the Senator has some novel idea that infanticide should be a crime and that we don't cover it now under the law is just not accurate, and it is not factual. That is why I think the Senator's bill is unnecessary.

This bill is necessary. Mothers are dying and babies are dying, and we can do something about it. It doesn't matter whether one goes to a pro-life or to a pro-choice rally; we all agree that this is something we can do on a bipartisan basis.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. SASSE. Madam President, just for the record and just so we all have it clear, the Senator talks about infanticide, and he is right. Active infanticide is illegal under Federal law as there are no crimes for it in half of the States.

More fundamentally, what the Senate is considering today is passive infanticide. Whether they are born in glistening NICUs at fancy hospitals, with a lot of rich cars in the parking lots, or whether the babies are born in the unfortunate circumstances of abortion clinics in strip malls, whether they are 1 day old or 5 days old, it turns out that they die if you wander away from them and deny them care. If you don't give them warmth and if you don't give them food, they die. Passive killing, passive infanticide, is not illegal under Federal law.

The Senator said infanticide is illegal, and he is half right. Active infanticide is illegal under Federal law. You cannot take a pillow and smother a newborn baby to death. What you can do and what does happen in abortion clinics across America—and it is why we held a Judiciary Committee hearing on this 2 weeks ago so as to hear from medical and legal community experts who know what the practice looks like—is the taking of that vulnerable,

innocent, little, tiny fetus, putting her on a cart, walking her down the hall, putting that cart in a closet, and leaving her to die by exposure. That is what we should prevent, and that is what this legislation is about.

I thank the Presiding Officer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, I come to the floor to support the two pro-life bills being considered this week and to stand with my friend and colleague from Nebraska in his efforts to promote the legislation that is before us, for both of these bills promote respect for innocent human life.

Senator LINDSEY GRAHAM's Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act would ban nearly all abortions at 20 weeks of pregnancy. As a doctor, I know that it is medically proven that babies do feel pain at 20 weeks. Americans overwhelmingly oppose these third-trimester abortions. Yet the United States remains one of only seven countries in the world to allow abortions after 5 months. This group includes China, and it includes North Korea. We need to do much better. The Graham bill puts us on higher ground with the rest of the world. It says, at 5 months, which is 20 weeks, abortion on demand must stop. It includes exceptions for rape, for incest, and for the life of the mother. I strongly support this effort by Senator GRAHAM, and I applaud him for his tremendous work on this issue.

I also stand here on the floor to say I strongly support what Senator SASSE has been saying about his specific bill, the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act. Senator SASSE is another champion on life issues. The Sasse bill affirms that infanticide is illegal. It upholds the right of all U.S.-born babies to full medical care. Every baby born in this country deserves every chance to live. All doctors must do everything in their power to save babies who survive abortions.

Both the Graham and the Sasse bills fully protect mothers from either prosecution or penalty. Both measures demonstrate character, and they demonstrate courage. These are bills that care for our children, and they do what is medically right.

Thanks to all of those who work to protect innocent human life, we are here on the floor, debating, promoting, and asking for a vote to pass this legislation. I urge all Senators to support these life-affirming bills.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. LOEFFLER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. LOEFFLER. Madam President, at the heart of this debate is life. When

I reflect on the importance of protecting innocent life, the story of Ellie Schneider comes to mind. She is a child who was born at just 21 weeks 6 days in Kansas City. Ellie is one of the youngest babies to survive, in the United States, a premature birth. She was born so early that most hospitals in Missouri would not treat her, except for the faith-based hospital St. Luke's.

She weighed only slightly more than a can of soda and was about as long as a piece of paper. She weighed just 14 ounces. At 21 weeks, the odds were stacked against her, but she is a fighter. Through the power of prayer and an incredible medical team, Ellie is now a healthy, happy 2-year-old girl. She brings endless joy to her family.

Her inclusion in the President's State of the Union Address is a powerful testament to life. Ellie is an example that every child is a blessing worthy of protection, and we have a moral obligation to defend the born and unborn.

In today's political climate, it is easy to forget that there are both Democrats and Republicans, liberals and conservatives, and people from every religious affiliation who believe in protecting the human rights of the unborn. I am proud to be a cosponsor S. 311, the Born-Alive Survivors Protection Act. It sends a clear message by establishing the real consequences for those who kill or abandon innocent children after they are outside the mother's womb. We should all be able to agree that once born, each baby deserves the right to proper access to medical care.

I also proudly support S. 3275, the Pain-Capable Unborn Protection Act, which places much needed restrictions on elective abortions on children at 20 weeks post-conception. It is unconscionable that America is one of only seven countries that does not have a 20-week abortion ban. These countries include China, North Korea, and Vietnam.

While it is disheartening that this type of horrific practice needs congressional action, I am glad there are commonsense pieces of legislation that can address the atrocities of late-term abortion and severely punishes those in the business of taking the lives of our youngest human beings.

I pray that the American people will recognize that lives hang in the balance, will stand with us to get our Nation back on the right track, and will fight for the born and the unborn. Being a voice for the voiceless requires us to take important steps, like passing the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act and the Pain-Capable Unborn Protection Act.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. CAPITO). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. Madam President, I rise today to oppose my colleagues' legislation that would limit women's healthcare choices. These bills that are being introduced are part of a wave of efforts to turn back the clock on women's healthcare.

In my home State of Nevada, with the only majority-women legislature in the Nation, we are moving in the opposite direction. We have been fighting to protect a woman's right to choose for decades. I am inspired by women like Sue Wagner, the first woman elected as Nevada's Lieutenant Governor, whose grit and leadership sparked a movement in the 1990s to enshrine women's reproductive freedom in the State's constitution.

Just this year, with women at the helm of the Nevada legislature, the Trust Nevada Women Act was signed into law to remove undue burdens on reproductive rights. Nevadans understand that reproductive rights are part and parcel not just of women's health but of their economic security. When women can't control whether and when they have children, they are more likely to struggle financially. Eighty-three percent of Nevadans are pro-choice, and I stand with them.

I am going to continue to fight for what the American people want: comprehensive healthcare and reproductive justice. Bills to protect women's health are what we should be voting on, like the bipartisan legislation to cover pre-existing conditions, to reduce prescription drug prices, to prevent violence against women, and many more that are languishing, unfortunately, on Leader MCCONNELL's desk. That includes pushing for meaningful legislation to protect mothers and babies at a critical time in their lives, like the Healthy MOM Act to expand healthcare coverage for pregnant and postpartum women.

Leader MCCONNELL is more focused on passing an extreme political agenda than on protecting women's health in Nevada and across this country. You know, we really have to stop the assault on women's right to choose and their reproductive healthcare. The rights of American women to make their own health decisions should not be up for debate. These are our fundamental rights, and they are worth fighting for and protecting.

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. SASSE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SASSE. Madam President, this afternoon, we are going to vote on the simplest bill in the history of the U.S.

Senate. It is the simplest bill we have ever considered here. It says that if a newborn baby survives an abortion, she deserves medical care. That is the bill. That is it.

Sadly, a lot of Senators are going to come to the floor, and they are going to read or they are planning to read—I hope they will reconsider—but they are planning to read talking points that were written for them by Planned Parenthood, and they are going to talk about a whole bunch of stuff that doesn't have anything to do with the bill we actually have before us.

Senators are going to muddy the issue, and, sadly, too many in the press are going to report with headlines like "Abortion Restrictions" and with anti-science jargon like "A Fetus That Was Born." That was an actual portion of the headline this morning: "A Fetus That Was Born."

Sadly, a lot of folks seem determined to look the other way. Looking the other way from the issue that we are considering today in this body shouldn't be an option, so let's start with four straight, undeniable facts—four simple facts.

First, Federal law does not criminalize the denial of care to newborn babies who survive abortions. Federal law doesn't criminalize the denial of care to babies who survive abortions.

Second, we know that babies sometimes survive abortions, and the data backs that up. If Senators don't like this inconvenient fact, they can take it up with the CDC and the States that have mandatory reporting about babies who survive abortions.

Third, this bill, the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act, simply says that if a baby survives an abortion, she should get the same degree of medical care that any other baby would get at that same gestational stage. It is really important—same care that would be provided to any other baby at the same gestational stage.

It is a short bill. I know my colleagues are busy, but all of them could read the bill. So instead of coming to the floor and reciting prepackaged talking points that Planned Parenthood wrote for you, take a few minutes and actually read the bill, and you will find that the talking points don't actually match up with the actual bill you are called on to vote on today. Those are the facts.

Finally, this is not about abortion. My colleague, the senior Senator from South Carolina, the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, has a really important piece of legislation that he is going to speak on in a moment, and I am going to support his legislation. It is a really important pro-life piece of legislation. I am in favor of it.

But my legislation, the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act, is not actually about abortion. It is about babies who have already survived a botched abortion. My legislation is not about *Roe v. Wade*. It is about what

happens after a baby is already born when an abortion failed to accomplish the purpose it had—the sad purpose, in my view—the purpose it had to terminate that pregnancy. This is about the babies who have already been born. This is about whether that baby who has survived the abortion and is now lying on the abortion table or on the medical table—whether or not that cold, naked baby alone has a right to medical care.

We all know the answer. The answer is, of course she does. Every baby dies if you leave her to passively die of exposure. Whether she was born in a gold-plated hospital with a lot of fancy, expensive cars in the parking lot outside that NICU unit or whether she was born in the unfortunate circumstances of an abortion clinic in a strip mall, every little baby who has already been born—they will die if you deny care to them. So, of course, we shouldn't do that. Of course, the U.S. Senate should stand up and defend those babies.

We all know that denying care to the most vulnerable among us is barbaric, and this body ought to be able to stand 100 to 0 against that barbarism. It is inhumane, and it is passive infanticide, and the Senate should today condemn and prohibit that practice. Is that practice what my colleagues really want to defend? I can't believe they do.

The 44 who filibustered this legislation a year ago this week, when you talk to them one to one, they get really uncomfortable, and they try to change the subject to all sorts of other culture war debates because they don't want to have a conversation about the actual legislation and the actual babies we are considering today. Why? Because they are scared to death of Planned Parenthood's army of lobbyists, that is why. It is not because any of them really want to defend the morally reprehensible and the morally indefensible practice that is passive infanticide. None of them want to defend it. They are just scared.

Last year, 44 Senators filibustered this legislation. They said that it was OK to look the other way while newborns were discarded. They said that Federal law should not ensure that these babies are treated with care. They seem to have a hard time saying that human beings outside the womb have the same right to life as you and I ought to have and that we get care; we need care. They need care, and they should get care.

Put down your talking points. Please read the bill before you vote today. Read the expert testimony that the chairman of the Judiciary Committee allowed us to hold in his committee room 2 weeks ago, where we brought in both medical and legal experts to talk about what happens in these abortion clinics.

For those in this body who are not on the Judiciary Committee or who didn't do the preparation for today's vote, I want to summarize the testimony of one of the people who came before our

Judiciary Committee—Jill Stanek, who now works for the Susan B. Anthony List. She was at an Illinois hospital in the 1990s and early 2000s. Here is a quote from her:

Of 16 babies Christ Hospital aborted during the calendar year 2000, four that I knew of [were born alive, and they] were aborted alive.

That is 25 percent—4 out of the 16 abortions at that hospital.

She continues:

Each of those babies—[there were] two boys and two girls—lived [somewhere] between 1½ and 3 hours. One baby was 28 weeks' gestation [age]—7 months old—and weighed two pounds, seven ounces.

Numbers from the CDC and the States that report data on abortion survivors—that is about 8 of the 50 States that do some reporting and data collection on this—tell a story of babies who were breathing, whose hearts were beating, who stretched their arms, wiggled their fingers, and kicked their legs. This is the actual data. You want to talk about being pro-science—being pro-science is pro-baby.

What happened to the babies? Medical practitioners have testified before Congress about walking into rooms where living babies were lying naked and alone on countertops, where they would be left to expire by themselves—alone, cold, naked, and denied care.

Opponents of this bill don't want to deal with the facts. They prefer to stick to talking points and claim that this never happens. If they will not listen to the medical experts, perhaps they will take the word of the Governor of Virginia, Ralph Northam.

In January of last year, disgraced Governor Northam was explicit during a radio interview in which he said that a baby born alive during an abortion "would be kept comfortable. . . . then a discussion would ensue" about whether that baby should be left to die. That is actually what Governor Northam was talking about on the radio in Virginia.

What he did is make the terrible faux pas of saying in public the true stuff about this procedure and this practice of walking away and backing away from these babies and letting them die. He just decided to talk in public about the reality of what happens in some of these abortion clinics.

Governor Northam is not an outlier. Just 3 weeks ago, one of the Democratic candidates for President was asked point blank on national television about infanticide: Would he be comfortable if a mother invoked infanticide to kill her now already born-alive child? Mayor Buttigieg's response: "I don't know what I'd tell them."

Really? Somebody asks you if you can kill a baby who has already been born, and you say you don't know what to say?

Every one of us, especially somebody running for the highest office in the land to uphold the laws—laws that promise to protect the right to life—

should be able to say without any hesitation that leaving babies to die is unacceptable.

This isn't horrid stuff, people. There are actually some horrid debates we have in this Chamber. This isn't one of them. This is about babies who have been born alive and whether you can decide to kill them. There is really no debate to be had here, which is why so many people who were planning to speak on the other side decided not to speak this afternoon, because you can't defend the morally reprehensible procedure that is backing away, that is passive infanticide.

There are no exceptions. There are no special circumstances. We should protect every human being, no matter how small they are, no matter how weak they are. And if the Senate says that it is OK to ignore born-alive babies, what we are really saying is that we are OK with a society where some people count more than other people. We would be saying that we want a society where some people can be pushed aside if other people decide those folks are inconvenient, a society where we can dispose of you if you happen to come into the world a certain way.

It is unbelievably telling that Planned Parenthood, NARAL, which is the extremist abortion lobby and their armies of lawyers and slick public relations teams and influence peddlers, cannot draw this line. It is pretty amazing.

This bill is not about abortion. Again, I want to be clear. We are voting on two things today. One of them is a piece of legislation about abortion. It is the pain-capable bill. LINDSEY GRAHAM, the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, is going to speak in favor of it in a minute. I am an original co-sponsor of his legislation. I support it, and I am going to wholeheartedly vote for it.

But the other piece of legislation we are going to vote on today isn't actually even about abortion. This should be 100-to-0 no-brainer. This bill is not about *Roe v. Wade*. This bill will not change one word of abortion law in the United States. My colleagues can vote up or down, but they can't pretend that they don't know the stakes of what we are talking about.

America is a country built on the beautiful principle of equality, and the terms of the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act are intended to reflect that. A child born alive during a botched abortion should be given the same level of care that would be provided to any other baby born at that same gestational stage, which is just to say that a born-alive baby is a human being with fundamental human dignity, which is undeniable. They should receive the care and affection due to every other human being.

Today, we have a chance to advance our commitment to human dignity. We can protect those babies who come into the world under the worst of conditions. We can welcome them into a

world with love and hope and help and care.

My colleagues, please do not turn your backs on those babies.

I yield the floor.

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, today, we will be voting on two very important bills: the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act and the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act. I would like to thank my colleagues Senator GRAHAM and Senator SASSE for their leadership on these bills, and I would like to thank Senator MCCONNELL, for his efforts to bring these bills to the floor for a vote.

First, I want to talk about Senator Sasse's Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act, a bill which I have cosponsored that would ensure that a baby who survives an abortion will receive the same treatment as any child naturally born at the same age, without prescribing any particular form of treatment.

That is just morally right, and I don't see why there would be any disagreement about it. This bill is not even about abortion; it is about infanticide.

Twenty-eight years ago, I came down here to tell the story of Ana Rosa Rodriguez. Here is what I said:

Mr. Chairman, there is a big misconception regarding abortion and the issue of women and their right to protect their bodies. It is not that right that I object to, but the right that is given them to kill an unborn fetus—an unborn child.

I want to share with you a story that my colleague, Chris Smith told some time ago on this very floor. Ana Rosa Rodriguez is an abortion survivor. At birth she was a healthy 3 pound baby girl except for her injury—she was missing an arm.

Ana survived a botched abortion. Her mother attempted to get an abortion in her 32nd week of pregnancy when she was perfectly healthy—8 weeks past what New York State law legally allows. In the unsuccessful abortion attempt the baby's right arm was ripped off, however they failed to kill Ana Rosa. She lived.

Pro-life supporters agreed that nightmare situations like the Rodriguez case are probably not common, but abortion related deaths and serious injuries occur more frequently than most people are aware.

It is amazing that we can pay so much attention to issues such as human rights abroad and can allow the violent destruction of over 26 million children here at home. We are fortunate that Ana was not one of those children—she survived.

That was in 1992. But today, we still don't have explicit Federal protections for the babies who survive the brutal abortion process. As I said, this issue is not about abortion but about caring for a baby outside the womb.

The need for these protections has become even clearer as we see States like New York and Illinois allow abortion for virtually any reason up until the point of birth and support infanticide by removing protections for infants born alive after a failed abortion.

Just a few years after that speech, in 1997, I was on the floor with my good friend former Senator Rick Santorum to try to pass the partial-birth abortion ban and end the horrific practice

of late-term abortions. Fortunately, we won the battle against partial-birth abortions and finally ended that practice in 2003. That ban was upheld by the Supreme Court in 2007.

But we have yet to pass legislation banning late term abortion.

Only seven countries allow abortion after 20 weeks, including the United States and North Korea. That is horrific. The U.S. is supposed to be an example in regards to global human rights; yet we are on par with North Korea when it comes to protecting the unborn.

Senator GRAHAM's Pain Capable Unborn Child Protection Act would help roll back this horrific practice by prohibiting abortion after 20 weeks post-fertilization, when we know babies can feel pain.

This is another commonsense bill that should not divide us along partisan lines; a baby is a baby whether in or outside of the womb, and each baby deserves a chance to live as an individual created in the image of God.

There still much more we need to do to end the abortion on demand culture, but thankfully, we have the most pro-life President in history.

This January, President Trump became the first sitting President to attend the annual March for Life rally in Washington. Hundreds of pro-life Oklahomans joined the President and tens of thousands of Americans to march. I had the chance to meet many of these Oklahomans, many of them extremely young—as young as high school. They asked me how to respond when the radical left attacks their views. I told them to be kind, but not to be afraid to voice their opinions—after all, they are right.

Under President Trump's leadership, we have protected the Hyde amendment, reinstated and expanded the Mexico City policy, and stripped abortion providers like Planned Parenthood from using title X funding for abortions.

The need to stand up for our babies is as important today as it was in 1992 and 1997. I am looking forward to building on our successes under President Trump to end the practice of abortion on demand and to ensure that we protect babies who survive abortions.

We will overcome evil with good by upholding and affirming the dignity and inherent worth of every human being. We will keep fighting.

Mr. MARKEY. Madam President, I rise in opposition to S. 3275, the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act, and S. 311, the Born-Alive Abortion Protection Act. These two dangerous bills infringe on the doctor-patient relationship and hinder women's constitutionally protected right to choose. Make no mistake, these bills are nothing more than a reminder that Republican discrimination toward women knows no boundaries. President Trump, his administration, and Senate Republicans think reproductive freedom is still up for discussion. It is not.

I am here to set the record straight for Leader MITCH MCCONNELL and my Republican colleagues. Women's reproductive health decisions should be left to women and their healthcare providers. That is it.

This time last year, the Born-Alive Abortion Protection Act failed to advance on the Senate floor. I was proud to vote against this bill then, and I hope more of my colleagues will join me in voting no on this bill now. Doing so will safeguard the right for an individual to make their own health choices, without interference from the Federal Government.

The Senate floor is not the only battleground for reproductive rights. Anti-Choice State legislators are continuing to assault reproductive freedom through the enactment of State laws restricting choice. Cases challenging these laws are working their way through the judicial system, including to the U.S. Supreme Court. There, the laws' supporters hope that the conservative justices will not only uphold these damaging laws but will go further and overturn *Roe v. Wade*, effectively ending this bedrock decision that ensures equality, privacy, and reproductive freedom.

Women across the Nation are facing imminent threats to their constitutional rights, to their personal liberty, and to economic freedom. Now more than ever, we must do everything in our power to raise our voices against this extreme, rightwing agenda of discrimination. This is more than a debate about access to safe abortion services. This is about fighting for gender equality. This is about continuing to ensure access to the opportunity that comes from quality, affordable healthcare. And this is about making sure that access to reproductive healthcare is never restricted.

Women's rights are not negotiable. Republicans may intend to continue advancing their radical anti-choice agenda, but I will never back away from the fight against it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. GRAHAM. Madam President, before Senator SASSE leaves, I say to the Senator, I just can't thank you enough for the passion and the persuasion you bring to these issues. You speak from the heart. You speak with reason. You make a lot of sense, and over time, you will prevail. Just stick with it. Your day will come.

What he is saying is, if you try to abort a child, and the child survives the abortion, shouldn't the doctor and the nurses and everybody involved treat the child the same as if they came into the world some other way? I think the answer is yes.

Really, these two pieces of legislation are about us as a nation. This is 2020. Who are we as Americans? To me it is odd that we even need to have a discussion about this. I am just perplexed that this is even a problem.

Abortion is legal in the United States. There are certain restrictions

on it, but I just can't believe we can't rally around the idea that if a baby survives the procedure and is alive and breathing and functioning, medical science doesn't kick in to save the baby. It is just—I don't know. I don't know what happened. What happened to our country that we are even talking about this? It is 2020, for God's sake. It is not 1020.

Anyway, just hang in there, Ben. Your day will come.

My legislation—I have been doing this for a few years now. We are one of seven nations in the world that allow abortion on demand at 20 weeks, along with North Korea, Vietnam, China, Singapore, the Netherlands, and Canada. What would this legislation do at 20 weeks? This is about the fifth month in the birthing process.

The bill is called the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act. Why do we call it that? Medical science has determined that a child at 20 weeks is capable of feeling excruciating pain. So if there is an operation to save a child's life or to repair a medical defect at 20 weeks, they provide anesthesia to the child because, during the surgery, the child feels pain. You can see that when a child is poked, they actually repel against the poking.

The bottom line is, I find it odd that medical science requires anesthesia to save the baby's life, but during that same period, you can dismember the child. That is what we are talking about here.

What kind of Nation are we if, at the fifth month—this is 20 weeks into the birthing process—we are one of seven nations that allow abortion on demand? There are exceptions for the life of the mother—that hard decision if the mother's life is impacted by the child, and we will leave that up to the family—and if the pregnancy is as a result of rape or incest. But beyond that, we want to eliminate abortion on demand at the 20-week period because, I would argue, that doesn't make us a better nation. It doesn't advance anybody's cause.

The bottom line is, based on medical science, we know that this child has nerve endings intact. Medical encyclopedias encourage young parents to sing to their unborn child during this period of development because they can begin to associate their voice and recognize who they are. I find it odd that we would encourage young parents to sing to their unborn child at 20 weeks; we require anesthesia to save the child's life; but we are also a country that allows the child to be dismembered. It makes no sense to me. They have exceptions that make sense: life of the mother, the result of rape or incest where there is no choice at all.

The bottom line is that these two pieces of legislation are going to continue to be advanced until they pass. It takes a while for America to kind of get focused on what we are saying here because abortion is an uncomfortable topic to talk about, particularly in the

early stages of the pregnancy. But what Senator SASSE is saying is that in the case of the child surviving an abortion, there is really not much to talk about. We should protect the life that is now a being. The baby survived. I don't know why the baby survived. I don't know how the baby survived. I just know that decent people would want to come to the child's aid once she does survive.

Just imagine what it must be like, after the baby survives the abortion, to be left unattended for 1½ to 3 hours. That says a lot about us as a nation. I just think we are better than that.

It is kind of odd that we even have to have this debate, but apparently we do because this happens more than you would ever think. Babies actually survive abortion, and the rules in this country are that you just let it die. There is no longer required care. That, to me, as Senator SASSE said, is barbaric. It doesn't make us a better people, and it really doesn't affect the abortion debate because the baby survived.

My legislation is about us as a nation too. How does abortion on demand in the fifth month advance the cause of America? I don't think it does.

We have exceptions in those instances where it is a tragic choice between the life of the mother and the unborn child and in the cases of rape or incest, which are tragic and criminal, but generally speaking, we would like to get ourselves out of a club of seven nations that allow abortion on demand at a time when the parents are encouraged to sing to the child and you have to provide anesthesia to save the child's life because you would not want to operate on a baby in a fashion to hurt the child.

I dare say that if you are a doctor and you try to save the baby's life at 20 weeks through surgery and you don't provide anesthesia, you are going to wind up getting yourself in trouble. I find it odd that the law would allow the dismemberment of the child even with anesthesia, but that is where we are.

To Senator SASSE, I say that you are an articulate spokesman for your legislation. One day, we will prevail. It took 15 years to pass the late-term abortion ban. It is going to take a while, but our day will come.

At the end of the day, the sooner America can get this right, the better off we will be.

With that, I yield the floor.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 420, S. 3275, an act to amend title 18, United States Code,

to protect pain-capable unborn children, and for other purposes.

Mitch McConnell, Tim Scott, Joni Ernst, Roy Blunt, Tom Cotton, Kevin Cramer, Cindy Hyde-Smith, Chuck Grassley, Marsha Blackburn, Richard Burr, Mike Rounds, Mike Lee, John Hoeven, Shelley Moore Capito, Mike Braun, Steve Daines, Lindsey Graham.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the motion to proceed to S. 3275, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to protect pain-capable unborn children, and for other purposes, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from 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 or change their vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 53, nays 44, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 57 Leg.]

YEAS—53

Alexander	Fischer	Perdue
Barrasso	Gardner	Portman
Blackburn	Graham	Risch
Blunt	Grassley	Roberts
Boozman	Hawley	Romney
Braun	Hoeven	Rounds
Burr	Hyde-Smith	Rubio
Capito	Inhofe	Sasse
Casey	Johnson	Scott (FL)
Cassidy	Kennedy	Scott (SC)
Cornyn	Lankford	Shelby
Cotton	Lee	Sullivan
Cramer	Loeffler	Thune
Crapo	Manchin	Tillis
Cruz	McConnell	Toomey
Daines	McSally	Wicker
Enzi	Moran	Young
Ernst	Paul	

NAYS—44

Baldwin	Harris	Reed
Bennet	Hassan	Rosen
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Schatz
Booker	Hirono	Schumer
Brown	Jones	Shaheen
Cantwell	Kaine	Sinema
Cardin	King	Smith
Carper	Leahy	Stabenow
Collins	Markey	Tester
Coons	Menendez	Udall
Cortez Masto	Merkley	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Murkowski	Warner
Durbin	Murphy	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Murray	Wyden
Gillibrand	Peters	

NOT VOTING—3

Klobuchar	Sanders	Warren
-----------	---------	--------

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 53, the nays are 44.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is not agreed to.

The Senator from Florida.

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the remaining votes in this series be 10 minutes in length.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 17, S. 311, an act to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit a health care practitioner from failing to exercise the proper degree of care in the case of a child who survives an abortion or attempted abortion.

Ben Sasse, John Boozman, Cindy Hyde-Smith, David Perdue, Tim Scott, Joni Ernst, Lindsey Graham, John Cornyn, James Lankford, Mike Rounds, John Hoeven, Mike Crapo, Thom Tillis, Roger F. Wicker, John Thune, Mike Braun, Mitch McConnell.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the motion to proceed to S. 311, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit a health care practitioner from failing to exercise the proper degree of care in the case of a child who survives an abortion or attempted abortion, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that 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 (Mr. CASSIDY). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 56, nays 41, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 58 Leg.]

YEAS—56

Alexander	Fischer	Paul
Barrasso	Gardner	Perdue
Blackburn	Graham	Portman
Blunt	Grassley	Risch
Boozman	Hawley	Roberts
Braun	Hoeven	Romney
Burr	Hyde-Smith	Rounds
Capito	Inhofe	Rubio
Casey	Johnson	Sasse
Cassidy	Jones	Scott (FL)
Collins	Kennedy	Scott (SC)
Cornyn	Lankford	Shelby
Cotton	Lee	Sullivan
Cramer	Loeffler	Thune
Crapo	Manchin	Tillis
Cruz	McConnell	Toomey
Daines	McSally	Wicker
Enzi	Moran	Young
Ernst	Murkowski	

NAYS—41

Baldwin	Cortez Masto	Kaine
Bennet	Duckworth	King
Blumenthal	Durbin	Leahy
Booker	Feinstein	Markey
Brown	Gillibrand	Menendez
Cantwell	Harris	Merkley
Cardin	Hassan	Murphy
Carper	Heinrich	Murray
Coons	Hirono	Peters

Reed	Sinema	Van Hollen
Rosen	Smith	Warner
Schatz	Stabenow	Whitehouse
Schumer	Tester	Wyden
Shaheen	Udall	

NOT VOTING—3

Klobuchar	Sanders	Warren
-----------	---------	--------

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 56 and the nays are 41.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is not agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate shall resume executive session to consider the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Silvia Carreno-Coll, of Puerto Rico, to be United States District Judge for the District of Puerto Rico.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Carreno-Coll nomination?

Mr. CRUZ. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Alabama (Mr. JONES), 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 96, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 59 Ex.]

YEAS—96

Alexander	Cruz	Leahy
Baldwin	Daines	Lee
Barrasso	Duckworth	Loeffler
Bennet	Durbin	Manchin
Blackburn	Enzi	Markey
Blumenthal	Ernst	McConnell
Blunt	Feinstein	McSally
Booker	Fischer	Menendez
Boozman	Gardner	Merkley
Braun	Gillibrand	Moran
Brown	Graham	Murkowski
Burr	Grassley	Murphy
Cantwell	Harris	Murray
Capito	Hassan	Paul
Cardin	Hawley	Perdue
Carper	Heinrich	Peters
Casey	Hirono	Portman
Cassidy	Hoeven	Reed
Collins	Hyde-Smith	Risch
Coons	Inhofe	Roberts
Cornyn	Johnson	Romney
Cortez Masto	Kaine	Rosen
Cotton	Kennedy	Rounds
Cramer	King	Rubio
Crapo	Lankford	Sasse

Schatz	Smith	Udall
Schumer	Stabenow	Van Hollen
Scott (FL)	Sullivan	Warner
Scott (SC)	Tester	Whitehouse
Shaheen	Thune	Wicker
Shelby	Tillis	Wyden
Sinema	Toomey	Young

NOT VOTING—4

Jones	Sanders
Klobuchar	Warren

The nomination was confirmed.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Katharine MacGregor, of Pennsylvania, to be Deputy Secretary of the Interior?

Mr. HAWLEY. 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. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Alabama (Mr. JONES), 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 58, nays 38, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 60 Ex.]

YEAS—58

Alexander	Graham	Perdue
Barrasso	Grassley	Portman
Blackburn	Hawley	Risch
Blunt	Heinrich	Roberts
Boozman	Hoeven	Romney
Braun	Hyde-Smith	Rounds
Burr	Inhofe	Rubio
Capito	Johnson	Sasse
Cassidy	Kennedy	Scott (FL)
Collins	King	Scott (SC)
Cornyn	Lankford	Shelby
Cotton	Lee	Sinema
Cramer	Loeffler	Sullivan
Crapo	Manchin	Thune
Cruz	McConnell	Tillis
Daines	McSally	Toomey
Enzi	Moran	Wicker
Ernst	Murkowski	Young
Fischer	Murphy	
Gardner	Paul	

NAYS—38

Baldwin	Feinstein	Rosen
Bennet	Gillibrand	Schatz
Blumenthal	Harris	Schumer
Booker	Hassan	Shaheen
Brown	Hirono	Smith
Cantwell	Kaine	Stabenow
Cardin	Leahy	Tester
Carper	Markey	Udall
Casey	Menendez	Van Hollen
Coons	Merkley	Warner
Cortez Masto	Murray	Whitehouse
Duckworth	Peters	Wyden
Durbin	Reed	

NOT VOTING—4

Jones	Sanders
Klobuchar	Warren

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 action.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Travis Greaves, of the District of Columbia, to be a Judge of the United States Tax Court for a term of fifteen years.

Mitch McConnell, Cindy Hyde-Smith, Thom Tillis, John Thune, Mike Crapo, Mike Rounds, Steve Daines, Kevin Cramer, Richard Burr, John Cornyn, Shelley Moore Capito, Todd Young, John Boozman, David Perdue, James E. Risch, Lindsey Graham, Roger F. Wicker.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Travis Greaves of the District of Columbia, to be a Judge of the United States Tax Court for a term of fifteen years, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Alabama (Mr. JONES), 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 (Ms. MCSALLY). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 91, nays 5, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 61 Ex.]

YEAS—91

Alexander	Fischer	Reed
Baldwin	Gardner	Risch
Barrasso	Graham	Roberts
Bennet	Grassley	Romney
Blackburn	Hassan	Rosen
Blumenthal	Hawley	Rounds
Blunt	Heinrich	Rubio
Boozman	Hoeven	Sasse
Braun	Hyde-Smith	Schatz
Brown	Inhofe	Schumer
Burr	Johnson	Scott (FL)
Cantwell	Kaine	Scott (SC)
Capito	Kennedy	Shaheen
Cardin	King	Shelby
Carper	Lankford	Sinema
Casey	Leahy	Smith
Cassidy	Lee	Stabenow
Collins	Loeffler	Sullivan
Coons	Manchin	Tester
Cornyn	McConnell	Thune
Cortez Masto	McSally	Tillis
Cotton	Menendez	Toomey
Cramer	Merkley	Udall
Crapo	Moran	Van Hollen
Cruz	Murkowski	Warner
Daines	Murphy	Whitehouse
Duckworth	Murray	Wicker
Durbin	Paul	Wyden
Enzi	Perdue	Young
Ernst	Peters	
Feinstein	Portman	

NAYS—5

Booker Harris Markey
Gillibrand Hirono

NOT VOTING—4

Jones Sanders
Klobuchar Warren

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas are 91, the nays are 5.

The motion is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Travis Greaves, of the District of Columbia, to be a Judge of the United States Tax Court for a term of fifteen years.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

ABORTION

Mr. LANKFORD. Madam President, I rise to have a dialogue. Let me start it this way. My brother and I did not always agree on things. I know that may be shocking that two brothers did not get along on everything. Maybe in your house you got along on everything, but my brother and I, growing up, did not agree on everything.

In fact, growing up, I distinctly remember the day we reached epic levels, and we actually got masking tape out in our room and put a line down the floor that ran from one wall across to the other wall. We had an old-school stereo record player in our room. The line ran up the record player so that on one side he had the tuning knob and on the other side I had the volume knob. We would have to reach some sort of detente to listen to anything. If he turned it to a station I didn't like, I could turn the volume all the way down. We would have to work things out. The line even went through our closet, with his clothes and my clothes on it, and we had a clear line of separation that you could not cross that line. The rules were very clear in our room. For whatever reason, our mom put up with it for quite a while as we had our "Don't cross the line into my side" kind of moment.

It is interesting that today in the Senate there was in some ways kind of a line-drawing moment to not draw a line but to try to figure out where are our lines, where are our boundaries on an issue that Americans talk about all the time, in many ways, but always get nervous in that dialogue. It is the issue about when is a child a child.

We have this weird dialogue as a nation because we have a great passion for children. We spend a tremendous amount of money, personally, on our families and in our communities and in nonprofits and Federal taxpayer dollars to walk alongside children to do everything we can to protect the lives of those children.

We have some in this body who have proposed Federal taxpayer dollars for children in their very first days of life to have childcare that is available for

them, but literally 3 days before that, they have also proposed Federal tax dollars for abortion to take that life.

It begs the question: Where is your line on life? What is that moment? For me, I go with the science. It is conception. That is a dividing cell that has DNA that is different than the mom and different than the dad. That dividing cell is a uniquely different person. Every science textbook, every medical textbook that you look at would identify that DNA is different than any other DNA in the world. That is a different person. As those cells grow and divide and as that child grows and divides, whether they are 50 years old or whether they are only days old still in womb, the DNA is the same. All the building blocks are in that child from their earliest days.

Others will look at it and will ask the question—like the Supreme Court did in 1973, when they ruled on *Roe v. Wade* on the issue of viability. That is when the Supreme Court said, in 1973, that States can engage and try to make some laws dealing with abortion, which is based around this issue of viability. Viability, in 1973, is very different than it is now. We have many children who are born at 21, 22, 23, 24 weeks gestation who are prematurely delivered, spend months in a NICU facility, and thrive as adults. That viability question is different now than it was in 1973, but we also know more about the science now than we knew at that time as well.

We know that a child—some would say on the science side of it—as early as 12 weeks old of development, still in the womb, can feel and experience pain. Certainly, by 20 weeks, 21, 22 weeks, they have developed a brain and have developed a nervous system. The system of experiencing pain is all in place. If anything happens to that child, that child will experience the pain and the effects of that.

The New York Times had a really interesting article in October 2017, talking about a young man, Charley Royer. When he was just at 24 weeks development in the womb, the parents made a very difficult decision to have a surgery in utero. It is spina bifida. The child would be paralyzed. The New York Times writes about how they did this surgery—this very intricate surgery—that happened at Texas Children's Hospital at Baylor College of Medicine. They basically delivered the child, doing surgery on that child, reinserting the uterus and the child back into the mom's womb, and then stayed all the way through until full gestation and was delivered.

Charley is apparently doing very well. It was a remarkable surgery. During that surgery, they made sure they helped that child and gave him additional medications to protect him from pain because they were doing surgery on someone who felt the effects of the surgery at 24 weeks.

Today we had a vote in the Senate to ask Senators, if you don't agree with

me on this that the line should be conception, to consider that child a child at conception, would you consider that child a child when they can experience pain? They have a beating heart. They have a functioning nervous system. They have 10 fingers, 10 toes.

This is not a tissue we are talking about. This is what a child looks like in the womb at 20 to 22 weeks. That is a child. The question is, Is your line when that child has a beating heart, has a functioning nervous system, can experience pain? Is that your line?

We had that vote today. Unfortunately, this Senate body said no. The line is not at conception, and the line is not even when they look like this and can experience pain. That bill was voted down.

There are only four countries in the world that allow abortion on demand at any time—four countries left in the world that still abort children who look like this, who experience pain, who are in late term. It is the United States, North Korea, China, and Vietnam. That is all that is left in the world that looks at this and says that is just tissue; that is not really a baby.

This Senate voted again today to affirm that same club that we are in with China, North Korea, and Vietnam. That is not a club I want our Nation to be in. They are some of the worst human rights violators in the world, and they don't recognize the value and the dignity of life. We do, or at least I thought we did, but that is not where our line is, apparently.

Today we took another vote in the Senate, and it was a very clear line as well to say: OK. If your line is not at conception, and if it is not when the child can experience pain, and it is not a late-term abortion when the child is actually viable, maybe your line is actually when they are delivered, when they are fully out of the womb. We took a vote on a bill called the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act. It is a very straightforward bill. It is not about abortion at all. It is about a child who is fully delivered.

In medical practice, there are times when there is a late-term abortion that in the procedure itself to actually conduct the abortion, instead of the child being aborted and killed in the womb, it is a spontaneous birth that actually occurs, and the child is actually fully delivered. The intent was to destroy the child in the womb, but that is not what happened. What happened, instead, in a small percentage of abortions, was that child was actually delivered. Now the question is, the child is no longer in the womb. The child is literally fully delivered and is crying on the table in front of you. What do you do? We asked the question of this body: Where is your line? Is your line at delivery? Even if the intent was originally abortion, that didn't occur, is your line at delivery? Unfortunately, this body voted no. We could not get 60 Senators of 100 to say even if a child is fully delivered outside of the womb,

crying on the table, that is a child. That is a frightening statement about where we are in our culture.

I have had all kinds of folks say: Well, this is not about infanticide. Infanticide is already illegal.

I said: Yes, that is true.

In 2002, there was unanimous support in this body, in the Senate, to pass a bill saying that if a child is delivered, that would be infanticide. The problem was, it left no consequences at all and allowed what still happens today where if a child is fully delivered, there are no consequences for allowing them to die on the table.

A couple of years ago, Kermit Gosnell was fully delivering children in his abortion clinic. He was fully delivering them, and then he would take scissors, flip the child over, and snip their spinal cord to kill them. He is in prison right now for carrying out that act because that was considered infanticide. But what is still legal is allowing the child to just lie there on the table until they slowly die.

Jill Stanek is a nurse who has practiced for years in Illinois. She gave testimony in a hearing not long ago and testified multiple times about what is going on in some of these abortion facilities and what happens when a child is fully delivered and they are still alive. In her experience, what she has watched before, she has noticed that children will live outside the womb. These are viable children lying on the table, or in her particular hospital, they literally took the child to a linen closet and closed the door and left him there. They would live somewhere between an hour and, some children, as long as 8 hours, just waiting to die. Ladies and gentlemen, in ancient times, it was called exposure when you would take a child and set them outside to die without medical care.

Our vote today was, if a child is fully delivered, should they get medical care, or should we just allow medical facilities to just back off and allow them to slowly die? And today this Senate could not get 60 votes to say we should at least give medical care to that child instead of allowing them to slowly die on the table on their own—a child literally crying, kicking their feet, but ignored. I would hope we are better than that as a country, but apparently the line has still not been discovered for the value of a child. I am one who believes that a child has great value, a child has great worth. Whether that child is a kindergartner or in the womb, that child has value. As a culture, we should stand for the value of every child.

I am amazed, absolutely amazed when I think about the fact that 100 years ago, my wife, my mom, and my daughters would not have been able to vote. I can't even process that 100 years ago, my wife, my mom, and my daughters would not have been allowed to vote in America. What were we thinking as Americans that we did that?

I am amazed that there was a time in America not that long ago where if you

were of Japanese descent, they rounded you up, put you in camps, and held you, as an American citizen, just because you were of Japanese descent. I can't even process the fact that we did that as Americans.

I cannot believe there was a time in America where we looked at African Americans and said: That is three-fifths of a man. I cannot even process that was in our law, that we declared a human being three-fifths of a person.

I am so grateful that we no longer round up people because they are of Japanese descent, that we allow women to vote, and that we consider all people equal. I am so grateful that time has passed. I long for the day, which I believe is coming, that we as a nation look back and say: What were we thinking that we allowed children to live or die based on our convenience? And if a child was inconvenient, we just killed them or we set them on the table and allowed them to slowly die from exposure because they were inconvenient in the moment. There will be a day when we will look back on this season in American history and we will say: What were we thinking that we considered some children more valuable than others, that we considered some lives worth living and some to just be thrown away?

What is your line? When is a life worth protecting? When does life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness actually apply to you in America? I wish it was conception or at least when they can experience pain or at least when they are fully born, but this body has not yet found the moment when we can agree that life is valuable. I long for the day that we do.

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. VAN HOLLEN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ELECTION SECURITY

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam President, I rise today to once again call upon the Senate to take immediate and urgent action to prevent Russia or any other foreign power from interfering in our 2020 elections. Since the last time I came to the Senate floor to talk about this issue, it has become only more urgent. The clock is ticking, and each day that goes by without the Senate taking action, this body becomes more complicit in the hijacking of our democracy by Vladimir Putin or other foreign powers that try to interfere in our elections.

Just in the last week, we have seen significant new developments. We know that the intelligence community briefed the House Intelligence Committee about ongoing Russian interference in our current elections.

We also know that upon learning about that briefing, upon hearing that

the intelligence community was doing its job in keeping Congress informed about election interference, President Trump erupted upon hearing the news. He did not want the House of Representatives to know what the Russians were up to.

We know that soon after that briefing, President Trump unceremoniously fired his Acting Director of National Security, Joseph Maguire, who is a military veteran and a career public servant of great integrity. All of that, we know. And we know that President Trump replaced Mr. Maguire with an Acting Director who has no prior experience in the intelligence community and whose only qualification appears to be to tell President Trump what President Trump wants to hear when it comes to intelligence information or other matters.

None of us should be surprised to learn that the Russians are interfering again in our elections. They did it in 2016. That was the unanimous verdict of all our U.S. intelligence agencies. In fact, that was the verdict by the head of agencies who had been appointed by President Trump. That was also the bipartisan finding of the Senate Intelligence Committee. They found that there was some level of Russian interference in the 2016 elections in every State in the country, all 50 States. It was also the well-documented conclusion in the Muller report that brought a number of indictments against Russian operatives of the GRU.

Just last November, the leaders of the intelligence agencies—again, leaders appointed by the current President—all warned the Congress and the American people that the Russians and other foreign powers would seek to interfere in our elections in 2020. Those agencies included the heads of the NSA, the CRA, the FBI, the DNI, and others. Last November, all of them warned us about expected Russian interference in our elections. So it really should be no surprise that we learned last week of a briefing in the House where the intelligence community said: We told you so.

We have determined that the Russians are interfering right now in the ongoing 2020 elections. That shouldn't be surprising. What is surprising and what is shocking is that the Congress has done virtually nothing to prevent it. Think about that. We were warned in 2016. We have been warned repeatedly since then that the Russians are going to interfere in our 2020 elections. We now have a briefing about ongoing interference and still nothing. What does the President do in response to that information? He fires the head of the intelligence community. He fires him because he doesn't want him to tell Congress what the Russians are doing.

Just last month, in February, the Senate Intelligence Committee issued another report. It was another bipartisan report. What they did was they went back to look at what happened in

the 2016 elections—specifically in the lead-up to the 2016 elections—and asked themselves the question: Why, when we learned that there was some Russian interference, did we not notify and alert the country?

Their findings were interesting. They found that there were various political reasons. People had concerns about making that information public. In fact, the Republican leader, the majority leader here, was one of those who said: No, we should not inform the American people about that interference.

The Senate Intelligence Committee drew lessons from that, saying: We shouldn't be caught once again unprepared. That is what they said in the report just last month, and now we are sitting here today with the intelligence community telling us the Russians are interfering right now as we speak, and we are doing nothing about it. Our democracy is under attack, and we are just pretending things are going on as normal. You would think we would all agree that when our democracy is under attack, we should unify immediately and take every action necessary to prevent that.

What could and should we do?

We should harden our election systems. We should make sure that voting systems around the country are harder to hack. We should make sure that voter registration information is harder to hack, and we have dedicated some additional resources to that. We haven't done enough, but we have taken some small steps in that direction, as we should.

This is a situation in which the best defense is a good offense, and as long as Vladimir Putin and the Russians don't pay any price at all for interfering in our elections, it should be no surprise that they are going to keep on doing it. It is cost-free to them. In fact, they are gaining major benefits, and we see them around the country. They are succeeding in helping to divide Americans against one another. They are succeeding in undermining public confidence in the democratic system. That is exactly what Vladimir Putin wants to do here in the United States and among our allies in Europe and elsewhere around the world.

What should we do about it?

After we learned of what happened in 2016, Senator RUBIO and I introduced a bipartisan bill. It is called the DETER Act. In addition to Senator RUBIO and me, we have Republican and Democratic cosponsors.

What does the bill do?

It is pretty straightforward. It says to Vladimir Putin and other foreign powers: If we catch you interfering in a future election, you will pay a price. That price will be immediate, and it will be severe. So, if you are thinking about what benefits you might gain from interfering in an American election, you will know there will also be a big price to pay.

That is the legislation that Senator RUBIO and I introduced back in 2017. It

has not gotten a vote here in the U.S. Senate. It has not gotten it. It didn't have a vote in the last Congress, so we reintroduced it in this Congress.

Now, last fall, when we were taking up the National Defense Authorization Act, the NDAA, the Senate agreed that part of our national defense meant defending our democracy and part of our defending our democracy meant defending the integrity of our elections. So we unanimously, by a voice vote here in the Senate, said that the Defense authorization bill should include a provision like the DETER Act, that it should include a provision that says to the Russians and other foreign powers: If we catch you interfering in an election, there will be a severe price to pay.

When I talk about a severe price, I mean sanctions on their economies, sanctions on their major banks, sanctions on the energy sectors—real economic pain, not imposing sanctions on a few oligarchs, but real pain. That is what the Senate said we should do as part of the NDAA, the National Defense Authorization Act.

Guess what happened?

When the conferees—when the negotiators—went behind closed doors, the White House essentially told the Senate conferees: Huh-uh, we don't want you adopting these important protections—protections to defend the integrity of our democracy.

So, despite that unanimous Senate vote, it just disappeared in the middle of the night from the negotiations over the Defense authorization bill.

What do we do?

The clock is ticking, and it is time for the Senate to do now what it said it wanted to do when we unanimously passed that motion to instruct the conferees to pass something like the DETER Act as part of the Defense bill, and we are, right now, engaged in ongoing discussions with the chairman of the Senate Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs Committee to try to finally get this bill—this bipartisan bill—out of the U.S. Senate. I hope we make progress because what appears to be the situation is that the White House is essentially putting up a massive roadblock to progress on this matter.

It is not our job in the U.S. Senate to simply do the bidding of this President or of any other President. It is the duty of this Senate to protect our democracy against what we know is an ongoing attack on the integrity of our elections.

That is why I am here on the floor right now, because we just got the news last week that everything we had been warned about in terms of expected Russian interference in our 2020 elections is coming true. So we have a missile aimed at the integrity of our elections, and the Senate is doing nothing about it. It is unbelievable and grossly negligent to know, in realtime, that our elections are being undermined and to take no action.

I just want to say to my colleagues that, if we don't move forward on the bipartisan DETER Act in the coming days and make progress in the coming days, I will be back here on the Senate floor next week, and I will ask for unanimous consent to bring it up. If Senators want to come down here in the light of day and say no—no to bipartisan legislation that protects our democracy—they can do that, but we are going to keep at this, and with every day that goes by, we learn more about what is happening now.

I close with what I said before: We should not be surprised that Vladimir Putin is interfering in our elections. He did it in 2016, and we have been told ever since then that he will do it again. What is surprising and shocking and grossly negligent is that this body has not taken action to date to protect our democratic process. We are going to keep fighting until we get that done.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Would the Senator accept a question?

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Yes, I would be delighted to entertain a question.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Madam President, just for the reference of everyone, I believe the majority leader is going to come in for his closing script. When he does, that will end whatever little colloquy we will have had here, and I will then do my "Time to Wake Up" speech.

In the time that it takes the majority leader to get here, I am interested in hearing the Senator from Maryland say that the White House—our White House—the President of the United States—is a massive roadblock to protecting the integrity of our upcoming election from foreign interference. How does that make sense? Why would it be an American President who doesn't want to defend the integrity of an American election from foreign interference?

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I thank the Senator from Rhode Island for the question.

All I can say is we have seen a pattern from this President. We saw this President, President Trump, in Helsinki a few years ago, standing next to Vladimir Putin, and our President was the one who threw our intelligence community under the bus. He said he trusted Vladimir Putin when Putin told him, Don't worry, President Trump. We didn't interfere in your elections.

President Trump said: OK. I think President Putin may be right about our intelligence community.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. He did say it very strongly.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. He did, and we have seen that pattern over and over again.

We just learned of this briefing that took place in the House of Representatives this week. The response from President Trump was not, Oh, my goodness. Let's pass this legislation. It was to fire the guy who was in charge of the intelligence community.

So what do you think?

It is a mystery to all of us as to why the President is taking this action other than the fact that, of course, he did call on Russia in the last election and welcomed its support. We all saw him on national television when he did that.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Yes.

In fact, even the Mueller report showed that there was considerable Russian activity and support in the election that made Donald Trump our President. They couldn't prove an ongoing conspiracy between the Trump campaign and the Russian election interference effort, but they confirmed that there was a Russian election interference effort. If I recall correctly, they confirmed that the Trump campaign was witting of it, just not conspiring with it, just not directly engaged with it.

So I don't know. Perhaps it is just the hope that, perhaps, he will get elected again with foreign interference and that he doesn't want to close off that option, but it is a little bit odd for the President of the United States not to take the protecting of the security of the American election more seriously.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I am glad Senator WHITEHOUSE made that distinction with respect to the Mueller report.

It is true that they did not find a criminal conspiracy, meaning they did not find some agreement between the Trump campaign and the Russians to interfere, but they found plenty of evidence of the Trump campaign's welcoming the intervention from the Russians.

Of course, we have more recently seen President Trump spreading the conspiracy theories that were launched by Vladimir Putin that it was not the Russians who interfered in the 2016 elections: Oh, my God. It was the Ukrainians who interfered in the 2016 elections.

There is this famous videotape now of Vladimir Putin's saying: Thank God, they are not blaming the Russians anymore. They are blaming the Ukrainians.

Translation: Thank God our propaganda is working, and even the President of the United States and some Members of the House of Representatives are parroting our conspiracy theory, the ones that we cooked up.

It is really alarming that a foreign government—someone like Vladimir Putin—is so successful in spreading its misinformation within our system.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. I appreciate the concern of the Senator from Maryland on this, and I wish him success with his legislation.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I thank the Senator for his questions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Madam President, I come to again raise an alarm about the massive carbon pollution

that we are dumping into our natural world and to tell the stories of two ocean creatures that are suffering from that pollution. Now, we may mock or ignore these creatures—these lesser creatures so far down the food chain from us—but we are fools to ignore the message of what is happening to them.

Matthew 25:41 admonishes, “as you did it to one of the least of these . . . you did it to me.” So we ought not mock and ignore these lesser species because they also have a lesson for us, a warning. If we keep up what we are doing to them, it will soon enough be we who suffer. As Pope Francis warned: Slap Mother Nature, and she will slap you back.

Let's start, before we get to the two species, with an overview.

First, it is not just these two species. Science writer Elizabeth Kolbert has warned that we have entered a sixth great extinction—the first and only great extinction in humans' time on the planet—and that this great extinction is driven by manmade pollution and climate change. Scientists from around the globe have just issued one of the most comprehensive reports ever on Earth's biodiversity, and the head of that panel, Sir Robert Watson, summarized its findings this way.

I quote him here:

The overwhelming evidence . . . presents an ominous picture. The health of ecosystems on which we and all other species depend is deteriorating more rapidly than ever. We are eroding the very foundations of our economies, livelihoods, food security, health and quality of life worldwide.

The legendary David Attenborough warns that we face what he calls “irreversible damage to the natural world and the collapse of our societies.”

He says: “It may sound frightening, but the scientific evidence is that if we have not taken dramatic action within the next decade, we could face irreversible damage to the natural world and the collapse of our societies.”

In all of this, we need to remember our oceans. Oceans are warming and acidifying and literally suffocating ocean species as oxygen dead zones expand. Earth's oceans warm at the rate of multiple Hiroshima explosions' worth of heat per second—per second. They acidify at the fastest rate in at least 50 million years. They are also fouled with our plastic garbage and polluted by runoff from farming and stormwater. Our oceans' warnings are loud and clear and measurable. They are chronicled by fishermen and sailors and measured with thermometers, tide gauges, and simple pH tests that measure acidification.

It is this acidification that takes me to these two species. The oceans are absorbing around 30 percent of our excess carbon dioxide emissions, and they do that in a chemical interaction that takes up the CO₂ but acidifies the seawater. Don't pretend there is any dispute about this. Acidification is a chemical phenomenon. You can demonstrate it in a middle school science

lab. You can demonstrate it with your breath, an aquarium bubbler, a glass of water, and a pH strip. In fact, I have done so right at this desk.

Here is the first species pictured—the tiny pteropod. It is an oceanic snail about the size of a small pea. It is known as the sea butterfly because it has adapted two butterflylike wings that can propel it around in the ocean.

Acidifying waters make it harder for pteropods and a lot of other shelled creatures to grow their shells and develop from juveniles to adults. Researchers in the Pacific Northwest have reported what they called “severe shell damage” on more than half of the pteropods they collected from Central California to the Canadian border.

These images show the pteropod's shell when the creature's underwater environment becomes more acidic—not good for pteropods. Maintaining their shells against that acidity requires energy—energy that would otherwise go into growth or reproduction. So acidification makes it harder for species, such as the pteropods and other shell creatures at the base of the oceanic food chain, to survive.

Who cares? Who cares about the lowly, humble pteropod? Who cares about some stupid ocean snail? Well, for one, salmon do. Half the diet of some salmon species in the Pacific is pteropods. Salmon fisheries support coastal jobs and economies across our Pacific Northwest. Offshore fishing in the United States is a multibillion dollar industry connected to hundreds of thousands of livelihoods. If you care about our fisheries industry, you should care about the humble pteropod. An entire food chain stands on its tiny back, and we are in that food chain.

Move up the food chain a little, and you find another creature facing peril from acidification—the Dungeness crab. You see this crustacean on ice in your local fish market. It is an important commercial catch along our west coast. In 2014, the last year the Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission did a comprehensive report, the Dungeness catch was worth \$170 million. It is Oregon's most valuable fishery, and it is important also for Washington State and for California, where annual landings run between \$40 and \$95 million. Up north, in 2017, Alaska's commercial landings of Dungeness crabs totaled more than 2.1 million pounds.

Last month, marine scientists reported that acidified oceans are dissolving the delicate shells of Dungeness crab larvae. The acidic environment is not just damaging the shells but also damaging the larvae's mechanoreceptors, the hairlike sensory organs that crabs use to hear and feel and make their way around the sea. The damage to the crabs is bad news, but worse is that we are seeing it now. Scientists thought hardy Dungeness crabs wouldn't be affected by acidification for decades. Richard Feely, senior NOAA scientist and coauthor of the study, reports that these “dissolution

impacts to the crab larvae . . . were not expected to occur until much later in this century."

The sentinel implications for the entire ecosystem are grave. If the Dungeness are feeling the effects of ocean acidification now, what other creatures are feeling those effects too? Another lead author of this study said: "If the crabs are affected already, we really need to make sure we start to pay much more attention to various components of the food chain before it is too late."

These concerns about the Dungeness crab and its happening too soon echo what scientists actually said of early findings about the pteropod. Oceanographer William Peterson, who is the co-author of an early study on the pteropod, said: "We did not expect to see pteropods being affected to this extent in our coastal region for several decades."

So we are way ahead of schedule in terms of what scientists have predicted for ocean acidification outcomes for these foundational creatures in our ocean ecosystem. Together, the pteropod and the Dungeness crab send a common message, one echoed by a Rhode Island fishing boat captain who told me: "Sheldon, things are getting weird out there."

And they are getting weird faster than expected. The rapid ocean acidification that we are measuring now and that we are causing now with further carbon pollution is nearly unprecedented in the geological record. Scientists look back to try to find historical analogs for what is happening. The closest historical analogs scientists can find for what they are seeing now in the oceans go back before human-kind. There is no analog in human time. You have to go back before humans existed, back into the prehistoric record, back to the prehistoric great extinctions, back when marine species were wiped out and ocean ecosystems took millions of years to recover. That is the historical analog that best matches our current direction.

In his encyclical "Laudato Si," Pope Francis, who is a trained scientist himself, reflected on what he called "the mysterious network of relations between things" in life. In that mysterious network of relations between things, the pteropod and the crab larva give their lives to transmit food energy from the microscopic plants they eat, which would be of no use to us, up to the fish that consume the pteropod and larva—fish, which we, in turn, consume—all in that great mysterious network of relations between things.

What is happening to these two species is more than just an event. It is a signal. It is a signal of a looming global ecological catastrophe. Lesser species, species that we may mock or ignore, can sometimes be sentinels for humans, like the legendary canaries taken down into coal mines. When the sentinels start to die, it is wise to pay attention.

What happens when, in our arrogance and pride, we refuse to heed the warnings from creatures so humble as the pteropods or crab larvae? Well, remember why Jesus was so angry with the Pharisees. What was their sin? Their arrogance and their pride blinded them to the truth. The Senate, this supposedly greatest deliberative body, has blinded itself to the devastation fossil fuels are unleashing on our Earth's mysterious network. We careen recklessly into the next great extinction.

Pope Francis says:

Because of us, thousands of species will no longer give glory to God by their very existence, nor convey their message to us. We have no such right.

Indeed, we have no such right.

So I come here today to challenge us to see the damage we have done—the damage we are doing now, today, to this mysterious network of life, this mysterious God-given network of life that supports us. I challenge us also to turn away from dark forces of corruption and greed—specifically, the fossil fuel industry forces that have deliberately, on purpose, crippled our ability in Congress to stop their pollution.

I close by challenging us to heed the message of the humble creatures sharing this planet with us—the least of us, who share God's creation. They suffer at our hands, and in their suffering they send us a message, a warning, that we would do well to hear.

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. 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.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam 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.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, when one looks at a largely unified and democratic Europe, today it is easy to forget just how different it was in Eastern Europe not that long ago. For half a century, millions lived under the tyranny and repression of the Soviet Union.

But in the late 1980s, things began to change, particularly in the Baltic nations of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania. Who can forget when 2 million people joined hands across these three

nations to form the 420-mile Baltic Chain of Freedom in August 1989? And not long after in February of the following year, Lithuania held its first free elections since World War II, voting for the country's first postwar non-Communist government. Immediately thereafter, the new Parliament voted to make Lithuania the first occupied Soviet republic to declare independence. Lithuania's bold move was followed later that year by Latvia and Estonia. These brave efforts culminated a year later in February 1991, when the Lithuania people overwhelmingly voted for independence—a historic move recognized by the US and Soviet Union that same year.

My first visit to Lithuania was nearly 40 years ago, but my ties reach back even further. One hundred years ago, my grandmother left her village of Jubarkas with her three small children to join my grandfather in America. In her arms, she carried a 2-year-old toddler—my mother, Ona Kutkaite.

Hidden in my grandmother's baggage was a small Catholic prayer book, printed in Vilnius in 1863, the last year before printing in Lithuanian was outlawed by the czars. That prayer book—the last, cherished relic of my family's life in their beautiful and ancient home—escaped the czars and was kept safe with our family in America during the brutal Soviet occupation. When I had the honor of addressing the Seimas of the Republic of Lithuania on the 20th anniversary of independence, I was proud to bring that prayer book home to a free Lithuania. Those brave Lithuanians 30 years ago—including my friend Vytautas Landsbergis, who served as Lithuanian's first post-independence head of state—led the country to a prosperous and democratic future.

Lithuania today is a vital member of the European Union, NATO, and the community of democracies. It held the presidency of the European Union earlier this decade and is a leading voice on the continent for standing up to Russia, defending Ukraine, and upholding key democratic values. And as it faces renewed threats from Russia, I have been a strong supporter of strengthening NATO operations and defenses in the Baltic nations. A few years ago, I visited the Lithuanian town of Rukla, where U.S. and German forces were rotating through as part of the European Reassurance Initiative aimed at keeping the Baltic safe.

As the cochair of the Senate Baltic Caucus, I will be introducing a resolution in the weeks ahead reaffirming this security cooperation and recognizing Lithuania's great achievements around its 30th anniversary of independence.

In February 1990, when I came to Lithuania as part of an American delegation to observe the historic elections, my friends took me inside the Seimas to show me the arsenal of the Lithuanian freedom fighters. In the corner stood a handful of old rifles—no

match for the Soviet war machine. But Lithuanians were armed with stronger weapons—faith, courage, and a burning desire to reclaim their independence. Because of the sacrifices of so many patriots, known and unknown, we can proudly and without fear proclaim here today on the 30th anniversary of these historic events: *Laisva Lietuva*. Free Lithuania. Now and always.

So let us use this historic anniversary to recommit to our continued support for our Baltic allies through economic and security cooperation and to reaffirm America's commitment to NATO and the enduring transatlantic alliance. Doing so will help ensure the next 30 years of the longstanding U.S.-Baltic friendship are equally strong and fruitful.

150TH ANNIVERSARY OF ERIE HOUSE

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, Florence Hayden Towne dedicated her book, "Neighbor: Stories of Neighborhood House Work in a Great City," to the Erie Neighborhood House. She wrote, it "brought new hope and courage and a new way of life these whom we call 'neighbors.'" Throughout its 150-year history, the Erie House has consistently improved the lives of low-income, immigrant families in Chicago. Though the people, challenges, and times may have changed, the Erie House's mission has remained firm. Immigrant families have always found Erie House to be a place that empowers them and helps create a more engaged community. Today, we celebrate the great work of Erie House and congratulate its staff and supporters on the 150th anniversary.

Erie Neighborhood House began as Holland Presbyterian Church on the corner of North Noble Street and West Erie Street in 1870. The congregation offered several programs, including kindergarten and Sunday school, to the new families arriving from Dutch, Scandinavian, and German countries to the West Chicago neighborhood. The congregation moved to 1347 West Erie Street and changed its name to Erie Chapel in 1886. In 1893, Erie Kindergarten became one of the 20 flagship programs in Chicago's Free Kindergarten Association initiative and expanded youth programs to include choirs for children and adults and industrial classes.

As the neighborhood immigrant population changed to include Catholic countries like Poland and Italy, Erie Chapel renamed itself the Erie Chapel Institute and continued to serve the community and advance the settlement house tradition. In 1936, the staff rechristened the 1347 building with a new name, the Erie Neighborhood House.

Erie Neighborhood House continued to meet the challenges of the time. In 1942, with the Second World War raging, Erie House began providing daycare services since many men were

deployed overseas and many women had entered the workforce. In February 1945, Reverend Douglas Cedarleaf marched with members of Erie House to protest the treatment of the Strongs, a Black family that had recently moved into a White community and faced violence from their neighbors.

In 1957, volunteer physicians at Northwestern Memorial and Erie Neighborhood House founded the Erie Family Health Center to provide a variety of primary care, case management, and dental services to low-income, underinsured, and uninsured Chicagoans. Now, every year, nearly 38,000 patients receive high-quality healthcare at the center, regardless of their ability to pay.

With the crisis in housing growing in the late 1960s, Erie House founded the Bickerdike Redevelopment Corporation to create affordable housing opportunities for members of the community. Since its founding, Bickerdike has developed more than 2,000 affordable homes for families.

Today, the West Town and Little Village neighborhoods are primarily Latino, and Erie Neighborhood House is helping people with the tools they need to build a foundation for greater well-being. Erie House has hosted me several times and has been an important ally in working toward comprehensive immigration reform and supporting Dreamers, providing legal consultation and representing people in immigration and asylum cases.

The blueprint created 150 years ago has evolved, but that mission has remained constant. Today, Erie House helps 18,000 people all across the city of Chicago annually. Young people and adults attend mentoring programs and learn about career opportunities. Families experiencing violence can find counseling. Erie House remains an essential ally as we work toward a just, inclusive society where we accept our new neighbors and help them achieve their potential.

Congratulations to Erie Neighborhood House on 150 years of good work, giving people hope and courage.

(At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the following statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.)

ABORTION

• Mr. SANDERS. Madam President, today I would like to speak in opposition to two dangerous pieces of legislation that were considered in the Senate, both of which would severely undermine women's constitutional right to safe and legal abortions. One bill, S. 3275, the so-called Pain-Capable Unborn Protection Act, would create a national 20-week abortion ban, while the other, S. 311, the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act, would attempt to scare providers who perform abortions out of business by subjecting them to penalties or even prison.

Let me be clear. These bills are not about protecting babies. These bills are

about telling women what they can and cannot do with their own bodies and making their own medical decisions for them. Today in the United States, we have some of the highest maternal mortality rates and infant mortality rates in the developed world. This crisis is only worsened by the racial and economic disparities many women face in our country, in addition to the reality that some 87 million Americans are either uninsured or underinsured. Instead of helping our Nation make progress toward eliminating these disparities, such as by guaranteeing affordable healthcare, including abortion, as a right, this legislation would bring us back to the dark ages when women in America did not have the right to control their own bodies. It is a simple reality that, if the Senate votes to deny women access to safe and legal abortion, many of them will suffer and perhaps even die. I urge my colleagues to oppose S. 3275 and S. 311. Thank you.●

BLACK HISTORY MONTH

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, in 1619, Africans were first brought to Virginia, against their will, to be enslaved. From that moment on, White Americans systematically and violently denied the rights of citizenship to Black Americans. The adoption of the 15th Amendment, ratified in February 1870, was a historic effort to correct course. It recognized the right of all male citizens, including Black men, to vote. This amendment was the first time that we promised to protect the right of African Americans to full and equal participation in our democracy.

In the 150 years since then, we have tried to expand on that promise many times, like when women of all races and ethnicities finally won the right to vote in 1920. Yet our promise remains elusively unfulfilled. Today, in honor of Black History Month, I would like to take a moment to discuss the trajectory of that broken promise, as well as its impact on our character as a nation.

We began to break our promise shortly after we made it. During the Reconstruction and Jim Crow eras, White men and women across the country developed a number of techniques—some obvious and brutal, some subtle and pernicious—to keep African Americans away from the polls and out of government.

The broader goal of these tactics was to hamper the Black population's ability to recover from slavery by blocking their access to education and the economic means of building wealth.

I believe that it is important to acknowledge that Maryland partook in these pernicious behaviors right alongside other States. Maryland residents and government officials engaged in ballot tampering, imposed literacy and property restrictions, stoked racist fears to galvanize the White vote, and intimidated Black voters using outright violence.

My intention here is not to condemn my home State. To the contrary, I am exceedingly proud of the struggles for justice that have bloomed in Maryland through abolitionists like Harriet Tubman and Frederick Douglass and civil rights leaders like Thurgood Marshall. I draw inspiration from the lineage of African-American public servants in Maryland who overcame enormous obstacles in order to amplify the voices of their brothers and sisters.

These public servants include Verda Welcome, the first Black woman ever elected to any State's senate, as well as Adrienne Jones, the current speaker of the Maryland House of Delegates, who is the first African American and first woman to serve in that position.

They also include my friend and hero, Congressman Elijah Cummings, the son of sharecroppers who devoted his life to fighting for equality and fairness and lifting up our beloved community of Baltimore.

I am likewise grateful for all of the Marylanders whose names we might not know, but who nevertheless work every day to expand educational equity, reform our justice system, shrink the wealth gap, deliver healthcare, and otherwise make our society better. Thanks to brave and dedicated people like these in Maryland and across the country, we have made significant strides toward racial justice.

I began my remarks by discussing Maryland's bleaker moments in history for two reasons. First, to demonstrate that we must never take progress for granted—Maryland has not always been a tolerant, inclusive State, it did not become one by accident, and it will not continue to be one unless we work to make it so. Democracy and the rule of law do not just happen; we need to protect and nourish them every day.

Second, to illuminate how those injustices that still exist, of which there are many, are not new and are not incidental—they are not just disparate effects of forces beyond our control. They are deeply rooted in policies and systems intentionally designed to subjugate African Americans.

One of the strongest, most disheartening examples of this phenomenon is the ongoing assault on the right to vote. This is not ancient history. States all over the country continue to "modernize" strategies developed a century ago to suppress African-American voting power. Some of these strategies are blatant and recognizable, like mass purges of voter rolls; the gerrymandering of districts with "surgical precision," according to one court; and intimidation of Black voters. Some of the strategies are disguised behind excuses or fear tactics, like obstructive voter ID laws and felony disenfranchisement.

Regardless, these tools of oppression are alive and operating as intended.

One in every 13 African Americans has lost his or her right to vote because of felony disenfranchisement. Seventy percent of the voters purged

from one State's roll in 2018 were African Americans. Studies reveal that implementing strict voter ID laws widens the Black-White turnout gap by more than 400 percent.

So long as we allow these sorts of practices to continue under the exaggeration of voter "fraud," we are denying African Americans their full right to vote and breaking the promise we made 150 years ago. This is a problem on principle, of course, but also for practical reasons; when we exclude people from fully participating in our democracy, we prevent them from achieving the social, economic, and civic reforms they need to strengthen their families and communities.

So what are we going to do about that? I know what I will do; I will fight for laws that will guarantee every American a voice in our democracy. That is why I have introduced bills to restore the Federal right to vote to ex-offenders and to penalize the voter intimidation and deception efforts so frequently aimed at people of color. These measures alone will not eliminate suppression of the Black vote, but they are steps in the right direction.

The racism that we vowed to root out a long time ago is still here. We may have reined it in, or it may have taken new forms that we do not recognize yet, but it is still here.

The Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. remarked, "It may be true that the law cannot make a man love me, but it can keep him from lynching me." It is true that we cannot legislate love, but we can and must legislate equality.

Until we guarantee the right to vote regardless of race, we fall short of the unique promise and potential of the United States of America. How can we be, at last, the Shining City on the Hill, while we continue to deny people their right to vote because of the color of their skin?

For the sake of our democracy and our common humanity, for the sake of those who have suffered and died, for the sake of those living and those yet to come, let us make good on our 150-year-old promise.

Let us build on the progress we have achieved, and let us stay vigilant about the threats that remain. Let us fulfill the right to vote.

IMPEACHMENT

Mr. LANKFORD. Madam President, the country is deeply divided on multiple issues right now. The impeachment trial is both a symptom of our times and another example of our division. At the beginning of our Nation, we did not have an impeachment inquiry of a President for almost 100 years with the partisan impeachment of Andrew Johnson. After more than 100 years, another impeachment inquiry was conducted when the House began a formal impeachment inquiry into President Nixon in an overwhelmingly bipartisan vote of 410-4. Within a

period of weeks, President Nixon resigned before he was formally impeached. Then, just over two decades later, President Clinton was impeached by the House, on another mostly partisan vote leading to a partisan acquittal in the Senate.

This season of our history has been referred to as the Age of Investigations and the Age of Impeachment. We have had multiple special counsels since 1974 over multiple topics. This is more than just oversight; it has been a unique time in American history when the politics of the moment have driven rapid calls for investigation and impeachment. Over the past 3 years, the House of Representatives has voted four times to open an impeachment inquiry: once in 2017, once in 2018, and twice in 2019. Only the second vote in 2019 actually passed and began a formal inquiry.

The Mueller investigation that consumed most of 2018 and 2019 answered many questions about Russian attacks on our voting systems—although no votes were changed—but it was also a \$32 million investigation that took more than 2 years of America's attention. For the last 4 months the country has been consumed with impeachment hearings and investigations. The first rumors of issues with Ukraine arose August 28 when POLITICO published a story about U.S. foreign aid being slow-walked for Ukraine, and then on September 18 when the Washington Post published a story about a whistleblower report that claimed President Trump pressured an unnamed foreign head of state to do an investigation for his campaign.

Within days of the Washington Post story on September 24, Speaker PELOSI announced that the House would begin hearings to impeach the President, which led to the formal House vote to open the impeachment inquiry on October 31 and then a vote to impeach the President on December 18. But after the partisan vote to impeach the President, Speaker PELOSI held the Articles of Impeachment for a month before turning them over to the Senate, which began the formal trial of the President of the United States on January 16, 2020. After hearing hours of arguments from both House managers and the President's legal defense team and Senators asking 180 questions to both sides, the trial concluded February 5, 2020.

There are key dates to know:

April 21, 2019, President Zelensky is elected President of Ukraine.

May 21, President Zelensky sworn in. After the ceremony, President Zelensky abolishes Parliament and calls for quick snap elections on July 21.

July 21, Ukrainian Parliamentary elections. President Zelensky's party wins a huge majority.

July 25, President Trump calls President Zelensky to congratulate him and his party.

August 12, An unnamed whistleblower working in the U.S. intelligence

community filed a complaint that he had heard from others that the President of the United States had tried to pressure President Zelensky of Ukraine to investigate former Vice President Joe Biden on an official phone call July 25, 2019.

August 26, the Inspector General for the Intelligence Community declares the whistleblower report “an urgent matter” and asks for its release within 7 days. The Justice Department looks over the report and notes that although it was written by a person in the intelligence community, it is not related to intelligence matters, so it does not fall within the Inspector General’s jurisdiction and it is forwarded on to the Department of Justice for review.

August 28, *POLITICO* publishes a story that the annual military aid for Ukraine is currently being slow-walked.

September 9, the Inspector General contacts the House Intelligence Committee to let them know that he has not been able to release the whistleblower report to their committee.

September 13, the House Intelligence Committee subpoenas the whistleblower report.

September 18, the *Washington Post* prints a story with “unnamed sources” that there is a whistleblower report about the President talking with a foreign leader about a campaign matter.

September 24, the House began an informal impeachment inquiry after Speaker Pelosi announced it at a press conference in the U.S. Capitol.

September 25, President Trump released the official unredacted “read out” of the phone call with President Zelensky from July 25.

September 26, the whistleblower report is declassified and released publicly.

October 31, the House formally votes along party lines for an impeachment inquiry.

December 18, the House votes to impeach the President with two articles—abuse of Power and obstruction of congress.

January 15, Speaker PELOSI releases the Articles of Impeachment to the Senate.

January 16, Senate trial on impeachment begins.

February 5, Senate trial concludes with acquittal on both articles.

Ukraine became independent in 1991 when it broke away from the Soviet Union, but the Ukrainians have faced constant pressure from Russia ever since. In 2014 Ukraine forced out its pro-Russia President, and Moscow retaliated by taking over Crimea—and stealing the Ukrainian Navy—then rolling tanks into eastern Ukraine and taking all of eastern Ukraine by force. Russian and Ukrainian troops continue to fight every day in eastern Ukraine.

The people of Ukraine face an aggressive Russia on the east and pervasive Soviet era corruption throughout the government and the business commu-

nity. President Trump met the previous President of Ukraine in 2017 to talk about other countries helping Ukraine with greater military support funds and to ask how Ukraine could address corruption on a wider scale. The two Presidents also spoke about lethal aid—allowing the Ukrainians to buy sniper rifles, anti-tank Javelin missiles, and other lethal supplies—to help them fight the invading Russians. The United States also started sending a couple hundred American troops to train Ukrainian soldiers in the far west of Ukraine.

On April 21, 2019, President Zelensky was overwhelmingly elected as the new President of Ukraine. He was a sitcom actor/comedian who had no political experience but was well known for his television show in which he played the part of a corruption-fighting teacher who was elected as President of Ukraine. His television popularity helped him win the election, but when he was sworn in on May 21, he was relatively unknown to most of the world.

On the same day as his inauguration, May 21, President Zelensky abolished Parliament and called for snap elections to put his party in power. With a new President in place and parliamentary elections in Ukraine coming, starting in June of 2019, the President ordered foreign aid to Ukraine to be held until the end of the fiscal year, but agencies were informed that they should do all the preliminary work needed before the aid was sent, so it would be ready to release at a moment’s notice. The leadership in Ukraine was not notified that there was a hold on their foreign aid.

The new Parliament was elected on July 21, and President Zelensky’s party won by a landslide. By mid-August, the new Parliament was working on anti-corruption efforts and trying to establish a high court on corruption, which they put in place September 5, 2019. There was a tremendous amount of uncertainty in the early days of the new administration, but by mid-August there was clear evidence of actual change in a country that desperately needed a new direction from its corrupt past.

On July 25, when President Trump called President Zelensky, the President congratulated President Zelensky for the big win in Parliament and talked about “burden-sharing”—other nations also paying their share of support for Ukraine. The two Presidents talked about their disapproval of the previous mbassadors to each other’s countries. But instead of following all the staff preparation notes written by Lieutenant Colonel Vindman, the National Security Council staffer assigned to Ukraine, and just talking about “corruption” in general, the President brought up a question about Ukraine and the 2016 election interference, which I will note below. President Zelensky also brought up to President Trump that his staff was planning to meet with Rudy Giuliani, President

Trump’s personal attorney, in the coming days, which led to a conversation about Joe Biden and the firing of the previous prosecutor in Ukraine.

After the call, Lieutenant Colonel Vindman contacted an attorney at the National Security Council to express his “policy concerns” about the call. It is interesting to note that Lieutenant Colonel Vindman’s boss, Tim Morrison, was also on the call, but he did not see any problems or concerns with the call according to his own testimony in the House impeachment inquiry. Within a month, a whistleblower filed a report about the call, saying he heard about the call secondhand and was concerned about the implications of a conversation about elections on a head-of-state call. To keep the July 25th call in context with other news, the day before it took place July 24 Robert Mueller had testified before Congress as the last official act to close down the 2½ year Mueller investigation and clear the President and his campaign team of any further accusation of election interference.

During the impeachment trial in the Senate, the House managers repeated over and over that the President was planning to cheat “again” on the next election, but the final conclusion of the Mueller report was that “ultimately, the investigation did not establish that the (Trump) Campaign coordinated or conspired with the Russian government in its election-interference activities.”

This is especially notable because for years a rumor circulated that Ukraine was part of the 2016 election interference and that someone in Ukraine was hiding the Democratic National Committee, DNC, server that was hacked by the Russians in 2016. As the conspiracy theory goes, it was actually the Ukrainians who hacked the DNC, not the Russians. This is the “Crowdstrike” theory that President Trump asked President Zelensky to help solve during the call.

Agencies of the U.S. intelligence community have stated over and over that they did not believe that Ukraine was involved in the Russian election interference from 2016. I personally agree with the intelligence community assessment but Rudy Giuliani and multiple others around President Trump believed there was a secret plan in 2016 to hurt President Trump’s election from Ukraine. This accusation was amplified by bits of truth, including that the Ukrainian Ambassador to the United States wrote an editorial in support of Hillary Clinton in 2016 right before the election, and several other Ukrainian officials publicly spoke out against Candidate Trump in 2016.

There is nothing illegal about a foreign nation speaking out for or against a Presidential candidate, whether Hillary Clinton or Donald Trump in 2016 or anyone else in the future. It may not be wise to take sides before an election, but it is not illegal. Just because some Ukrainian officials took sides

does not mean that the whole Ukrainian Government worked on a cyber attack on our elections. But since this rumor had persisted, and it was a new administration now in Ukraine, President Trump asked President Zelensky to help clear up the facts if he could. That is certainly not illegal or improper, and it is certainly not something that could help the President in the 2020 election, especially since the 2016 Russian election accusation had just been closed the day before.

The 2016 “Crowdstrike” theory is the issue that President Trump asked President Zelensky to “do us a favor” about, not the Bidens or Burisma. During the July 25 call after the question about “Crowdstrike,” President Zelensky mentioned to President Trump that one of his advisers would be meeting with Rudy Giuliani soon. Then, President Trump affirmed that meeting and encouraged them to talk about the Biden investigation and the firing of the Ukrainian prosecutor.

That may seem out of the blue, but in Washington, D.C., that week, the city was buzzing about a Washington Post article that had been written 3 days before July 22, 2019—detailing Hunter Biden’s giant salary—\$83,000 per month—for doing essentially nothing for a corrupt Ukrainian natural gas company and how it undercut Vice President Biden’s message on corruption.

It is important to get the context of that week to understand the context of the phone call that day. I have no doubt that the story was just as big of news in Kiev, Ukraine, as it was in Washington, D.C., that week. President Trump’s personal attorney, Rudy Giuliani, had been in and out of Ukraine since November 2018, meeting with government officials and trying to find out more about the “Crowdstrike” theory or any other Ukrainian connection to the 2016 election. During that time, Rudy Giuliani met several former prosecutors from Ukraine who blamed their departure on Vice President Biden. It is clear that Rudy Giuliani was working to gain information about both of these issues in his capacity as President Trump’s private attorney.

It is not criminal for Rudy Giuliani to work on opposition research for a Presidential campaign or to work on behalf of his client to clear his name from any issues related to the 2016 campaign, which he had done since November 2018. Some have stated that since this was “foreign information,” it is illegal. That is absolutely not true. In fact, Hillary Clinton and the Democratic National Committee in 2016 paid a British citizen, Christopher Steele, to work his contacts in Russia to create the now debunked “Steele Dossier,” which the FBI used to open its investigation into President Trump, leading directly to the appointment of Special Counsel Mueller. That dossier was opposition research done in Russia by a British citizen, paid for by the Clinton campaign team. Their opposi-

tion research was not illegal, but the use and abuse of that document by the FBI to start an investigation was certainly inappropriate and is most likely illegal. But the FBI warrant issue is still being investigated by the ongoing Durham probe.

During the July 25, 2019, call, President Zelensky brought up the issue of Rudy Giuliani, and President Trump replied to his statement. You can argue that President Trump should not have discussed the issue with President Zelensky when he brought it up, but it is certainly not illegal or impeachable to talk about it, especially when there are serious questions about Hunter Biden’s work with Burisma. That is not a conservative conspiracy theory; the issue of Hunter Biden’s employment in Ukraine was a problem for years at the State Department. It had been raised to Vice President Biden when he was still in office. Every State Department official interviewed for the Trump impeachment investigation noted that at best it was a clear conflict of interest, and it was the center of a huge story on corruption in the Washington Post on July 22, 2019. It had the appearance of high-level corruption by using a well-placed family member on the board of a known corrupt gas company in Ukraine to shelter it from prosecutors. Hunter Biden had only resigned from the Burisma board a few months before the July 25 phone call, just prior to when his dad announced his run for the Presidency in 2019.

After the July 25 phone call, Attorney General Barr did not have any followup meetings or calls with Ukrainian officials. Rudy Giuliani did have additional conversations with Ukrainian officials, which are legal to do since he is a private attorney representing the President.

TEXT OF JULY 25, 2019 PHONE CALL BETWEEN PRESIDENTS TRUMP AND ZELENSKY

The President: Congratulations on a great victory. We all watched from the United States and you did a terrific job. The way you came from behind, somebody who wasn’t given much of a chance, and you ended up winning easily. It’s a fantastic achievement. Congratulations.

President Zelensky: You are absolutely right Mr. President. We did win big and we worked hard for this. We worked a lot but I would like to confess to you that I had an opportunity to learn from you. We used quite a few of your skills and knowledge and were able to use it as an example for our elections and yes it is true that these were unique elections. We were in a unique situation that we were able to achieve a unique success. I’m able to tell you the following; the first time you called me to congratulate me when I won my presidential election, and the second time you are now calling me when my party won the parliamentary election. I think I should run more often so you can call me more often and we can talk over the phone more often.

The President: (laughter) That’s a very good idea. I think your country is very happy about that.

President Zelensky: Well yes, to tell you the truth, we are trying to work hard because we wanted to drain the swamp here in our country. We brought in many many new

people. Not the old politicians, not the typical politicians, because we want to have a new format and a new type of government. You are a great teacher for us and in that.

The President: Well it is very nice of you to say that. I will say that we do a lot for Ukraine. We spend a lot of effort and a lot of time. Much more than the European countries are doing and they should be helping you more than they are. Germany does almost nothing for you. All they do is talk and I think it’s something that you should really ask them about. When I was speaking to Angela Merkel she talks Ukraine, but she doesn’t do anything. A lot of the European countries are the same way so I think it’s something you want to look at but the United States has been very very good to Ukraine. I wouldn’t say that it’s reciprocal necessarily because things are happening that are not good but the United States has been very very good to Ukraine.

President Zelensky: Yes you are absolutely right. Not only 100%, but actually 1000% and I can tell you the following; I did talk to Angela Merkel and I did meet with her I also met and talked with Macron and I told them that they are not doing quite as much as they need to be doing on the issues with the sanctions. They are not enforcing the sanctions. They are not working as much as they should work for Ukraine. It turns out that even though logically, the European Union should be our biggest partner but technically the United States is a much bigger partner than the European Union and I’m very grateful to you for that because the United States is doing quite a lot for Ukraine. Much more than the European Union especially when we are talking about sanctions against the Russian Federation. I would also like to thank you for your great support in the area of defense. We are ready to continue to cooperate for the next steps specifically we are almost ready to buy more Javelins from the United States for defense purposes.

The President: I would like you to do us a favor though because our country has been through a lot and Ukraine knows a lot about it. I would like you to find out what happened with this whole situation with Ukraine, they say Crowdstrike. I guess you have one of your wealthy people . . . The server, they say Ukraine has it. There are a lot of things that went on, the whole situation. I think you’re surrounding yourself with some of the same people. I would like to have the Attorney General call you or your people and I would like you to get to the bottom of it. As you saw yesterday, that whole nonsense ended with a very poor performance by a man named Robert Mueller, an incompetent performance, but they say a lot of it started with Ukraine. Whatever you can do, it’s very important that you do it if that’s possible.

President Zelensky: Yes it is very important for me and everything that you just mentioned earlier. For me as a President, it is very important and we are open for any future cooperation. We are ready to open a new page on cooperation in relations between the United States and Ukraine. For that purpose, I just recalled our ambassador from United States and he will be replaced by a very competent and very experienced ambassador who will work hard on making sure that our two nations are getting closer. I would also like and hope to see him having your trust and your confidence and have personal relations with you so we can cooperate even more so. I will personally tell you that one of my assistants spoke with Mr. Giuliani just recently and we are hoping very much that Mr. Giuliani will be able to travel to Ukraine and we will meet once he comes to Ukraine. I just wanted to assure you once again that you have nobody but friends

around us. I will make sure that I surround myself with the best and most experienced people. I also wanted to tell you that we are friends. We are great friends and you Mr. President have friends in our country so we can continue our strategic partnership. I also plan to surround myself with great people and in addition to that investigation, I guarantee as the President of Ukraine that all the investigations will be done openly and candidly. That I can assure you.

The President: Good because I heard you had a prosecutor who was very good and he was shut down and that's really unfair. A lot of people are talking about that, the way they shut your very good prosecutor down and you had some very bad people involved. Mr. Giuliani is a highly respected man. He was the mayor of New York City, a great mayor, and I would like him to call you. I will ask him to call you along with the Attorney General. Rudy very much knows what's happening and he is a very capable guy. If you could speak to him that would be great. The former ambassador from the United States, the woman, was bad news and the people she was dealing with in the Ukraine were bad news so I just want to let you know that. The other thing, There's a lot of talk about Biden's son, that Biden stopped the prosecution and a lot of people want to find out about that so whatever you can do with the Attorney General would be great. Biden went around bragging that he stopped the prosecution so if you can look into it . . . It sounds horrible to me.

President Zelensky: I wanted to tell you about the prosecutor. First of all, I understand and I'm knowledgeable about the situation. Since we have won the absolute majority in our Parliament, the next prosecutor general will be 100% my person, my candidate, who will be approved, by the parliament and will start as a new prosecutor in September. He or she will look into the situation, specifically to the company that you mentioned in this issue. The issue of the investigation of the case is actually the issue of making sure to restore the honesty so we will take care of that and will work on the investigation of the case. On top of that, I would kindly ask you if you have any additional information that you can provide to us, it would be very helpful for the investigation to make sure that we administer justice in our country with regard to the Ambassador to the United States from Ukraine as far as I recall her name was Ivanovich. It was great that you were the first one who told me that she was a bad ambassador because I agree with you 100%. Her attitude towards me was far from the best as she admired the previous President and she was on his side. She would not accept me as a new President well enough.

The President: Well, she's going to go through some things. I will have Mr. Giuliani give you a call and I am also going to have Attorney General Barr call and we will get to the bottom of it. I'm sure you will figure it out. I heard the prosecutor was treated very badly and he was a very fair prosecutor so good luck with everything. Your economy is going to get better and better I predict. You have a lot of assets. It's a great country. I have many Ukrainian friends, they're incredible people.

President Zelensky: I would like to tell you that I also have quite a few Ukrainian friends that live in the United States. Actually last time I traveled to the United States, I stayed in New York near Central Park and I stayed at the Trump Tower. I will talk to them and I hope to see them again in the future. I also wanted to thank you for your invitation to visit the United States, specifically Washington DC. On the other hand, I also want to ensure you that we will

be very serious about the case and will work on the investigation. As to the economy, there is much potential for our two countries and one of the issues that is very important for Ukraine is energy independence. I believe we can be very successful and cooperating on energy independence with United States. We are already working on cooperation. We are buying American oil but I am very hopeful for a future meeting. We will have more time and more opportunities to discuss these opportunities and get to know each other better. I would like to thank you very much for your support.

The President: Good. Well, thank you very much and I appreciate that. I will tell Rudy and Attorney General Barr to call. Thank you. Whenever you would like to come to the White House, feel free to call. Give us a date and we'll work that out. I look forward to seeing you. President Zelensky: Thank you very much. I would be very happy to come and would be happy to meet with you personally and get to know you better. I am looking forward to our meeting and I also would like to invite you to visit Ukraine and come to the city of Kyiv which is a beautiful city. We have a beautiful country which would welcome you. On the other hand, I believe that on September 1 we will be in Poland and we can meet in Poland hopefully. After that, it might be a very good idea for you to travel to Ukraine. We can either take my plane and go to Ukraine or we can take your plane, which is probably much better than mine.

The President: Okay, we can work that out. I look forward to seeing you in Washington and maybe in Poland because I think we are going to be there at that time. President Zelensky: Thank you very much Mr. President.

The President: Congratulations on a fantastic job you've done. The whole world was watching. I'm not sure it was so much of an upset but congratulations.

President Zelensky: Thank you Mr. President bye-bye.

Based on a whistleblower report about the July 25 call, the House Intelligence Committee subpoenaed the report on September 13 and started its impeachment inquiry on September 24.

In the Senate impeachment trial, House managers stated their belief that the President had carried out a "scheme to cheat in the 2020 election" by withholding financial aid to Ukraine and withholding a White House meeting with the new President of Ukraine in exchange for Ukraine announcing it would investigate Joe Biden, Burisma, and 2016 election interference.

Let's discuss the facts of both.

WHITE HOUSE MEETING

There is no question that President Trump had offered a White House meeting to President Zelensky three times: once in May on a phone call after President Zelensky won his election, once in June in a letter, and finally in the July 25 call after President Zelensky's party won the parliamentary elections. But Tim Morrison—State Department official called as a witness by the House—also testified that they were working on heads-of-state meetings with 12 other heads of state during that same time period. Many nations were trying to line up meetings in the White House during the summer of 2019.

During the July 25 call, President Zelensky offered to instead move their

meeting from a White House meeting to a face-to-face meeting in Warsaw, Poland, when they would both be there on September 1, 2019. The Presidents agreed, and planning began on the meeting in August. By August 22, the meeting planning was in full swing, as noted by emails in the House hearing's evidence. However, Hurricane Dorian slammed into the United States in the hours leading up to the September 1 meeting, causing a last-minute shift to the Vice President traveling to Poland so the President could stay in the United States to monitor hurricane relief.

We know that Vice President PENCE met face-to-face with President Zelensky, and they spoke about other nations paying their fair share to help Ukraine and the issue of corruption across Ukraine. We know from the preparation materials and the meeting notes themselves that during the meeting the Vice President did not bring up or discuss the issue of Burisma, Joe Biden, or any other campaign conversation with President Zelensky.

The White House found the next available time when President Trump and President Zelensky would both be in the same place at the same time to set up a face-to-face meeting: September 25 at the U.N. Assembly in New York. That meeting was set up, and it took place as scheduled.

In the Senate impeachment trial, the House managers maintained that only a White House meeting was sufficient and that it was being withheld, but the facts show that President Zelensky himself floated the idea of a meeting in Poland and that the meeting was not barred or withheld.

In the early months of President Zelensky's term, there was a great deal of concern about him, his staff, and his plans because he was an unknown political figure. Until more was known about him, it was entirely appropriate to show caution in coordinating a meeting, but once his nationwide anti-corruption efforts began in August, it was clear that face-to-face meetings were planned and carried out.

There was no withholding of a face-to-face meeting with President Trump and President Zelensky. There cannot be a quid pro quo if the meeting was not withheld from Ukrainian officials.

The House managers claimed that there was a secret plot to "extort" or "bribe" the leadership of Ukraine to investigate Hunter Biden in exchange for around \$400 million of U.S. aid. The aid was State Department and foreign military aid that had been provided for the past 4 years, since Ukraine had been in a war with Russia.

After the Russian invasion of Ukraine in 2014 and its occupation of Crimea and the Donbas region in eastern Ukraine, the United States started sending aid to help the Ukrainian Government. Congress allowed lethal and non-lethal aid to support Ukraine, but during the previous administration, only non-lethal aid was sent. Under

President Trump's administration, it was determined that the United States would give the leadership of Ukraine lethal aid to help them fight off Russian tanks, which was President Zelensky's reference to "javelins" in the July 25 phone call and his gratitude to President Trump for allowing those tank killing rockets to flow to Ukraine.

To be clear, the theory of funds being withheld from Ukraine in exchange for an investigation does not originate from the July 25 call read-out. There is nothing in the text of the call that threatens the withholding of funds in exchange for an investigation.

The theory originates from the fact that aid was held back by the Office of Management and Budget, headed by the President's Acting Chief of Staff, Mick Mulvaney, and the "presumption" of U.S. Ambassador to the European Union, Gordon Sondland, that the aid must have been held because of the President's desire to get the Biden investigation done, since the President's attorney, Rudy Giuliani, was working to find out more about the Biden investigation.

Ambassador Sondland told multiple people about his theory, but when he finally called President Trump and asked him directly about it, the President responded that he did not have any quid pro quo; he just wanted the President of Ukraine to do what he ran on and "do the right thing." Obviously, people who assume the worst about President Trump take this as a secret message that there actually was a quid pro quo, but the most important fact is that Ambassador Sondland did not read it that way after his call with the President. Ambassador Sondland believed that the President was serious. Unfortunately, the White House Counsel was never allowed to cross examine Ambassador Sondland during the House investigation to get the facts about who he talked to and why he came to believe for a while that there was an effort to push for investigations in exchange for money.

During the Senate trial, I listened closely to the facts surrounding the withholding of aid money to Ukraine. This was by far the most serious charge against the President. Two key questions had to be answered for me: Why was the aid held, and why was the aid released? There was no question the aid was held for a couple months. The question was why?

Statements from the House witnesses during the House impeachment inquiry answered the two key questions: The aid was held because there was a legitimate concern about the new President of Ukraine and his administration in the early days of his Presidency and the aid was released on time when the new Ukrainian Parliament starting passing anti-corruption laws in August and after Vice President PENCE sat down face to face with President Zelensky on September 1 in Poland to discuss their progress on corruption.

We should not lose track of what was happening in Ukraine in 2019. A new President was elected who was a TV actor with no political experience and no record on how he would handle Russia or the issue of widespread national corruption in Ukraine. He ran on a platform of anti-corruption at all levels, but no one knew how he would govern. His campaign was funded by a Ukrainian oligarch who owned a major media outlet, and one of his first advisers was the former attorney for that oligarch.

I personally spoke to many of the State Department officials in Ukraine in May of 2019 and heard their concerns about the new government. Then, newly elected President Zelensky used his power to dissolve their Parliament the day he was sworn in and called for "snap elections" in which the vast majority of the newly elected leaders were from his newly formed party. To our State Department and the White House, this was either a really a good sign or a really bad sign. Either Ukraine was about to take a major change for the better with new leadership, or this new young leader was about to assume real centralized power. No one knew for certain in May, June, and July of 2019. Within a few weeks in August, the new Parliament got to work passing anti-corruption laws and making significant changes in their accountability and for the country. This was a very good sign.

When Vice President PENCE met face to face with President Zelensky September 1, both sides had confidence the country was taking a new direction. On September 10 Vice President PENCE and Senator ROB PORTMAN met with President Trump to tell him about the progress that had been made, and both advised lifting the hold on aid. The aid was lifted the next day, September 11. No investigation into Hunter Biden or Burisma was ever done by Ukraine, and no part of the U.S. Department of Justice was ever involved in any investigation of Hunter Biden or Burisma.

Although the aid was frozen in June, there was no public announcement of the hold, as explained by the White House Counsel, to keep this from becoming a public issue while the White House monitored the progress and status of the transition in Ukraine.

On August 27, POLITICO published an article that noted that the foreign aid had been held by the United States. This caused President Zelensky's office to reach out to the State Department and ask why. During the House impeachment proceedings, four of the House witnesses—Ambassador Voelker, Ambassador Sondland, Ambassador Taylor, and Tim Morrison—all testified that the Ukrainian leadership learned about the temporary hold in aid after the POLITICO article was published.

The issue of the hold was also the first question from President Zelensky to Vice President PENCE when they met on September 1 in Poland. The idea that the leadership in Ukraine had

pressure placed on them to do an investigation fails the most essential test. Did the leadership of Ukraine even know that the aid was being held? The answer from multiple American and Ukrainian leaders was no, they did not know there was a hold on the aid from the White House. You cannot have pressure to act on an investigation if they did not even know the aid was being held.

It is interesting to note, when I researched the records of past foreign aid payment dates and times to Ukraine, I found the 2019 aid was in line with the date the 2016, 2017, and 2018 aid was sent. The vast majority of the military aid to Ukraine was obligated in August or September for the past 4 years. Although the aid was ready to go out the door a couple months earlier in 2019, it was certainly not late, based on the record of the previous 3 years. In fact, the State Department aid was obligated September 30 in 2019, but it was obligated September 28 in 2018. As quoted by the Ukrainian Minister of Defense, "The aid was held such a short time, we did not even notice."

During the 2 days of question-and-answer time, I asked a specific question related to this issue because I felt it was important to get the context of the aid, since there had been so much made of the issue during the trial. Here is the full text of my question to the White House Counsel:

House Managers have described any delay in military aid and state department funds to Ukraine in 2019 as a cause to believe there was a secret scheme or quid pro quo by the President. In 2019, 86% of the DOD funds were obligated to Ukraine in September, but in 2018, 67% of the funds were obligated in September and in 2017, 73% of the funds were obligated in September. In the State Department, the funds were obligated September 30 in 2019, but they were obligated September 28 in 2018. Each year, the vast majority of the funds were obligated in the final month or days of the fiscal year. Question: Was there a national security risk to Ukraine or the United States from the funds going out late in September in the two previous years? Did it weaken our relationship with Ukraine because the vast majority of our aid was released in September each of the last three years?

In response to my question, White House Counsel detailed the fact that military aid from the United States was not for immediate use. It was designed to help the Ukrainian military buy materials for the next year, so it was common for the aid to be obligated at the end of the fiscal year—September 30—and it was also common for some money to be left unobligated and carried over into the next fiscal year, as it was in 2019.

While it is easy to create an intricate story on the hold placed on foreign aid to Ukraine, it is also clear that President Trump has temporarily held foreign aid from multiple countries over the past 2 years, including: Afghanistan, Pakistan, Honduras, Guatemala, El Salvador, Lebanon, and others. There is no question that a President can withhold aid for a short period of

time, but it must be released by September 30, the end of the fiscal year, which it was in this instance.

Article I, section 2 of the U.S. Constitution grants the U.S. House of Representatives “the sole power of impeachment,” while article I, section 3 states that “the Senate shall have the sole power to try all impeachments.”

The Constitution is clear that the House does not control the Senate process and the Senate does not control the House process; however, during the impeachment trial of President Trump, the House tried repeatedly to dictate to the Senate how it should conduct its trial.

The “sole power to try” means laying out rules for the trial, including when and if to call additional witnesses or request more documents.

In addition to laying out roles and responsibilities for impeachment, our Constitution also provides basic rights for the accused. The Fifth Amendment ensures due process. However, the receipt of due process is not contingent upon waiving another right, like immunity or executive privilege. But that is exactly what the House tried to force President Trump to do.

The President is not above the law, but neither is the House of Representatives. If there was a question as to the scope and proper use of the President's right to assert immunity or executive privilege regarding conversations he had with his closest advisers, that question is proper for a court to determine, not Congress, and surely not the House on its own accord. To put this in constitutional terms, the legislative branch cannot prevent the executive branch from having access to the judicial branch. The House wanted to move quickly and prevent the President from ever going to court to resolve any issue. That has never been done for a good reason, the separation of powers. In previous legal battles with the President, it has taken months to resolve critical issues, like *Bush v. Gore* in 2000 or even in the Clinton impeachment trial, when the House took 2 months to resolve an issue with witnesses in court. It does not have to drag on for years.

The House also wanted the Chief Justice of the United States to “rule on” any issue quickly instead of allowing the President to go through the courts. This would have created a new judicial executive branch by putting all the judicial power of the nation in one person, not in the judicial branch, as is stated in the Constitution. It would have also ignored the text of the Constitution where it notes that the Chief Justice “presides” in the court of impeachment, not “decides.” The sole power of impeachment is in the Senate, not the Senate plus the one Justice. The Chief Justice keeps the trial moving along, based on the rules of the trial, but he or she is not a decider of fact; that is reserved to the Senate. The House managers wanted to ignore that part of the Constitution to move

the trial faster for expedience. We cannot ignore the Constitution or create bad precedent, no matter which party is being tried for impeachment.

Further, the Sixth Amendment guarantees that the accused has the ability to both confront the witnesses against him and to have the assistance of counsel. The majority of the impeachment inquiry in the House was done without a meaningful opportunity for the President to participate, and administration witnesses were denied the ability to have counsel present for depositions.

The Constitution lays out a clear separation of powers but importantly also provides a system of checks and balances. For something as important as impeachment, it is imperative that the process be one that is squarely within the bounds of the Constitution and is one that the American people can trust. Unfortunately, the process undertaken by the House to impeach President Trump falls wildly short of the standards put in place by our Founders.

Article II, section 4 of the Constitution states that “the President, Vice President and all civil officers of the United States, shall be removed from office on impeachment for, and conviction of, treason, bribery, or other high crimes and misdemeanors.”

During the trial of President Trump, there was a lot of conversation about what constitutes a “high crime” or “misdemeanor.” Notably, the House did not charge the President with any crimes; rather, the House chose to impeach the President for “abuse of power” and “obstruction of Congress.”

The House theoretically could have chosen to file Articles of Impeachment for crimes such as bribery, extortion, solicitation of interference in an election, or violations of the Impoundments Clause Act. For any of these crimes, the House would have had to prove specific elements of each. Since they couldn't prove any of those crimes, they chose to charge the President with abuse of power. As was noted in the trial, 40 Presidents have faced accusation of abuse of power, going back as far as George Washington.

The abuse of power charge for President Trump was based on allegations that he improperly withheld aid to Ukraine and conditioned a meeting with President Zelensky at the White House in exchange for an investigation into former Vice President Biden and his son Hunter. Over the course of the last 4 months, we heard the term “quid pro quo” used over and over again, but the facts do not show criminal quid pro quo. As previously mentioned, President Zelensky asked to meet with President Trump in Poland, and that meeting was set up. Further, while the aid to Ukraine was delayed, it wasn't delayed more than it had been the previous 2 years, and the aid was released without an investigation—or even an announcement of one—into the Biden's.

The second Article of Impeachment, obstruction of Congress, had an even

weaker constitutional foundation. The investigation was announced September 24 did not officially begin until October 31. The impeachment vote in the House was December 18. This very short time table and the accusation that the President refused to follow the law, honor the courts, and that he acted like a “King” did not meet even the most basic constitutional standards for justice.

For example, during the Mueller investigation, the President's team fully cooperated with the investigation that included over 2,000 subpoenas and 500 witnesses, including the President's Chief of Staff, multiple Cabinet officials, and many lower level officials who were all made available. It was clear throughout the investigation that the President did not like or agree with the Mueller investigation, but he also fully cooperated with every subpoena, each witness, and every document. In fact, they released over a million pages of documents to the Mueller team.

President Trump also made his disagreement with the courts very clear on issues like the census, whether travel restrictions can be put in place to ensure national security, or whether particular funds can be used to secure our southern border. But each time the President lost in court, his administration complied with orders from the judiciary. That is how our system of government is supposed to work.

When disagreements happen between the legislative branch and the judicial branch, they usually lead to resolution, not impeachment. The Fast and Furious investigation, which lasted more than 3 years in the Obama administration, led to a vote in the House to hold then-Attorney General Eric Holder in contempt, but it never led to an impeachment inquiry, even though there was a clear and consistent refusal to cooperate with Congress or turn over key documents for 3 years.

In this case, the accusation that President Trump ignored subpoenas or refused to follow the law is not correct. The President's team made it very clear that they would cooperate during the impeachment inquiry with properly authorized and issued subpoenas, but the House refused to issue subpoenas that were consistent with the law to seek resolution for documents and witnesses. The House was focused on speed, not legal process.

The House, in a rush to impeachment last fall, issued multiple subpoenas for documents and testimony before the House had given authority to the committees to issue subpoenas for an impeachment inquiry, which happened October 31. Since there was no authority to issue the subpoenas, they were not duly authorized. The House also demanded testimony from the President's inner circle without working through the legal questions, and the House demanded executive agency witnesses appear without allowing them to bring agency counsel with them. All of those

issues created very real legal and constitutional problems. Agency individuals have always been allowed to have legal counsel with them when they are deposed, except this time.

As a Member of Congress, I cannot demand the President turn over documents or give testimony in any fashion that I would prefer just because I have oversight responsibilities. In the same way, the President or other executive branch officials cannot demand I turn over my notes or provide my staff for testimony without going through the courts and gaining a legal subpoena. Congress has vigorously and rightfully protected its rights from unwarranted investigations from any President and Presidents have done the same. But in all cases, the law must be followed and the proper process must be pursued to get the information in a legal way.

From the very first moments of the Senate trial, the House managers fought for additional witnesses and documents from the President. Their argument and justification for the second Article of Impeachment centered on the White House's refusal to turn over documents and make every witness available without going through the normal legal process.

Per the resolution adopted by the Senate, the House record was part of the trial record. The Senate had the testimony of the witnesses the House chose to question as part of the overall information of the trial. The House already had 28,000 pages of documents that were part of the evidence they submitted to the Senate, although, the House managers admitted during the Senate impeachment trial that they still have not released all of the documents and witness testimony that they had gathered in their investigation to the White House Counsel or to the Senate. We do not fully know why the House held back some of its witness testimony and released others.

The House witness testimony was used extensively in the Senate trial.

These are the witnesses who testified live or via video in the House and Senate Impeachment: David Holmes, Political Counselor, U.S. Embassy Ukraine, State Department; Dr. Fiona Hill, White House Advisor, National Security Council; David Hale, Under Secretary for Political Affairs, State Department; Laura Cooper, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense; Gordon Sondland, U.S. Ambassador to the European Union; Tim Morison, Former White House Adviser; Kurt Voelker, Former Special Envoy for Ukraine; LTC Alexander Vindman, National Security Council; Jennifer Williams, aide to the Vice President; Marie Yovanovitch, Former Ambassador to Ukraine; George Kent, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State; Bill Taylor, Former U.S. Ambassador to Ukraine.

The House managers repeated over and over that additional witnesses would only take a week to depose, which is a clearly false statement. New witnesses took longer than a week to

depose in the House inquiry; clearly it would take just as long or longer in a Senate trial. The remaining "wish list" of witnesses all had clear issues that needed to be resolved in the courts, which would take a couple of months to resolve, which is why the House managers did not push for their testimony in the House impeachment process. They valued speed more than legal process.

House managers repeatedly stated that witnesses only took a week to depose in the Clinton Senate impeachment trial, but they know that during the Clinton Senate trial, all three called witnesses previously deposed in the House inquiry or in the grand jury investigation, and all issues of executive privilege had already been decided through the courts. There were no new witnesses in the Senate trial of President Clinton. Also, the Clinton White House had already had the opportunity to cross-examine witnesses or the investigators in the Clinton impeachment inquiry. This time, the Trump White House had been denied that right. So, if new witnesses would be added for the Senate trial, the White House should have the right to also cross-examine the previous House witnesses they had been denied the right to cross examine in the past. This would all take much longer than a week, and the House managers knew that.

During the Clinton impeachment trial in the Senate, there were no additional documents requested, only previously deposed witnesses. The House managers did not go through the legal process to get documents, like the Mueller investigation had done, so all of the new document requests from the House managers would take at least 3 to 5 weeks to complete, once a legal subpoena is delivered. It takes time to search all databases, review the documents for classified materials, determine any legal issues, and release them to the investigation. Once the documents are turned over, both legal teams need time to review the documents. Again, the House managers knew these facts, but they continued to repeat over and over that it would only take a week to get all the documents.

The first question for the Senate trial was, do we have enough evidence and testimony to answer the questions the House presented in their Articles of Impeachment? If the answer is yes, then we do not need additional witnesses or documents. If the answer is no, then we do need additional information. There were many leaks and newspaper stories during the trial designed to push the Senate to vote to ask for more testimony, but that did not change the primary question. We already knew from evidence that there was no quid pro quo, no Ukrainian investigations, and no withholding of a public meeting with President Trump.

The New York Times story on January 26 and again on January 31 are

clear examples of an attempt to bring doubt on the information and witness testimony. Both stories stated that someone had read the pending John Bolton book manuscript and that in the book, Bolton stated that President Trump had talked about investigations in exchange for aid funding for Ukraine. The New York Times also wrote that the book would state that Acting Chief of Staff Mick Mulvaney and White House Counsel Pat Cipollone were also a part of the scheme. I looked at both stories closely and noticed that the reporters had not read the manuscripts or quoted the manuscripts; they were reports from someone who stated that they had read the manuscripts. Both stories took significant liberties to describe the intent in the manuscripts, but the reporter had apparently also not spoken to John Bolton.

On January 23, 2020, the National Security Council lawyers sent a letter to the legal team handling the book publishing for John Bolton to inform him that the manuscript contained some classified information and it would need have some edits before publication in March. Then, on January 26, the New York Times published a story that someone had leaked some of the details of the book, but they had not released the actual manuscript. While I am interested in seeing the actual manuscript, I am also very aware that this selective leak was designed by the New York Times and whoever leaked the information to influence the ongoing trial.

It was clear from the earliest days of the trial that the House had a clear political strategy as well as a courtroom strategy. During the trial, I had the responsibility to hear the facts but also to separate the politics from the facts. Politically, it was best for the House to move as quickly as possible through impeachment so that vulnerable Democratic Members could vote for impeachment and then move quickly to other topics. But since the Presidential election is in full swing, it was politically better for Democrats to make the Senate trial move as slow as possible to hurt the President during the campaign. That explains why the House did not take the time to formally request documents or testimony from many individuals; they needed to move fast and try to force the Senate to move slowly. It also explained why the House passed impeachment on a party line vote, then held the Articles of Impeachment for a month before delivering them to the Senate to start the trial. The House managers said repeatedly that the evidence was clear and that they had proved their case, but if that was true, why would the Senate need to call additional witnesses? I think the reason is that the witness process was about delay, more than facts.

The facts do not support the accusation in the Trump impeachment, and it certainly did not need to come to this moment of national division. While it was clear that the House managers

wanted to drag the trial on for months in the Senate, through the primary election season, their case consisted of hypothetical story lines and “presumptions” more than facts that warrant the removal of a President. This does not meet what Alexander Hamilton in *Federalist* 65 described as the “due weight” for the arguments.

But impeachment has certainly created the division in our society that Alexander Hamilton predicted. Over 200 years ago he wrote, “The prosecution [of impeachments], will seldom fail to agitate the passions of the whole community, and to divide it into parties more or less friendly or inimical to the accused.” This has been an incredibly divisive season in our Nation. It is not about one person; it is about all of us. We individually choose how we handle disagreements with family, friends, and people on the other side of particular issues. Our government represents us, so it is up to us to model for our government how to handle disagreements.

We are now past impeachment, and it is time to work on the issues that matter most to the American people. As we move forward, every American should speak out on the issues that are important to them and the voices that speak for their point of view. But we should remember that we have much more in common than we have that divides us. It is my hope that our Nation does not go through a season like this again for a very long time and that we can move past this age of impeachment to an age of oversight and accountability.

I appreciate all the engagement with our office during the impeachment proceedings. We had thousands of calls and emails over the past month. We had hundreds of thousands of views on the nightly Facebook Live updates each day during the trial. While not every Oklahoman agrees with every decision I make on behalf of our State, I am grateful most choose to be respectful in expressing their points of view. At the end of the day, we are Oklahomans. We may not all agree on each issue, but we can be respectful of each other in our disagreement.

I am honored to serve our State and Nation. We have many important issues to address in the coming days I pray we can work on them together for the future of our State and Nation.

Mr. TILLIS. Madam President, during the impeachment trial, this Chamber considered the evidence and heard the arguments presented by the House managers and White House Counsel. During the 12 days of the impeachment trial, the Senate heard from the House managers for nearly 22 hours, and we heard from the White House Counsel for nearly 12 hours. This was followed by 180 questions asked and answered over 2 days, concluding with closing arguments by the House managers and White House Counsel.

Ultimately, there were two questions the Senate had to answer when considering the Articles of Impeachment.

The first question, for the near-term, is should the President be removed from office?

The second question, for the long-term health of our Nation, is whether we should allow the impeachment process to be weaponized and used by a majority in the House to settle partisan political scores?

My answers to both questions are a resounding no.

That is why I voted against both Articles of Impeachment.

While my Democratic colleagues operated under the presumption of guilt, even if one is to assume the worst, the reality is the allegations against President Trump were neither criminal nor impeachable. They did not come close to meeting the standard of treason, bribery, or high crimes or misdemeanors set by our Founding Fathers.

It is remarkable to read the *Federalist* Papers and appreciate their clairvoyance. *Federalist* 65, written by Alexander Hamilton, was frequently quoted throughout these proceedings, and for good reason. Hamilton’s warnings to this body of using impeachment as a partisan device were borne out. Hamilton wrote that impeachment:

[W]ill seldom fail to agitate the passions of the whole community, and to divide it into parties more or less friendly or inimical to the accused. In many cases it will connect itself with the pre-existing factions . . . and in such cases there will always be the greatest danger that the decision will be regulated more by the comparative strength of parties, than by the real demonstrations of innocence or guilt.

By placing the impeachment power within the House and Senate, Hamilton acknowledged that power may wind up in the hands of “the leaders or tools of the most cunning or the most numerous faction,” which may “hardly be expected to possess the requisite neutrality towards those whose conduct may be the subject of scrutiny.” It is because of this remarkable power that Hamilton argued the Senate had been granted the power to try impeachments because the Senate is more likely to preserve “the necessary impartiality between the INDIVIDUAL accused and the REPRESENTATIVES OF THE PEOPLE, HIS ACCUSERS?”

It is important to note that the Speaker of the House previously warned about the dangers of a politically motivated impeachment effort, stating in March 2019 that “impeachment is so divisive to the country that unless there’s something so compelling and overwhelming and bipartisan, I don’t think we should go down that path, because it divides the country.”

History has proven that warning to be true. One only needs to compare the dramatically different outcomes between the Nixon impeachment inquiry, which resulted in resignation, and the Clinton impeachment process, which resulted in acquittal.

The Speaker’s warning rings as true today as it did when she said it nearly 1 year ago. Unfortunately, the House

majority ignored this warning, electing to lead a distinctly partisan process from beginning to end, based on a political timeline.

It began when the House majority refused to provide the President with basic due process rights for 71 of the 78 days of the formal House impeachment inquiry. The House majority also refused to provide proper rights to the minority, whose requests for an equal number of witnesses was denied.

It is no wonder why House Resolution 660, which permitted an impeachment inquiry, and House Resolution 755, the Articles of Impeachment against President Trump, failed to receive a single vote from the minority. In fact, the only thing that was bipartisan was the opposition to the articles.

The House majority presented a weak and completely partisan case for impeachment to the Senate. This is why the House managers attempted to convince the Senate to endorse its particular views of separation of powers, essentially asking the Senate to do the House’s job where it failed: to make a compelling case for the President’s removal.

This is yet another area Hamilton addressed. In *Federalist* 66, Hamilton outlined the differing roles and responsibilities between the House and Senate on impeachment, casting the House as the accusers and the Senate as the judges:

The division of them between the two branches of the legislature, assigning to one the right of accusing, to the other the right of judging, avoids the inconvenience of making the same persons both accusers and judges; and guards against the danger of persecution, from the prevalence of a factious spirit in either of those branches. As the concurrence of two thirds of the Senate will be requisite to a condemnation, the security to innocence, from this additional circumstance, will be as complete as itself can desire.

By dividing the power to accuse and the power to judge, the Founding Fathers further recognized the procedural nature of this process. Appropriate procedure would serve to protect the Executive from the designs of a partisan faction in the House and would ensure that removal was not just desirable, but truly necessary.

In this instance, removal was absolutely unnecessary, even if it was desirable to the whims of some in the House majority since the day the President was inaugurated in 2017.

This addresses the answer to the second question I posed on whether the Senate will allow the impeachment process to become the new normal.

It would create a dangerous precedent in which the House actively seeks opportunities to open impeachment inquiries to politically weaken and potentially remove the President of the opposing party.

Impeachment is the most powerful tool the Founding Fathers gave to us to defend against Executive misconduct, but it should never be abused. It should never be used to settle political scores, and it should never be used

as an effort to deny the American people the right to decide the President's fate at the ballot box.

To transform impeachment into a partisan political weapon is to diminish and undermine its critical constitutional role.

Despite the factions which formed during this impeachment trial, I remain optimistic about the direction of our Nation. For all the bitter partisan emotions this impeachment process has enflamed, this Congress now has the opportunity to move on and focus on forging consensus to conduct the business of the American people. Congress has recently demonstrated this ability—enacting historic criminal justice reform, agreeing on reforms to improve the delivery of healthcare to our brave veterans, and approving a fair and free trade deal with America's two largest economic partners, producing a win for American workers and consumers.

I hope, when the record is written of this impeachment, that history will say that the Senate ultimately retained the high bar which must be met to remove a President, that the Senate rejected the temptation to normalize the impeachment process for partisan political gain, and that Congress turned the page following the President's acquittal to prioritize the needs of the American people and, in turn, solve the most pressing challenges facing our great Nation.

TRIBUTE TO ROBERT J. JACKSON, JR.

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, I rise to express my appreciation for the work of Securities and Exchange Commission: Robert J. Jackson, Jr. Commissioner Jackson stepped down earlier this month from the SEC, having served with distinction since December 2017. He returns to teaching, having made many valuable contributions to policy debates at the SEC and beyond.

Mr. Jackson is no stranger to public service. Prior to his work at the SEC, he served in the Treasury Department as the Nation emerged from the financial crisis. Mr. Jackson has led by example, working diligently to ensure the SEC fulfills its three-part mission, particularly the protection of investors in an increasingly complex marketplace. As an outspoken voice on behalf of investors, Mr. Jackson stressed the importance of clear and sensible rules that put investors first, combined with a pragmatic understanding of how markets work.

Mr. Jackson brought a law professor's analytical approach to his responsibilities as a Commissioner. His careful and thoughtful work digging through data, developing original research, and presenting it in a clear and insightful manner provided the SEC and other policymakers with critical information and a valuable perspective with which to consider some of the most difficult questions in securities laws.

Over the years, Commissioner Jackson has been a leader on the issue of corporate political spending disclosure. He has helped to focus the conversation on how to think about reasonable and material disclosure as our political system has become awash in dark money. Similarly, Mr. Jackson's study of trends in stock buybacks and the potential for abuse by corporate executives raised many issues that merit additional consideration by regulators and lawmakers.

I would like to lead my colleagues in wishing Mr. Jackson the best of luck as he returns to academia. I expect that he will continue his insightful research and scholarship to benefit investors and make markets more efficient. The SEC benefited from Commissioner Jackson's tenure, and we know his students will benefit, too.

TRIBUTE TO KIMBERLY HAZELGROVE

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, today I rise to honor Kimberly Hazelgrove for her service and sacrifices for our country and her successful efforts to advocate for families like her own who lost loved ones serving our Nation.

Kimberly Hazelgrove is a former sergeant first class in the U.S. Army. In 2004, her husband, Chief Warrant Officer 2 Brian Hazelgrove was killed in a helicopter crash near Mosul, Iraq. That loss was devastating enough, but after his death, Ms. Hazelgrove also lost the military benefits her family earned serving the United States and that she needed to support her family. They lost those benefits because of a 1970s-era law that causes Gold Star families to lose out on financial benefits that their spouses paid into and earned.

For 16 years, Ms. Hazelgrove advocated on Capitol Hill for the repeal of that law, the Survivor Benefit Plan-Disability and Indemnity Compensation offset, while raising her family as a single mother. She said, "I was angry . . . Very angry for the inequities that I was seeing, not only for myself, but for a lot of my friends going through it and it just lit a fire, and I found a stronger voice than I had before."

My office and I met with Ms. Hazelgrove and took up her cause. Gold Star families like hers have sacrificed so much for this country and nothing should get in the way of providing them with benefits that they have paid into and earned. We worked together with colleagues on both sides of the aisle to write legislation that will fix this, and this past December, because she never gave up, we got it done. We passed a fix in the Senate, and the President signed it into law. Because of Ms. Hazelgrove's perseverance and strong advocacy, 67,000 military spouses will now get the benefits they have earned to support themselves and their families.

Thank you, Kimberly, for raising your voice and for all the work you do

to fight for fellow Gold Star families. I am sure my Senate colleagues will join me in honoring Ms. Kimberly Hazelgrove for her exemplary efforts.

REMEMBERING JEFFREY HAMMOND LONG

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Madam President, I rise today to pay tribute to Jeffrey "Jeff" Hammond Long, an outstanding public servant and friend to many. Sadly, Jeff passed away on July 8, 2018. He was critically injured by a truck while riding his bike in Washington the previous day. Today, in honor of what would have been his 38th birthday, I wish to recognize Jeff's legacy of positivity.

Born in New York City, Jeff enrolled at Brunswick School in Greenwich, CT. Throughout his many years there, Jeff set an example for his fellow students. Not only did he mentor younger members of the community and cocaptain the lacrosse team, but he also served as president of the student body. Even after graduation, Jeff continued to serve the school as a result of the foundational experience he had at Brunswick.

Jeff studied at Hamilton College, where he was vice president of the student body and an Arthur Levitt Scholar. During his time at Hamilton, Jeff began his remarkable dedication to public service by interning for former President Clinton at the Clinton Foundation's New York office, as well as for Secretary Kerry's Presidential campaign and his U.S. Senate office.

I had the pleasure of first meeting Jeff in 2010. He worked in my Senate office for many years, serving as a legislative assistant on the energy, environment, and transportation portfolio. Jeff routinely demonstrated his extraordinary commitment to helping the people of Connecticut and the Nation. A diligent and bright member of my team, he always put the needs of others before his own, focusing on serving the people of Connecticut with tireless care and patience.

His incredible wife, Kaylie—another Connecticut native and devoted public servant—continues to honor his memory by doing acts of kindness on Jeff's birthday. She and their friends are guided by his motto: "It's cool to be nice."

Jeff's natural inclination to support others and bring smiles to people's faces touched countless lives from Connecticut to DC, and everywhere in between. He helped everyone around him find a positive side to any situation or take a moment to appreciate even the smallest parts of life.

I am grateful for the considerate and warm outlook Jeff brought wherever he went, and I know his memory will forever serve as a model of selflessness and unfailing devotion. My wife Cynthia and I extend our warmest thoughts to Kaylie, as well as to Jeff's parents, Nancy and David, and I hope my colleagues will join me in acknowledging Jeff's incredible impact.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO DR. PHOEBE STEIN

• Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, I would like to take a few moments to thank and congratulate Dr. Phoebe Stein for her lifetime commitment to advancing the humanities. At the end of this week, Phoebe will leave her post as the executive director at Maryland Humanities, a position she has held for more than 11 years. But Maryland's loss is the Nation's gain. Effective May 1, Phoebe will succeed Esther Mackintosh as president of the Federation of State Humanities Councils. The federation is the national member association of the 56 State and jurisdictional humanities councils. The Federation's purpose is "to provide leadership, advocacy, and information to help members advance programs that engage millions of citizens across diverse populations in community and civic life." I can't think of anyone better suited for the job.

Phoebe, a Maryland native, arrived at Maryland Humanities in 2008 after serving as the director of public affairs at the Illinois Humanities Council, now called Illinois Humanities. She received her B.A. in English from the University of Michigan and her M.A. and Ph.D. in English from Loyola University of Chicago.

Phoebe has effectively advocated for the humanities at the local, State, and Federal level for more than 20 years. Even though Phoebe became executive director at Maryland Humanities at the beginning of the Great Recession, she managed to expand the council's partnerships, programs, staff, financial support and other resources, and, most importantly, its reach. She hosted a radio spot, "Humanities Connection," while advancing several of the council's flagship programs, including Maryland History Day, Museum on Main Street, and One Maryland One Book. The organization now offers more than 1,000 free events annually in partnership with more than 500 organizations in more than 150 communities statewide.

Phoebe has brought Maryland History Day winners to meet with their elected representatives at the Maryland State House and here at the U.S. Capitol. She helped to foster a responsive environment following the death of Freddie Gray in 2015 and launch a Humanities Fund for Baltimore. She introduced student authors to author Chimamanda Ngozi Adichie at One Maryland One Book events in 2017. Through it all, Phoebe has been a joyful and indefatigable advocate, coming up to the Hill or to Annapolis to lobby or traveling throughout Maryland to bring the humanities to the people. In 2016, "The Daily Record" rightfully recognized Phoebe as one of Maryland's Top 100 Women.

The National Endowment for the Humanities, NEH, provides funding to State humanities councils through

NEH's Federal/State Partnership Office. The councils also receive funding from private donations, foundations, corporations, and from the States themselves. This year, we will celebrate the 55th anniversary of the NEH's creation. On September 29, 1965, President Lyndon Johnson signed the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act into law. The act called for the creation of the NEH and the National Endowment for the Arts, NEA, as separate, independent agencies. More than 200 people filled the Rose Garden for the bill signing ceremony, including Gregory Peck, Dumas Malone, Ansel Adams, Ralph Ellison, Walter Gropius, and Paul Mellon.

President Trump's fiscal year 2021 budget request once again tentatively proposes to terminate the NEH, the NEA, the Institute of Museum and Library Services, and the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. In previous years, Congress has ignored these proposals, and I am optimistic we will do so again this year. I would note that Federal funding for the NEH peaked in 1994 in nominal terms at \$177.5 million; in inflation-adjusted terms—2019 dollars—Federal funding peaked in 1979 at nearly three times its current level.

On a per capita basis, Federal funding for the NEH amounts to less than the cost of a single postage stamp. That is a rather paltry investment since, as author and essayist Mark Slouka wrote in his book, "Essays from the Nick of Time: Reflections and Refutations," "[T]he humanities are a superb delivery mechanism for what we might call democratic values." He went on to say:

The case for the humanities is not hard to make, though it can be difficult—to such an extent have we been marginalized, so long have we acceded to that marginalization—not to sound either defensive or naive. The humanities, done right, are the crucible in which our evolving notions of what it means to be fully human are put to the test; they teach us, incrementally, endlessly, not what to do, but how to be. Their method is confrontational, their domain unlimited, their "product" not truth but the reasoned search for truth, their "success" something very much like Frost's momentary stay against confusion.

Phoebe Stein understands how important the humanities are to our individual, collective, and civic well-being. While we Marylanders will miss her at Maryland Humanities, all Americans are fortunate that she will be heading the federation, where her passionate advocacy will extend beyond Baltimore, the Eastern Shore, and the Cumberland Narrows to redound to the benefit of people and communities across our Nation.●

REMEMBERING ANTHONY J. MAY

• Mr. CASEY. Madam President, today I wish to honor the distinguished life and career of Anthony J. May, who passed away on January 20, 2020.

Tony worked for more than 30 years as a political strategist and journalist,

leaving his mark on Pennsylvania politics. He used his deep knowledge of Pennsylvania history to assist many in trying to find the best way forward, including during his time as executive director of the Pennsylvania Democratic Party. He served as the communications director and press secretary for my father, Governor Robert P. Casey, as well as press secretary for Governor Milton J. Shapp and as communications director under House Speakers K. Leroy Irvis and James J. Manderino. Most recently, he worked at Triad Strategies, a communications and public relations firm in Harrisburg, as Partner Emeritus.

Tony also served the public as a journalist and political analyst for various newspapers in Pennsylvania, Ohio, and New Jersey, and as an editor for the Associated Press. In these roles, in addition to being past chair of the Pennsylvania Public Television Network, he worked tirelessly to keep the public informed and to support journalists and journalism wherever and whenever he could.

Tony was a legend in Pennsylvania for decades, and his legacy will be felt for years to come. My thoughts and prayers are with his wife, Betsy; his children, Crispin, Amy, and Cybele; his five grandchildren and two great-grandchildren; and all of Tony's family and friends as they mourn his loss.●

RECOGNIZING THE WEST FARGO
PACKATAHNAS

• Mr. CRAMER. Madam President, the West Fargo, ND, dance team, the Packatahnas, has returned home from the National Dance Team Competition in Florida as national high kick champions.

This comes after winning championship titles competing this year with the Class A Large Varsity schools in North Dakota. It is always cause for celebration when students bring home a championship title, but this year's award is one of several the team has won.

After more than eight high kick first place finishes at the State level in the past 25 years, the Packatahnas were back-to-back national champions in 2006 and 2007. Now 14 years later and after finishing ahead of 22 other national teams, it has been especially meaningful for these teammates to place another trophy in the school's award case.

The passion, dedication, and time the Packatahnas devote to their dance team season rival that of other high school student athletes. For several hours every day, they first work to develop their routines. Then it is practice, practice, and more practice until they are ready for competition.

At their side throughout this year was their coach, Shayla Pennick, whom they credit for her commitment to them in this successful season. Shayla knows the thrill they feel as champions because she competed with

the team when the Packatahns finished at the top 14 years ago. She deserves recognition and thanks for sharing her time and talents to help another team go as far as her high school team did.

Madam President, I join the West Fargo High School, the city of West Fargo, and the rest of North Dakota in congratulating these talented Packatahns for finishing their season as champions. They are an inspiration to all of us by demonstrating the good that can come from combining a passion for excellence with plenty of hard work.●

TRIBUTE TO CAPTAIN JEREMY WHITE

● Mr. RISCH. Madam President, when you do nuclear theory research and classified national security work, you need a world-class protective security force to protect materials, facilities, information, and people. Fortunately, Idaho National Laboratory, INL, has a world-class protective force, Pro Force, as was recently affirmed through the presentation of the Colonel Sydnor Memorial Award.

Each year, the Colonel Sydnor Memorial Award recognizes an exceptional participant in the Composite Adversary Team—CAT—Program, which trains members of Pro Force teams across the Department of Energy's nuclear security complexes to act as attackers in simulated force-on-force exercises that test the strength of each lab's Pro Force team. This year, that recognition was given to INL Pro Force captain Jeremy White. White has an expansive career in law enforcement, including time as a juvenile detention officer and a deputy officer in adult corrections. Along with his duties as Pro Force captain, White also serves as Bingham County reserve deputy and is a member of the Special Tactics and Response—STAR—team, a multijurisdictional SWAT team. Before being presented the award, White was described as an individual who demonstrates "excellence in the areas of character, ability to motivate others, physical fitness, tactical skills and teamwork" by April Stephenson, Deputy Director for Department of Energy's Office of Enterprise Assessments.

As a member of the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee, I am honored to represent people like Jeremy White who are so dedicated to protecting the energy resources of Idaho. Congratulations to Jeremy and to all the members of INL's Pro Force team. You make Idaho proud, and I wish for your continued success in the Pro Force field.●

RECOGNIZING TALLY MAC SHACK

● Mr. RUBIO. Madam President, as chairman of the Senate Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship, each week I recognize a small business that exemplifies the American entre-

preneurial spirit at the heart of our country. It is my privilege to recognize a Florida small business that not only creates a delicious product, but dedicates time, effort, and money to serving its community. This week, it is my pleasure to honor Tally Mac Shack of Tallahassee, FL, as the Senate Small Business of the Week.

Despite having a graduate degree in criminology from Florida State University and a job with a State agency, when the opportunity arose, Justo Cruz jumped at the chance to pursue his entrepreneurial dream. After attending a mac-and-cheese fest in 2017, Justo was inspired to create comfort food with a gourmet twist. Creating social media accounts and a logo, Justo started Tally Mac Shack that same day. He traded in his 2006 Nissan Armada for an old Frito-Lay delivery truck, converting it into the original Tally Mac Shack food truck, where he experimented with his mac-and-cheese creations.

On October 1, 2017, Tally Mac Shack debuted at a food-tasting event and sold out within 2 hours. Two-and-a-half years later, Tally Mac Shack is 30 employees strong, boasts two food trucks, two brick-and-mortar locations, and has established a strong catering presence in the Tallahassee area. Partnering with his alma mater, Justo established a brick-and-mortar location on FSU's campus and a concession stand in its football stadium.

Since its inception, Tally Mac Shack has emphasized the importance of community service. The business has partnered with local agencies and organizations to support a variety of causes, including Hurricane Michael disaster relief and the Down Syndrome Association of Florida. They have also supported the Tallahassee Memorial Healthcare Cancer Center, the Kearney Center for the Homeless, and Fort Braden Middle School. During its summer nonprofit program, Tally Mac Shack donates a portion of its profit and a free visit from one of its food trucks to a local organization. Participating groups include Big Bend Hospice, Alzheimer's Project, Inc., Habitat for Humanity, and the local Humane Society. Additionally, Justo recently announced that Tally Mac Shack is an official On the Job Training partner with Leon High School's culinary program, providing mentorship and job training to local students.

Combined with community involvement, Tally Mac Shack's modern take on a culinary classic was a recipe for success and business continues to boom. Excelling on all fronts, Tally Mac Shack was recognized for its community service as an inaugural winner of the 2019 All in Tally Award for going "above and beyond to make our community a better place to live." Within its first 18 months, Tally Mac Shack was also honored five times as Tallahassee's best food truck.

Tally Mac Shack is a great example of the pivotal role community-oriented

small businesses play in the U.S. economy. I commend their efforts to provide a quality product, while simultaneously prioritizing local involvement and training to support local jobs. Congratulations to the entire team at Tally Mac Shack. I look forward to watching your continued growth and success.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

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

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

PRESIDENTIAL MESSAGE

REPORT ON THE CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY ORIGINALLY DECLARED IN EXECUTIVE ORDER 13660 ON MARCH 6, 2014, WITH RESPECT TO UKRAINE—PM 47

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days before the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13660 of March 6, 2014, with respect to Ukraine is to continue in effect beyond March 6, 2020.

The actions and policies of persons that undermine democratic processes and institutions in Ukraine; threaten its peace, security, stability, sovereignty, and territorial integrity; and contribute to the misappropriation of its assets, and the actions and policies of the Government of the Russian Federation, including its purported annexation of Crimea and its use of force in Ukraine, continue to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of

the United States. Therefore, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13660 with respect to Ukraine.

DONALD J. TRUMP.
THE WHITE HOUSE, February 25, 2020.

PRESIDENTIAL MESSAGE

REPORT ON THE CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO CUBA AND OF THE EMERGENCY AUTHORITY RELATING TO THE REGULATION OF THE ANCHORAGE AND MOVEMENT OF VESSELS, AS AMENDED—PM 48

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days before the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency with respect to Cuba that was declared on March 1, 1996, in Proclamation 6867, as amended by Proclamation 7757 on February 26, 2004, Proclamation 9398 on February 24, 2016, and Proclamation 9699 on February 22, 2018, is to continue in effect beyond March 1, 2020.

It continues to be United States policy that a mass migration from Cuba would endanger the security of the United States by posing a disturbance or threatened disturbance of the international relations of the United States. The Cuban government has not demonstrated that it will refrain from the use of excessive force against United States vessels or aircraft that may engage in memorial activities or peaceful protest north of Cuba. Further, the unauthorized entry of United States registered vessels into Cuban territorial waters continues to be detrimental to United States foreign policy and counter to the purpose of Executive Order 12807 of May 24, 1992, which is to ensure, among other things, safe, orderly, and legal migration. The possibility of large-scale unauthorized entries of United States-registered vessels would disturb the international relations of the United States by facilitating a possible mass migration of Cuban nationals. For these reasons, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared with respect to Cuba and the

emergency authority relating to the regulation of the anchorage and movement of vessels set out in Proclamation 6867, as amended by Proclamation 7757, Proclamation 9398, and Proclamation 9699.

DONALD J. TRUMP.
THE WHITE HOUSE, February 25, 2020.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bill was read the first time:

S. 3339. A bill to restore military priorities, and for other purposes.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Ms. MURKOWSKI, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 500. A bill to amend title 54, United States Code, to establish, fund, and provide for the use of amounts in a National Park Service Legacy Restoration Fund to address the maintenance backlog of the National Park Service, and for other purposes.

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

S. 1081. A bill to amend title 54, United States Code, to provide permanent, dedicated funding for the Land and Water Conservation Fund, and for other purposes.

S. 2418. A bill to amend the Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act of 2006 to modify a definition and the disposition and authorized uses of qualified outer Continental Shelf revenues under that Act and to exempt State and county payments under that Act from sequestration, to provide for the distribution of certain outer Continental Shelf revenues to the State of Alaska, and for other purposes.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. SCHATZ:

S. 3328. A bill to award grants to States to establish or improve, and carry out, Seal of Bilingual programs to recognize high-level student proficiency in speaking, reading, and writing in both English and a second language; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. HASSAN (for herself and Mr. HAWLEY):

S. 3329. A bill to establish an incubator network and startup success program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

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

S. 3330. A bill to amend the Mineral Leasing Act to increase certain royalty rates, minimum bid amounts, and rental rates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. GARDNER (for himself and Mr. BENNET):

S. 3331. A bill to modify the boundary of the Rocky Mountain National Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. ROSEN (for herself and Mr. SCOTT of Florida):

S. 3332. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for the halt in pension payments for Members of Congress sentenced for certain offenses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Ms. SMITH, Mr. SULLIVAN, Ms. HASSAN, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. TESTER, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. JONES, Ms. ROSEN, Ms. SINEMA, and Ms. HARRIS):

S. 3333. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the implementation of curricula for training students, teachers, and school personnel to understand, recognize, prevent, and respond to signs of human trafficking and exploitation in children and youth, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. DUCKWORTH:

S. 3334. A bill to require the publication of opinions issued by the Office of Legal Counsel of the Department of Justice, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PORTMAN (for himself and Mr. BROWN):

S. 3335. A bill to require the Secretary of the Army to convey certain Federal property in the State of Ohio to the Friends of Barker House; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. MURPHY (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. MARKEY, and Ms. WARREN):

S. 3336. A bill to reauthorize The Last Green Valley National Heritage Corridor and the Upper Housatonic Valley National Heritage Area, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. UDALL):

S. 3337. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to require more accountability in the airline industry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. HEINRICH (for himself and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 3338. A bill to establish programs to improve family economic security by breaking the cycle of multigenerational poverty, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. REED, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. JONES, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. TESTER, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. CASEY, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. WARNER, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. UDALL, Mr. BENNET, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. KAINE, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BROWN, Ms. HIRONO, and Mr. COONS):

S. 3339. A bill to restore military priorities, and for other purposes; read the first time.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 259

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 259, a bill to impose criminal sanctions on certain persons involved in international doping fraud conspiracies, to provide restitution for victims of such conspiracies, and to require sharing of information with the

United States Anti-Doping Agency to assist its fight against doping, and for other purposes.

S. 279

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 279, a bill to allow tribal grant schools to participate in the Federal Employee Health Benefits Program.

S. 296

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 296, a bill to amend XVIII of the Social Security Act to ensure more timely access to home health services for Medicare beneficiaries under the Medicare program.

S. 360

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 360, a bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to require the submission by issuers of data relating to diversity, and for other purposes.

S. 460

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) 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. 500

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 500, a bill to amend title 54, United States Code, to establish, fund, and provide for the use of amounts in a National Park Service Legacy Restoration Fund to address the maintenance backlog of the National Park Service, and for other purposes.

S. 525

At the request of Mr. PAUL, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mrs. LOEFFLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 525, a bill to preserve and protect the free choice of individual employees to form, join, or assist labor organizations, or to refrain from such activities.

S. 560

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the names of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) and the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) were added as cosponsors of S. 560, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act, the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require that group and individual health insurance coverage and group health plans provide coverage for treatment of a congenital anomaly or birth defect.

S. 696

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 696, a bill to designate the

same individual serving as the Chief Nurse Officer of the Public Health Service as the National Nurse for Public Health.

S. 866

At the request of Mr. VAN HOLLEN, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 866, a bill to amend part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act to provide full Federal funding of such part.

S. 916

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 916, a bill to improve Federal efforts with respect to the prevention of maternal mortality, and for other purposes.

S. 1072

At the request of Mr. BRAUN, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mrs. LOEFFLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1072, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to establish a Job Training Federal Pell Grants demonstration program, and for other purposes.

S. 1081

At the request of Mr. MANCHIN, the names of the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) and the Senator from Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY) were added as cosponsors of S. 1081, a bill to amend title 54, United States Code, to provide permanent, dedicated funding for the Land and Water Conservation Fund, and for other purposes.

S. 1331

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mrs. LOEFFLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1331, a bill to provide additional protections for our veterans.

S. 1421

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1421, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the 23d Headquarters Special Troops and the 3133d Signal Service Company in recognition of their unique and distinguished service as a "Ghost Army" that conducted deception operations in Europe during World War II.

S. 1781

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

S. 1918

At the request of Mr. BOOZMAN, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) was added as a cosponsor of S.

1918, a bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to require alternative options for summer food service program delivery.

S. 2059

At the request of Mr. TILLIS, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2059, a bill to provide a civil remedy for individuals harmed by sanctuary jurisdiction policies, and for other purposes.

S. 2085

At the request of Ms. ROSEN, the names of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER), the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) and the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) were added as cosponsors of S. 2085, a bill to authorize the Secretary of Education to award grants to eligible entities to carry out educational programs about the Holocaust, and for other purposes.

S. 2097

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2097, a bill to amend section 287 of the Immigration and Nationality Act to limit immigration enforcement actions at sensitive locations, to clarify the powers of immigration officers at such locations, and for other purposes.

S. 2179

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) 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. 2233

At the request of Mr. SCHATZ, the name of the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2233, a bill to nullify the effect of the recent executive order that requires Federal agencies to share citizenship data.

S. 2300

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2300, a bill to amend the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 to establish a program to incentivize innovation and to enhance the industrial competitiveness of the United States by developing technologies to reduce emissions of nonpower industrial sectors, and for other purposes.

S. 2321

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the names of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS), the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO), the Senator

from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN), the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING), the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY), the Senator from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) and the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) were added as cosponsors of S. 2321, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint a coin in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the establishment of Negro Leagues baseball.

S. 2439

At the request of Mr. LANKFORD, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2439, a bill to amend the Trademark Act of 1946 to provide that the licensing of a mark for use by a related company may not be construed as establishing an employment relationship between the owner of the mark, or an authorizing person, and either that related company or the employees of that related company, and for other purposes.

S. 2669

At the request of Mr. TESTER, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 2669, a bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to clarify the obligation to report acts of foreign election influence and require implementation of compliance and reporting systems by Federal campaigns to detect and report such acts, and for other purposes.

S. 2748

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2748, a bill to repeal the section of the Middle Class Tax Relief and Job Creation Act of 2012 that requires the Federal Communications Commission to reallocate and auction the T-Band spectrum.

S. 2858

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2858, a bill to require the Administrator of the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration to establish an advisory board focused on creating opportunities for women in the trucking industry, and for other purposes.

S. 2892

At the request of Ms. HASSAN, the names of the Senator from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA) and the Senator from Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY) were added as cosponsors of S. 2892, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the distribution of additional residency positions to help combat the opioid crisis.

S. 2907

At the request of Ms. HASSAN, the names of the Senator from Virginia

(Mr. WARNER) and the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) were added as cosponsors of S. 2907, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide coverage of medical nutrition therapy services for individuals with eating disorders under the Medicare program.

S. 2950

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

S. 2970

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

S. 2993

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the names of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER) and the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO) were added as cosponsors of 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.

S. 3004

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3004, a bill to protect human rights and enhance opportunities for LGBTI people around the world, and for other purposes.

S. 3020

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3020, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to enter into contracts with States or to award grants to States to promote health and wellness, prevent suicide, and improve outreach to veterans, and for other purposes.

S. 3054

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3054, a bill to establish that a State-based education loan program is excluded from certain requirements relating to a preferred lender arrangement.

S. 3152

At the request of Ms. ROSEN, the names of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BRAUN), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) were added as cosponsors of S. 3152, a bill to require the Federal Communications Commission to incorporate data on maternal health outcomes into its broadband health maps.

S. 3167

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

S. 3174

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

S. 3176

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the names of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from Georgia (Mrs. LOEFFLER), the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) and the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BRAUN) were added as cosponsors of S. 3176, a bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 and the United States-Israel Strategic Partnership Act of 2014 to make improvements to certain defense and security assistance provisions and to authorize the appropriations of funds to Israel, and for other purposes.

S. 3194

At the request of Ms. ROSEN, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3194, a bill to establish a program ensuring access to accredited continuing medical education for primary care physicians and other health care providers at Federally-qualified health centers and rural health clinics, to provide training and clinical support for primary care providers to practice at their full scope and improve access to care for patients in underserved areas.

S. 3196

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3196, a bill to conserve global bear populations by prohibiting the importation, exportation, and interstate trade of bear viscera and items, products, or substances containing, or labeled or advertised as containing, bear viscera, and for other purposes.

S. 3276

At the request of Mr. COONS, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3276, a bill to eliminate asset limits employed by certain federally funded means-tested public assistance programs, and for other purposes.

S. 3296

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3296, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently allow a tax deduction at the time an investment in qualified property is made, and for other purposes.

S. 3298

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3298, a bill to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to permit the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation to terminate the insured status of a depository institution that refuses to provide services to certain Federal contractors, and for other purposes.

S. 3310

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3310, a bill to permit visiting dignitaries and service members from Taiwan to display the flag of the Republic of China.

S. 3314

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3314, a bill to seek a diplomatic resolution to Iran's nuclear program, and for other purposes.

S. 3319

At the request of Mr. HAWLEY, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mrs. LOEFFLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3319, a bill to reauthorize comprehensive research and statistical review and analysis of trafficking in persons and commercial sex acts, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 502

At the request of Mr. YOUNG, the names of the Senator from Florida (Mr. SCOTT), the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BRAUN), the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) and the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 502, a resolution recognizing the 75th anniversary of the amphibious landing on the Japanese island of Iwo Jima during World War II and the raisings of the flag of the United States on Mount Suribachi.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION

By Mr. HEINRICH (for himself and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 3338. A bill to establish programs to improve family economic security by breaking the cycle of multigenerational poverty, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I rise today to join my colleague from New Mexico, Senator HEINRICH, in introducing the Two-Generation Economic Empowerment Act. Our bipartisan bill would support an innovative approach to fighting poverty, one that focuses on addressing the needs of children and their parents—two-generations together—in order to help break the cycle of intergenerational poverty.

Many current conversations about lifting families out of poverty high-

light record low unemployment and the booming U.S. economy as proof that we are finally headed in the right direction. I see many encouraging signs, such as the U.S. poverty rate finally in 2018 falling below the pre-recession level and Maine experiencing the largest decline in child poverty in the Nation from 2016 to 2017, but I also know far too many families still struggle financially. Over 38 million people, or about one in eight Americans, lived below the poverty line in 2018. This sadly includes nearly 13 million children, including 35,000 children in Maine. Despite recent progress, Maine's child poverty rate is still higher than all the other New England states.

In addition to recognizing the continued need to lift up families and provide a brighter future for our Nation's youth, the economic motivation for addressing intergenerational poverty points to one simple fact—we must do something different. It is estimated that child poverty costs the U.S. between \$800 billion and \$1.1 trillion a year. For a sense of scale, the high end estimate of \$1.1 trillion annually is similar to the amount Congress appropriated in December to fund programs across the entire government.

Our legislation marks an important first step toward reevaluating our approach to poverty-reducing programs and encouraging innovative, more effective uses of taxpayer dollars. We support an approach that is aimed at equipping both parents and their children with the tools they need to succeed and become self-sufficient. Oftentimes, Federal programs intended to help low-income individuals address certain issues in silos, overlooking the fact that the needs of family members are usually interconnected. Our bill aims to change that. For example, helping a mother secure safe, high-quality child care can have a positive impact on her ability to succeed in the workforce, as well as improving her child's ability to be ready for school. While that child receives care and an education, her mother can be connecting with skills training to help her improve her income. Connecting various Federal programs that target both parents and children with supports aimed at increasing economic security, educational success, social capital, and health and wellbeing has the potential to lift whole families out of poverty.

Listen to the story of Ambrosia Ross, a mother of three from Washington County, Maine, who was part of the first cohort of participants at Family Futures Downeast, a two-generation program designed to improve economic outcomes for low-income families through post-secondary education for parents at the same time their children access high quality early childhood education. In a testimonial about her experience, Ambrosia says, "Family Futures Downeast opened up a whole new world, not just for me but also for my children . . . Both of my boys

talk about going to "Mama's school" and assure me that they are going to go to college also! They watch me doing homework and ask to do theirs as well. It means so much to me to know that not only has FFD changed my life but also set my children on a brand new path." In addition to continuing to attend college full time, Ambrosia is putting her new skills and education into practice by serving as a WIC Breastfeeding Peer Support Counselor. Her sons are also both eager to continue learning and her young daughter is already a "wanna-be reader."

Family Futures Downeast is just one example of the great strides we have made in bringing communities and service providers together to implement two-generation strategies. By blending federal dollars with the help of the State of Maine, Family Futures Downeast has reached nearly 230 individuals in Maine's most impoverished county with astounding results. In 2015 when the program was just getting started, I was proud to support Family Future Downeast's application to participate in a federal demonstration project aimed at combatting rural child poverty, which provided critical technical assistance and, with additional support from the John T. Gorman Foundation in Portland, helped the program get off the ground. The legislation we are introducing today would build on efforts like Family Futures Downeast that are increasing opportunities for families in need across the country by funding projects that work.

Specifically, the Two-Generation Economic Empowerment Act would create an Interagency Council on Multigenerational Poverty and Economic Mobility to better coordinate federal efforts aimed at supporting vulnerable families and moving them out of poverty. The Council would also make recommendations to Congress on ways to improve coordination of anti-poverty programs and to identify best practices. While I applaud ongoing efforts across the federal government to implement two-generation strategies, this Council is needed to tackle logistical challenges, such as lack of coordination and communication across federal agencies—and in some cases different departments within a single agency—and improve the dissemination of information and best practices.

Our bill would also authorize a pilot program that would provide additional flexibility for states and local governments to improve the administration of programs using Two-Generation models. It would authorize five states to participate in Two-Generation Performance Partnerships, allowing states to achieve reductions in poverty by blending similarly purposed funds across multiple federal programs. Two-generation approaches are often created "from the bottom up," meaning local organizations and states are at

the forefront of responding to local or regional needs. Therefore, our role as federal policymakers should be to give states and local organizations the flexibility they need to be creative in solving their unique challenges. For this reason, our legislation would reduce duplicative reporting and application requirements that may deter local agencies and organizations from making the most effective use of taxpayer dollars. To ensure accountability, the bill would require that these pilot programs be targeted at specific, poverty-reducing outcomes.

While federal programs have helped many of those living in poverty manage day-to-day hardships, they are falling short of breaking the cycle of poverty that has trapped too many families. With this bill, we have the chance to make a permanent difference in the lives of families and to break the multigenerational cycle of poverty. Just as a child's ZIP code should not determine his or her future success, so should the bureaucratic siloed approach to poverty not make it so difficult for families to get the help they need to escape poverty. The federal government can be an effective partner in providing opportunities for parents and their children, lifting up families, and in turn, building stronger communities. State and local governments can be at the forefront of these efforts, and the increased flexibility proposed by this bill would help reform practices across government.

In addition to strong support from national organizations like Ascend at the Aspen Institute, I want to thank the Maine Community Action Association and the Maine Head Start Directors Association for endorsing this important legislation. I also thank Senator HEINRICH for his continued leadership and urge my colleagues to support this innovative approach to moving families out of poverty by giving them the tools they need to succeed.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. REED, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. JONES, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. TESTER, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. CASEY, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. WARNER, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. UDALL, Mr. BENNET, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. KAINE, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BROWN, Ms. HIRONO, and Mr. COONS):

S. 3339. A bill to restore military priorities, and for other purposes; read the first time.

S. 3339

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 "Restoring Military Priorities Act of 2020".

SEC. 2. RESTORATION OF REPROGRAMMED FUNDS.

All amounts transferred under the Department of Defense reprogramming action FY 20-01 RA, "Support for DHS Counter-Drug Activity Reprogramming Action", shall be restored to the appropriation accounts and the programs, projects, and activities for which such amounts were appropriated or otherwise made available by the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2020 (division A of Public Law 116-93).

SEC. 3. LIMITATION ON GENERAL TRANSFER AUTHORITY.

Section 8005 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2020 (division A of Public Law 116-93;) is amended by striking "\$4,000,000,000" and inserting "\$1,798,000,000".

SEC. 4. LIMITATION ON OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS/GLOBAL WAR ON TERRORISM TRANSFER AUTHORITY.

Section 9002 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2020 (division A of Public Law 116-93;) is amended by striking "\$2,000,000,000" and inserting "\$371,000,000".

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I have 8 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 Tuesday, February 25, 2020, at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

The Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, February 25, 2020, at 2:30 p.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 Tuesday, February 25, 2020, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

The Committee on Energy and Natural Resources is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, February 25, 2020, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, February 25, 2020, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

The Committee on Veterans' Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, February 25, 2020, at 2 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, February 25, 2020, at 2 p.m., to conduct a closed briefing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON EAST ASIA, THE PACIFIC, AND INTERNATIONAL CYBERSECURITY POLICY

The Committee on Foreign Relations of the Subcommittee on East Asia, The Pacific, and International Cybersecurity Policy is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, February 25, 2020, at 2:15 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

CONGRATULATING THE KANSAS CITY CHIEFS ON THEIR VICTORY IN SUPER BOWL LIV

On Thursday, February 13, 2020, the Senate passed S. Res. 490, as follows:

S. RES. 490

Whereas, on Sunday, February 2, 2020, the Kansas City Chiefs (in this preamble referred to as the "Chiefs") defeated the San Francisco 49ers by a score of 31 to 20 to win Super Bowl LIV in Miami, Florida;

Whereas the Chiefs, established on August 14, 1959, playing in their 60th season in the National Football League (referred to in this preamble as the "NFL"), made their third Super Bowl appearance and their first Super Bowl appearance since Super Bowl IV;

Whereas Super Bowl LIV was the culmination of the 100th season of the NFL, a season in which the league has promoted stars both past and present, served the community, and looked toward the next 100 years of football;

Whereas the Chiefs overcame a 10-point deficit in the fourth quarter and scored 21 straight points in the final 6 minutes and 13 seconds of gameplay to earn the victory;

Whereas the victory in Super Bowl LIV earned the Chiefs their second Super Bowl victory, ending their 50-year Super Bowl drought that had lasted since the team last won Super Bowl IV on January 11, 1970;

Whereas the Chiefs were participants in the first ever Super Bowl and are now champions of the centennial season of the NFL;

Whereas the Chiefs began their championship season in another great Missouri city, St. Joseph, holding training camp on the campus of Missouri Western State University for the tenth straight year;

Whereas head coach Andy Reid earned his 222nd career win, placing him sixth on the all-time wins list of the NFL and earning his first Super Bowl title in his 21-year tenure as a head coach in the NFL;

Whereas Andy Reid is the 24th head coach of the NFL to appear in more than 1 Super Bowl;

Whereas in the 2019 NFL season, the Chiefs earned a playoff bid for the sixth time in 7 seasons under Andy Reid;

Whereas quarterback Patrick Mahomes completed 26 of 42 pass attempts for 286 yards and 2 touchdowns, rushed 9 times for 29 yards and 1 touchdown, and was named Most Valuable Player of Super Bowl LIV;

Whereas Patrick Mahomes became the youngest player in NFL history to earn both the NFL Most Valuable Player award and a Super Bowl title, while setting a playoff record for most touchdowns thrown before the first interception to start a player's playoff career;

Whereas in the American Football Conference Championship, Patrick Mahomes completed an iconic 27-yard scramble down the sideline for a touchdown to take the lead against the Tennessee Titans;

Whereas Patrick Mahomes became the first NFL quarterback with 3 double-digit comebacks in a single postseason;

Whereas Damien Williams rushed for 104 yards and scored 2 touchdowns, increasing his career playoff touchdown total to 11, tying Hall of Famer Terrell Davis for the

most touchdowns in an individual's first 6 playoff games;

Whereas Travis Kelce had 6 receptions for 43 yards and 1 touchdown;

Whereas Tyreek Hill had 9 receptions for 105 yards, including a crucial 44-yard reception on third-and-fifteen with only 7 minutes remaining in the fourth quarter;

Whereas Sammy Watkins had 5 receptions for 98 yards;

Whereas Bashaud Breeland led the team with 7 tackles and 1 interception;

Whereas Chris Jones was a disruptive force with 3 passes defended;

Whereas Frank Clark sacked the quarterback of the 49ers, Jimmy Garoppolo, on fourth-and-ten with fewer than 2 minutes remaining to seal the victory;

Whereas Harrison Butker was 1-for-1 in field goal attempts and 4-for-4 in point-after attempts;

Whereas Dustin Colquitt, the longest-tenured Chief, earned his first Super Bowl victory in his 15th season;

Whereas kick returner Mecole Hardman, tight end Travis Kelce, safety Tyrann Mathieu, and right tackle Mitchell Schwartz were named to the Associated Press All-Pro team for the 2019 season;

Whereas the Chiefs should be recognized for their tremendous resiliency in the face of adversity when trailing 24-0 against the Houston Texans in the American Football Conference Divisional Round, down by 10 against the Tennessee Titans in the American Football Conference Championship Round, and trailing 20-10 against the San Francisco 49ers in Super Bowl LIV;

Whereas the entire Chiefs roster contributed to the Super Bowl victory, including Nick Allegretti, Jackson Barton, Blake Bell, Bashaud Breeland, Alex Brown, Harrison Butker, Morris Claiborne, Frank Clark, Dustin Colquitt, Laurent Duvernay-Tardif, Cam Erving, Rashad Fenton, Eric Fisher, Kendall Fuller, Mecole Hardman, Demone Harris, Chad Henne, Tyreek Hill, Anthony Hitchens, Ryan Hunter, Chris Jones, Travis Kelce, Tanoh Kpassagnon, Darron Lee, Jordan Lucas, Patrick Mahomes, Tyrann Mathieu, LeSean McCoy, Matt Moore, Ben Niemann, Derrick Nnadi, Dorian O'Daniel, Mike Pennel, Byron Pringle, Reggie Ragland, Austin Reiter, Demarcus Robinson, Khalel Saunders, Mitchell Schwartz, Anthony Sherman, Daniel Sorensen, Terrell Suggs, Darwin Thompson, Charvarius Ward, Sammy Watkins, Armani Watts, Damien Williams, Xavier Williams, Damien Wilson, James Winchester, Stefen Wisniewski, Andrew Wylie, and Deon Yelder;

Whereas the victory of the Kansas City Chiefs in Super Bowl LIV instills an extraordinary sense of pride for fans in the States of Missouri and Kansas and across the Midwest; and

Whereas people all over the world are asking, "How 'bout those Chiefs?": Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) congratulates the Kansas City Chiefs and their entire staff, Mayor of Kansas City Quinton Lucas, Governor of Missouri Mike Parson, and loyal fans of the Kansas City

Chiefs for their victory in Super Bowl LIV; and

(2) respectfully directs the Secretary of the Senate to transmit an enrolled copy of this resolution to—

(A) the chairman and Chief Executive Officer of the Kansas City Chiefs, Clark Hunt;

(B) the president of the Kansas City Chiefs, Mark Donovan; and

(C) the head coach of the Kansas City Chiefs, Andy Reid.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to modify the order of January 31 to allow Senators to have until Thursday, February 27, 2020, to have printed statements and opinions in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, if they choose, explaining their votes and include those in the documentation of the impeachment proceedings; finally, I ask that the two-page rule be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MEASURE READ THE FIRST TIME—S. 3339

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I understand there is a bill at the desk, and I ask for its first reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bill by title for the first time.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 3339) to restore military priorities, and for other purposes.

Mr. McCONNELL. I now ask for a second reading and, in order to place the bill on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I object to my own request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The bill will be read for the second time on the next legislative day.

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 2020

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9:30 a.m., Thursday, February 27; further, that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed; finally, following leader remarks, the Senate proceed to executive session and resume consideration

of the Greaves nomination, under the previous order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 2020, AT 9:30 A.M.

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned, under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:38 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, February 27, 2020, at 9:30 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

WILLIAM JORDAN GILLIS, OF GEORGIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE, VICE ROBERT H. MCMAHON.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

DOUGLAS BENEVENTO, OF COLORADO, TO BE DEPUTY ADMINISTRATOR OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY, VICE ANDREW WHEELER, RESIGNED.

BROADCASTING BOARD OF GOVERNORS

MICHAEL PACK, OF MARYLAND, TO BE CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER OF THE BROADCASTING BOARD OF GOVERNORS FOR THE TERM OF THREE YEARS. (NEW POSITION)

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

ALEX NELSON WONG, OF NEW JERSEY, TO BE ALTERNATE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA FOR SPECIAL POLITICAL AFFAIRS IN THE UNITED NATIONS, WITH THE RANK OF AMBASSADOR.

ALEX NELSON WONG, OF NEW JERSEY, TO BE AN ALTERNATE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE SESSIONS OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE UNITED NATIONS DURING HIS TENURE OF SERVICE AS ALTERNATE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA FOR SPECIAL POLITICAL AFFAIRS IN THE UNITED NATIONS.

ALDONA Z. WOS, OF NORTH CAROLINA, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO CANADA.

NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES

ELIZABETH GLEASON, OF PENNSYLVANIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE ARTS FOR A TERM EXPIRING SEPTEMBER 3, 2020, VICE AARON PAUL DWORIN, TERM EXPIRED.

JESSE MERRIAM, OF MARYLAND, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE HUMANITIES FOR A TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 26, 2024, VICE RAMON SALDIVAR, TERM EXPIRED.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 25, 2020:

THE JUDICIARY

ROBERT ANTHONY MOLLOY, OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS, TO BE JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT COURT OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS FOR A TERM OF TEN YEARS.

SILVIA CARRENO-COLL, OF PUERTO RICO, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF PUERTO RICO.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

KATHARINE MACGREGOR, OF PENNSYLVANIA, TO BE DEPUTY SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

RECOGNIZING CHARLES "RANDY" RANDAL BENJAMIN

HON. TRENT KELLY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 25, 2020

Mr. KELLY of Mississippi. Madam Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the life of Charles "Randy" Randal Benjamin, who passed away on Wednesday, February 12, at the age of 70.

Randy was born on February 23, 1949, in Pontotoc County, Mississippi. He graduated from Hurricane High School in 1967 and later answered the call to serve our great nation in the United States Air Force.

In 1970, Randy married Pat Graham, and they remained together for over 49 years and had two children. He started his business, Connect Two, Inc., in 2001 in Pontotoc. Randy was an active member at First Baptist Church in Pontotoc and set an example of faith for his family to follow. He was an avid bass fisherman and a proud charter member of the Pontotoc Bass Club.

Left to cherish his memory is his wife, Pat Benjamin; his daughter, Tonya Shirley; his son, Chip Benjamin; his grandchildren, Lindsey Claire Shirley, Ryan Shirley, Harper Benjamin, and Tripp Benjamin, as well as many friends and extended family members.

Randy's life was one of service, grace, and love for his family and community. He will be greatly missed by all whom he encountered.

RECOGNIZING THE SERVICE AND EFFORTS OF LT. COL. JIM CANNON

HON. CAROL D. MILLER

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 25, 2020

Mrs. MILLER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize retired Lieutenant Colonel Jim Cannon for his efforts in pioneering the National Workforce Awards. Located in Athens, West Virginia, this company's sole purpose is to provide national awards for employers that want to appreciate, encourage, and motivate exceptional employees. Given after fulfillment of stringent criteria, these awards include the National Economic Welfare Medal, The National Productivity Cross, The National Distinguished Service Star, and The National Order of Job Formation.

Lieutenant Colonel Cannon has truly dedicated his life to civil service. In 1965, he joined the Army and would serve for a total of 34 years as both an active duty and reserve officer. He received the Legion of Merit award in 1983 for eighteen years of exceptional meritorious conduct. After retiring from the military, he worked in the private sector as a Corporation Manager, yet he still involved himself in public affairs by becoming the Mayor of Princeton, West Virginia, in 1984 and serving until 1988.

In 1993, Lieutenant Colonel Cannon became the Vice President of Business and Finance at Concord University. This is where he came up with the idea to create a company that honors those that go above and beyond for their employers: while at work one unfortunate evening, Concord University's South Tower Residence Hall was caught ablaze by a student's candle. The Athens Fire Department quickly put out the fire, but students on two floors of the residence hall were displaced because of structural damage and fire extinguisher residue. The custodial staff at Concord worked around the clock to make the dorms habitable for the students effected, resulting in many moving back-in only after 24 hours.

Lieutenant Colonel Cannon wished he could have put a medal on each and every community member, including Concord's Staff and the firefighters, that went above the call of duty to overcome this terrible accident. This is why he started the National Workforce Awards in 2015 to honor people across our nation that have done similar acts of excellence for their employers. I commend the National Workforce Awards for encouraging higher productivity, more innovation, and a strong, complete work ethic.

May God bless Lieutenant Colonel Cannon, and may he continue his work in recognizing great Americans throughout our country.

CONGRATULATING TRACEY CHILDRESS AS THE HOT SPRINGS ARKANSAS WOMAN OF THE YEAR

HON. BRUCE WESTERMAN

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 25, 2020

Mr. WESTERMAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Ms. Tracey Childress of Hot Springs on her recognition as the Hot Springs Chamber of Commerce's 2020 Woman of the Year.

This award is given yearly by the Chamber of Commerce based on the impact that members of a community have on their fellow man. Since she moved to Arkansas in 1992, Ms. Childress has been a vital part of the Hot Springs area, specifically in her work with the Cooper Anthony Mercy Child Advocacy Center where she has served as Director since January 2019. She worked as a forensic interviewer for several years, often cited as one of Arkansas' leading experts on Child First Forensic Interview Protocol.

In addition to her work, she is also a respected and active member of her church, a state and national forensic interview instructor, a certified law enforcement instructor, and a beloved mentor in the local YMCA Reach and Rise Program.

Ms. Childress provides this nation with a perfect example of what service can accomplish in a community both professionally and personally. I am proud to call her a friend and

a fellow Fourth District citizen. I take this time to congratulate her on her success as Woman of the Year and thank her for her continued service to the young people around us.

IN HONOR OF DR. MANUEL "MANNY" LOPEZ

HON. JULIA BROWNLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 25, 2020

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Madam Speaker, I rise to honor the remarkable life of Dr. Manuel "Manny" Lopez and his over 50 years of public service to the City of Oxnard. During his time as a dedicated public servant and throughout his career, Manny exhibited outstanding leadership, innovative community interaction, and distinguished professionalism, and he paved the way for future leaders to continue his unparalleled legacy of service to the community.

Manny was born in Oxnard, California on June 1, 1927 to immigrant parents who fled the Mexican Revolution. A son of farmworkers, Manny would graduate from Oxnard High School and Ventura College before finishing his undergrad at San Diego State University. It was shortly after that he attended the University of California Berkeley School of Optometry. In 1962, Manny opened the first bilingual optometry practice in the community and served patients for over 50 years until his retirement in 2016.

In 1978, Manny became the first Latino to be elected to the Oxnard City Council. He served as a member of the Oxnard City Council until 1992, when he became the first elected Latino Mayor of Oxnard. He served as Mayor until 2004. After serving as the Mayor of Oxnard for over a decade, Manny took a four-year break from public service. Manny returned to local government in 2008 when he was elected as the Commissioner to the Port of Hueneme five-member Board of Harbor Commissioners. He served as a Harbor Commissioner until his passing in 2020.

Manny devoted his time to giving back to the community and served on many local boards including the Oxnard Chamber of Commerce Board, Oxnard Community Relations Commission, City of Oxnard Redevelopment Agency, Oxnard College Foundation, Oxnard Planning Commission, Tri-County Optometric Association, and the Boys and Girls Club of Oxnard. He dedicated his life to helping those around him and was a founding member of several service-oriented and philanthropic groups including the CSUCI Foundation, Sister City Oxnard-Ocotlán, Ventura County Community Foundation's Destino Fund, and the Ventura County Community Foundation Women's Legacy Fund.

Throughout his life, Manny embodied the spirit of giving back, and his more than five decades in public service is evidence of his passion for making Oxnard a thriving community for everyone.

• 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.

I personally knew Manny to be a kind soul, who was a loving father, wonderful husband, and respected leader throughout our community. I will especially remember Manny for his big heart and thoughtfulness. He often provided me with words of advice and wisdom that continue to guide my work in public service.

For these reasons, it is with great honor that I offer Dr. Manuel "Manny" Lopez my heartfelt appreciation for his years of outstanding service to the City of Oxnard and unwavering dedication to our community during his exemplary career. On behalf of the people of Oxnard and a very grateful community, whom he served with distinction, I express my sincere condolences to his family and friends, and to all who knew him.

RECOGNIZING THE 150TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FOUNDING OF MISSOURI UNIVERSITY OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

HON. JASON SMITH

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 25, 2020

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the 150th anniversary of the founding of Missouri University of Science and Technology (Missouri S&T). Missouri S&T was originally established in 1870 as the University of Missouri School of Miners and Metallurgy, and it was the first technical institute west of the Mississippi River. In the last 150 years, Missouri S&T has grown into a world-class engineering school. While its name has changed over time, its focus has remained the same: to prepare the best young minds in Missouri and around the world to tackle the challenging technical demands of the modern era.

Missouri S&T students achieve a level of success that is unmatched, in large part because of campus programs that emphasize practical experience. This enables S&T graduates to combine their studies with real-world practice and execution and prepare for the workforce. For instance, students can compete on one of 18 competitive "design teams" to build optimized models of systems such as a Baja off-roader or an underwater robot. The skills learned in these applied programs benefit S&T students after graduation, and 92 percent of recent graduates find employment or gain admission to additional schooling within 6 months of graduation.

Being a student at Missouri S&T is both work and play. One fun tradition at S&T is to put on two full weeks of celebrations for St. Patrick's Day—St. Patrick being the patron saint of engineers. This tradition has been going on for 112 years, and preparation for the two weeks of celebration takes place all year, during which Miners count down to the next "Greatest St. Pats Ever." A wagon with St. Pat aboard leads the annual parade through Rolla with families and alumni lining the street to greet the figure. After the two-hour parade, festivities kick off with concerts and food vendors, and they go through the night.

I'm proud to represent Missouri S&T and honored to commemorate the 150th anniversary of its founding. Miners makes our community better, and after graduation, they work

in the defense, engineering, technology, and other sectors to make our workforce and country better. For Missouri S&T, the past 150 years have been bright, and I hope the next 150 years will be even brighter.

GEORGE JENKINS HIGH SCHOOL
CHEERLEADING CHAMPIONSHIP

HON. ROSS SPANO

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 25, 2020

Mr. SPANO. Madam Speaker, today I rise to congratulate the George Jenkins High School Cheerleading team for their championship performance at the state competition in Gainesville, Florida.

George Jenkins High School cheerleaders won their first state title while competing in the Medium Non-Tumbling Division and beating second place by 4.6 points.

Not only was this the first state title for the school in cheerleading, but just the fourth time George Jenkins High School has captured a title in any sport.

Prior to this, the Jenkins squad had never made it to the finals. However, their strong preparation, passion, and unwavering commitment to one another were instrumental in their victory.

The Jenkins cheerleading squad was led by their head coach Nashan Davis, who, after winning the title, held back tears in stating, "The coaches gave them the tools and they went out there and did their job today."

Congratulations once again to the George Jenkins Cheerleading team and on their title. They earned it and deserved it, and I look forward to seeing them defend it next year.

IN RECOGNITION OF DIANE
ALBERIGI, UNICAN OF THE YEAR
FOR SCRANTON CHAPTER OF
UNICO NATIONAL

HON. MATT CARTWRIGHT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 25, 2020

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Diane Alberigi, who will be named UNICAN of the Year for 2019. Diane will be honored at the annual UNICO Charity Ball, held on February 29, 2020, at Fiorelli's Manor in Peckville, Pennsylvania.

Diane is the daughter of Francis Tougher and Grace Reidenbach. She grew up in the Hill Section neighborhood of Scranton along with her sister, Francie. After graduating from Technical High School, Diane was employed by the Chamberlain Insurance Agency for 35 years. Since 2007, Diane has worked at NEPA Center for Independent Living, where she earned a certification in payroll operations and oversees the disbursement of checks to employees in 10 states.

Diane has lived in Clarks Summit since 1984. She is committed to her church and community, having served as a lector at both St. Peter's Cathedral and Our Lady of Snows. Diane volunteered for and chaired the Our Lady of Snows picnic for a decade. In between time, she also worked at the Glint of

Gold Jewelry Store on South Washington Avenue in Scranton.

Since joining UNICO in 2004 under the sponsorship of Chris DiMattio, Diane has been invaluable in the Scranton Chapter's activities. She served as treasurer of the Chapter's Ladies Auxiliary and co-chair of the cappuccino stand at La Festa Italiana, and she currently sits on the board of La Festa as well as the board of the Scranton Chapter. She was named a Northeast Woman by the Scranton Times-Tribune in June 2018.

Diane is also passionate about helping rescue animals and has four dogs, including a blind, special-needs dog. She has seven nieces and nephews, one great niece, and one great nephew.

It is an honor to recognize Diane as the Scranton Chapter of UNICO National's UNICAN of the Year for 2019. May she continue to honorably represent and serve the people of Northeastern Pennsylvania for many years to come.

TRAVIS AGUIRRE RECEIVES THE
YOUNG ALUMNI HALL OF FAME
AWARD

HON. PAUL COOK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 25, 2020

Mr. COOK. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the service and commitment of Travis Aguirre, who received the Young Alumni Hall of Fame Award from the Victor Valley College Foundation on February 22, 2020.

Captain Travis Aguirre's commitment to public service came from a passion of wanting to make an impact and difference in his career field. After receiving his Associate's in Fire Science from Victor Valley College, Travis transitioned from student to teacher and taught at the Fire Academy and within the EMT Program at the college. Beginning his fire career with City of Victorville Fire Department, he has progressed from Engineer to Captain with the San Bernardino County Fire Department. He consistently stays involved in his community, by mentoring local youth, serving in the San Bernardino County Fire Department Honor Guard, and serving as the Vice President of IAFF Local 935.

On behalf of the U.S. House of Representatives, I congratulate Captain Travis Aguirre on this award, and thank him for his dedication and service to the residents of San Bernardino County. Captain Aguirre is a true mode of the professionalism and service of the San Bernardino County Fire Department.

HONORING FRANK PAREDES ON
HIS 100TH BIRTHDAY

HON. JIM COSTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 25, 2020

Mr. COSTA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Frank Paredes on his 100th birthday. Mr. Paredes is an upstanding World War II veteran and Pearl Harbor Survivor who I am proud to represent in Washington.

Mr. Paredes was born on February 15, 1920 in Douglas, Arizona and enlisted in the Army

on May 5, 1941. After basic training, he was sent to Pearl Harbor, where he was on the morning of Sunday, December 7, 1941. Mr. Paredes was heading to mass when the attack began and ran to the first anti-aircraft gun he could find and manned it until the attack was over, managing to shoot down at least one plane.

Mr. Paredes was then sent to Australia where he volunteered to be the nose gunner on a B25 that was shot down at sea near Port Moresby. Once rescued, he was sent to Cairns, Australia and later to Owens Stanley Range, New Guinea, where he participated in the Kokoda Track Campaign and Battle of Buna-Gona with the 7th Division, 32 Infantry. Later, Mr. Paredes joined the 2nd Engineer Special Brigade from September to October 1943, where he was wounded transporting troops to and from Scarlett Beach.

After being attached to the Navy and stationed near Vella Lavella Island in 1943, Mr. Paredes participated in the Battle of Tarawa, and given a cyanide pill to be taken if captured. He was later sent to his final combat station in the Philippines and discharged in September 1945.

In 1959, Mr. Paredes married his wife Artemisa and had four kids, eventually settling down in Atwater in the 1970s, working for many years as a bricklayer. Though his wife passed away in 2007, Mr. Paredes remains proud of the family he started with her and now has many grandchildren, great, and great-great grandchildren.

Since retiring from the bricklayers' union in the 1980s, Mr. Paredes has remained civically engaged. He is a member of Merced Elks Lodge No. 1240 and a lifetime member of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, where he still serves as the bugler in the honor guard.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in honoring the exceptional life of Frank Paredes on his 100th birthday. I wish him and his family the best as they celebrate 100 years of a gentleman that has made a difference and truly exemplifies the values of duty, honor, and country.

HONORING THE PASSAGE OF THE 19TH AMENDMENT AND THE LEG- ACY OF SUSAN B. ANTHONY ON HER 200TH BIRTHDAY

HON. ELISE M. STEFANIK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 25, 2020

Ms. STEFANIK. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the passage of the 19th Amendment and the legacy of Susan B. Anthony on her 200th birthday.

Susan B. Anthony was born on February 15, 1820 in Adams, Massachusetts. At the age of six, she moved with her family to Battenville, New York in Washington County. Her family were devout Quakers committed to social equality and the anti-slavery movement. She educated herself on reform issues, reading the early work of her future partner, Elizabeth Cady Stanton.

Their partnership began shortly after they first met in person in 1851. In 1852 they founded the New York Women's State Temperance Society. Throughout the rest of her life, Susan B. Anthony worked tirelessly for the

equality of woman and African Americans. During her lifetime, women achieved suffrage in Wyoming, Utah, Colorado and Idaho. Legal rights and employment opportunities had been greatly expanded in most states. In addition, colleges and universities began allowing women to enroll and by the time of her death, more than 36,000 women were attending schools throughout the U.S.

Susan B. Anthony passed away in 1906 in her home in Rochester, saying of national suffrage that "Failure is impossible." The 19th Amendment was ratified just 14 years later, in 1920. I was proud to honor her work by leading the Women's Suffrage Centennial Commemorative Coin Act through its passage in the House of Representatives. This bill was signed into law by President Trump on November 25, 2019.

The work of Susan B. Anthony was crucial to the eventual passage of the 19th Amendment and her legacy is as strong as ever. As commemorations go on across the country, I am proud to honor her 200th birthday on behalf of New York's 21st Congressional District.

LAKELAND HIGH SCHOOL CHEERLEADING CHAMPIONSHIP

HON. ROSS SPANO

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 25, 2020

Mr. SPANO. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Lakeland High School cheerleading team on their championship performance at the University of Florida in Gainesville.

These students won the Extra Large Non-Tumbling Division title at the FHSAA 2A state meet despite losing one of their key members to injury just prior to the finals.

Just as spectacular, the Dreadnaughts repeated as state champions having won in the Large Non-Tumbling Division last year.

Lakeland High School was led to victory by head coach Crystal Abdon who praised her team's grit and perseverance.

Competitive cheerleading has grown as a sport and Lakeland High continues to prove themselves as not only one of the best in our state, but also one of the top programs in the nation and world.

Again, congratulations to the Lakeland High School cheerleading team and staff for this victory. Their commitment to one another and joy for their sport is admirable, and I, along with all of Lake County, are so proud of them all.

RECOGNIZING DOROTHY STEIN

HON. HALEY M. STEVENS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 25, 2020

Ms. STEVENS. Madam Speaker, I rise today in recognition of a dear friend and mentor, Dorothy Stein, who will celebrate her 102nd birthday this year.

Dorothy was born in 1918 in Owosso, Michigan to Justina (Byrnes) and Matthew Shea. While she was still young, the family moved to Flint, Michigan, and Dorothy stayed there until

she was married. She was eventually hired by the Flint Journal covering 'society news' and cherished the time she spent reporting there.

She met her husband, Donald (Don) J. Stein, through friends. They married during the war but before he enlisted in the Army Air Corps. The war ended just as he completed his training.

The couple moved to Detroit and had four children, then eleven grandchildren, then twenty great grandchildren. She was involved with several charities, including Christ Child Society. She and Don were also very involved in the Academy of the Sacred Heart where their three daughters attended school. They joined Otsego Ski Club and enjoyed spending time there for many years.

Dorothy played bridge several days a week and became extremely skilled. She has been a member of the Village Club for decades which was the site of much of her bridge playing. She still plays occasionally to this day. She drove until she was 98 years old, and she continues to bless all with her warm heart and beautiful wardrobe. Our community is a better place because of Dorothy Stein.

REMEMBERING THE LIFE OF JOHN T. MURPHY

HON. TIM RYAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 25, 2020

Mr. RYAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of John "Jack" T. Murphy of Youngstown, Ohio, who passed away peacefully on February 20, 2020.

John was born on December 17, 1931 in Youngstown as the son of Irish immigrants, Bridget Durkin Murphy and Michael Murphy. He married Joanne Mondora on September 13, 1958, who passed away on May 18, 2012. Together, John and Joanne raised seven children and taught them all, by their own example, how to cherish their family, their heritage, their faith and their hometown.

John graduated from South High School in Youngstown in 1950. Upon his graduation from high school, he joined the U.S. Air Force and proudly served his country in the Korean War. After his military service, John performed in plays at the Youngstown Playhouse and then headed "out west" to pursue an acting career. He was cast in numerous roles in many performances in North Dakota, but he ultimately chose to return to his family and his beloved Youngstown.

Upon his return, John earned his bachelor's degree from Youngstown State University, and subsequently earned his master's degree from the University of Akron. John spent his professional career working for the Youngstown City Schools as an Art teacher, Principal and as a Truant Officer, retiring in 1993. Also, during his professional life, he was a Mill Creek Park policeman and proudly served as the 7th Ward Councilman in the City of Youngstown from 1976 to 1981. He also served as a board member on the Mahoning County Children Services Board.

As a proud veteran, John was a member of the American Legion for over fifty years. John had immense pride in both his Irish and Catholic heritage. He was a member of the Knights of Columbus and St. Dominic's Catholic Church and regularly attended mass at St. Charles Borromeo Church.

John's hobbies included fly fishing, wood carving, drawing and watching plays and movies. In addition, after sending all seven of his children to Cardinal Mooney High School, he became an unwavering fan. John also took great pride in the fact that his seven children all graduated from Youngstown State University and would always support its sporting events, even attending several of the National Championship games. His love of Notre Dame football was unmatched. Every Saturday during every Fall, John would be glued to the television watching his beloved team and made sure to never miss a game. He also traveled to South Bend whenever he had the opportunity. If he happened to be at an event during game time, John could be found with his earphones listening to the game and ready to share the status of the game and the score.

Above all else, though, the most important thing to John was his family. He was at his happiest when he was attending his grandchildren's sporting events and activities. He was so proud of all of his children and grandchildren, and he found absolute joy in every moment spent with them. John especially loved to spend every New Year's Eve with his family, when he would "drop" his silver disco ball for them as they all counted down the last ten seconds to every new year.

John leaves to cherish his memory, his sister, Marie Murphy; sister-in-law and brother-in-law, Adele and George Eonomus; children, Bridget (Chris) Weber, Joanie Murphy, John (Linda) Murphy, Jenn (Mike) Ritter, Mollie Kay, Liz (Dave) Phillips and Dan (Leslie) Murphy; grandchildren, Jackie, Joe and Jake Weber, John Murphy, Linnie, Anthony and Daniel Ritter, Pat, Carolyn and Matthew Kay, Michael, Mark and Jack Phillips and Luke, Janine and Cara Murphy; his nephew, Dennis Gruber, who was like a brother to him and numerous other nieces and nephews, known to them as "Uncle Jack."

John was preceded in death by his parents; his siblings, Kate Murphy, Jim Murphy, Elizabeth Murphy, Hannah Murphy, Peg Tabor, Rita Crawford, Betty Murphy, Daniel Murphy and Theresa Bartelmay and his beloved wife, Joanne.

Mr. Murphy was a long-time Democratic activist, and supporter of mine. He was a great public servant and advocate for the Mahoning Valley. My deepest condolences go out to the family and to all whose lives were touched by John.

HONORING THE LIFE AND SERVICE OF MR. JAMES ARRIGO

HON. JOHN KATKO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 25, 2020

Mr. KATKO. Madam Speaker, I rise to honor the life and service of Mr. James Arrigo as he celebrates his 96th birthday. Throughout his life, Mr. Arrigo has demonstrated exemplary patriotism through his service in World War II, and longstanding devotion to his family.

After graduating from North High School in 1942, Mr. Arrigo enlisted in the United States Air Force, proudly serving his country in World War II. During the war, he was stationed in Japan, working as a bombardier with the 20th

Air Force 313th Wing. In December of 1945, Mr. Arrigo was discharged as a 1st Lieutenant, after flying 35 missions over Japan.

Following completion of his military service, Mr. Arrigo returned home to Central New York and on April 7, 1947 married Mary Ann Cali. Together they lived in North Syracuse and raised two children. After many years working as a self-employed barber at Jimmy's Barber-shop, Mr. Arrigo retired at the age of 82. In addition to working as a barber, Mr. Arrigo served as a Town of Clay councilman from 1966 to 1970 and served as an active member of the Town of Clay Men of Rotary.

Madam Speaker, I ask that my colleagues in the House join me in honoring the life and service of Mr. James Arrigo. Mr. Arrigo's life has been one marked by admirable devotion to his family and country.

HONORING THE LIFE OF JON MYERS

HON. JIM BANKS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 25, 2020

Mr. BANKS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Mr. Jon Myers for his dedicated service to Whitley County, Indiana. Hoosiers in my hometown of Columbia City and throughout Whitley County owe a great debt of gratitude to Jon for ushering our region into a more prosperous future, and we wish him the very best as he retires from his post as president of Whitley County Economic Development Corporation (EDC).

Under Jon's leadership, the Whitley County EDC has flourished. As of 2019, Whitley County has higher homeownership, a higher workforce participation rate, more people with health insurance, and fewer residents in poverty than compared to the national average. The opportunity and prosperity Whitley County enjoy today is due in no small part to Jon's leadership.

Jon's career is distinguished, defined by his active role in the broader northeast Indiana community. Prior to serving on Mitch Daniels' campaign for governor in 2004, Myers helped establish the law firm of Myers and Hockemeyer and held a senior role with Lincoln Life. In 2005, Jon became manager of the Indiana EDC office in Fort Wayne, where, in the years thereafter, determined to address problems facing Whitley County.

He has worked tirelessly to ensure those living in the region have good jobs, can support their families and have the best quality of life. Although he will no longer lead the Whitley County EDC, his legacy will endure, and his commitment to the community and state will serve as a proud example for others in the years to come.

CONGRATULATING THOMAS MICHAEL SEILER

HON. JOHN JOYCE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 25, 2020

Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Hollidaysburg native

Thomas Michael Seiler as he retires from the Altoona Mobile Emergency Department (AMED) after many years of service as an EMT.

Throughout Mr. Seiler's career, he has touched the lives of many families in our community and has saved countless lives. In recognition of this service, he was recognized as the "AMED EMT of the Year" in 2013 and has been lauded multiple times for his "out of hospital cardiac arrest saves."

In 1976, Mr. Seiler began his public service as a volunteer firefighter and rescue captain for the Phoenix Volunteer Fire Department in Hollidaysburg. He first obtained his EMT certification in 1980. Before joining AMED in 2004, Mr. Seiler worked as an EMT at Hollidaysburg American Legion Ambulance Service. In addition to his work as a first responder, he also served in the U.S. Army Reserves from 1974 to 1981.

As he and his family begin a new chapter, I congratulate Mr. Seiler on his achievements and thank him for his tireless devotion to the citizens of Blair County and our nation.

LARRY BIRD RECEIVES THE DISTINGUISHED SERVICE COMMUNITY AWARD

HON. PAUL COOK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 25, 2020

Mr. COOK. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Larry Bird, the Mayor of Hesperia, CA, on being selected as the recipient of the 2020 Distinguished Service Community Award by the Victor Valley College Foundation.

A third-generation resident, Larry Bird was born and raised in the High Desert, where he currently serves as Mayor of the City of Hesperia. While elected office is a recent development for Larry, he has spent his entire career working for Hesperia Unified School District. After teaching for several years, he was promoted to work in school administration. Today, he serves as the Principal of Sultana High School in Hesperia. In 2016, he sought election to the Hesperia City Council, and ended up winning with the greatest number of votes ever achieved by a council candidate.

I am confident that Larry will continue to be an example and role-model to both his students and the residents of Hesperia. His dedication to his students, the citizens of Hesperia, and our High Desert community is constantly on display, and he is undoubtedly deserving of this award. Congratulations, Larry.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF GIRLS INC.

HON. SUSAN W. BROOKS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 25, 2020

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Madam Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the 50th Anniversary of the non-profit organization Girls Inc. of Greater Indianapolis, also known as Girls Inc. Indy. Stemming from the national program

Girls Inc., Girls Inc. Indy opened its doors in 1969. It has since established programs in sixty-one different schools in the Indianapolis area with a mission to empower all young women to be strong, smart, and bold. The people of the Fifth Congressional District of Indiana are grateful for Girls Inc. Indy, and it is my pleasure to congratulate the organization in celebration of this special occasion.

In 1864, the national organization Girls Inc. was created in Waterbury, Connecticut to aid girls and young women in their navigation of society after the Civil War. The new organization dedicated itself to creating a safe environment for young women to further their self-confidence, independence, and education. Over time, Girls Inc. adapted its programs to fit society's changing social climate while maintaining its original values. In 1969, Girls Inc. reached Indianapolis. The Girls Inc. Indy branch was established, rooted in the fundamental values of the national organization but designed programs specific to young women in the Indianapolis area. Historically girls in our country have been excluded from opportunities due to gender, race, or socio-economic status. Recognizing the detrimental effects that this has on girls' self-confidence and mental health, Girls Inc. Indy fights to provide young women with a safe place to grow in their own capacities and be themselves.

This nonprofit organization is staffed by developmental professionals as well as trained volunteers, all of whom serve as mentors for girls in the program. Staff members are dedicated to providing girls with an emotionally stable environment in which they foster educational, professional, and personal growth. To embolden girls in their education and career fields, Girls Inc. Indy holds a variety of science and STEM initiatives, such as its Eureka! 5-year science program for middle school girls and its Girls Inc. Day for the inner scientist in girls of all ages. In preparing girls for their future endeavors, Girls Inc. Indy encourages their members to cultivate leadership skills and a streak of independence. It has adopted programs such as its Young Women in Leadership classes and its economic literacy classes for high school girls. However, because Girls Inc. Indy recognizes the irreplaceable value of high self-esteem, the organization has created numerous initiatives that focus on personal growth. Programs that discuss the definition of beauty and the importance of conflict management and empower young women as they embark on their journeys of self-discovery. Girls Inc. Indy has served a wide variety of young women around Indianapolis, welcoming all girls despite age, race, ethnicity, and socio-economic background.

The impact of this organization on our girls is immeasurable. In 2017 alone, Girls Inc. Indy served 4,299 girls in its programs, reaching across four different counties in the Indianapolis area. Many of these girls participated in more than one program, totaling 8,106 program enrollments.

For fifty years, Girls Inc. of Greater Indianapolis has aided the young women of the Indianapolis area in their development, facilitating a healthy environment to allow girls to explore their personalities, their communities, and their future careers. The challenges that young women face are constantly evolving, but I am confident that Girls Inc. Indy will continue to serve a pivotal role in their development for another fifty years and more.

Annually, Girls Inc. Indy recognizes female leaders with the Touchstone Award to those who have made astounding contributions to the Indianapolis community, and have inspired all girls to be strong, smart, and bold, enabling them to be confident in their abilities, proud of who they are, and ready to take their place in the world. It was my distinct honor to receive this prestigious award in 2008.

On this 50th Anniversary, I commend Girls Inc. Indy on its mission to embolden girls and its success in its programs. I wish the organization, its staff, volunteers and the girls it serves all the best in its future endeavors.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE GRAND OPENING OF THE LINCOLN PARK PUBLIC SCHOOLS HEALTH CEN- TER

HON. DEBBIE DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 25, 2020

Mrs. DINGELL. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the grand opening of the Lincoln Park Public Schools Health Center. The new facility will increase access to healthcare services, improving the health and wellness of many students in our community. This endeavor is worthy of commendation.

Last summer, Lincoln Park Public Schools and Henry Ford Health System's Department of Pediatrics announced a partnership that would facilitate the creation of a school health and wellness center at Lincoln Park High School. Months later, we celebrate as that vision finally comes to fruition and the Lincoln Park Public School Health Center opens its doors to the community today. The new health and wellness center will provide basic primary care and behavioral health services to patients between the ages of 4 and 21 and special education students up to age 26.

The opening of the Lincoln Park Public Schools Health Center exemplifies our community's commitment to meeting the increasingly complex health care concerns of students across Michigan. The services it will offer like nursing care for common illnesses and injuries, mental health evaluations, and risk reduction counseling will help eliminate the barriers that have traditionally prevented students in the community from seeking the health care services they require. The health and wellness center will be a critical resource for many and help improve the lives and overall health of students in the downriver community.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the grand opening of the Lincoln Park Public Schools Health Center. The opening of the new facility will enable our community to better meet the needs of our students, making it easier for them to access the vital healthcare and wellness services they need. I am grateful for this partnership between Henry Ford Health System and Lincoln Park Public Schools and the tremendous impact it will have on the students of our community.

RECOGNIZING NAOMI REEM

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 25, 2020

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, I rise today to ask the House of Representatives to join me in recognizing Naomi Reem, an extraordinary woman and a leader in the Washington, D.C. Jewish community, who has, for 15 years, served as Head of School for the only Jewish day school in the District, the Milton Gottesman Jewish Day School of the Nation's Capital.

The Jewish community of Washington, D.C. is one of the fastest growing and largest in the nation. Indeed, according to a February 2018 article in The Washington Post, the D.C.-metro area is now home to the third largest population of Jewish people in the country after New York and Los Angeles. As we all know, a critical part of building strong community is access to good education, and Ms. Reem has made it her personal mission over the past decade and a half to ensure that a vibrant Jewish education is available to families in and around the city.

Founded in 1988, Milton, formerly known as JPDS-NC, has had just two heads of school in its 31-year history. Under Ms. Reem's leadership, the school received its first independent school accreditation; grew from under 200 to over 450 students; opened a second, early childhood education campus in the District; and launched the first Jewish middle school program in D.C. in over 40 years.

Ms. Reem is an expert educator with a teaching degree from the Agnon Institute in Buenos Aires, Argentina, a bachelor's degree from Hebrew University in Jerusalem, and a master's degree in Jewish Education from Hebrew College in Newton, Massachusetts. She has led Milton to adopt numerous curricular initiatives in General Studies and Hebrew and Judaic Studies, which have earned the school a solid reputation, locally and nationally, as a forward-looking institution, excellent in all academic areas. Milton's reputation has attracted major philanthropic support, totaling well over \$55 million since Ms. Reem joined the school.

Prior to coming to Milton, Ms. Reem was Head of School at Sinai Academy of the Berkshires, a day school in Pittsfield, Massachusetts, for seven years. Previously, she worked at the Gordon Day School in Miami, Florida and in several educational settings in Argentina, Israel and the United States.

Ms. Reem has served on the Board of the Association of Independent Maryland and D.C. Schools, where she previously chaired two accreditation teams for other independent schools. She has also served as a mentor at the Day School Leadership Training Institute, a program sponsored by the AVICHA Foundation and the Jewish Theological Seminary to train new and aspiring heads of schools. Additionally, Ms. Reem is a member of the Executives Council for the Jewish Federation of Greater Washington and served as its co-chair for three years.

Ms. Reem is a native of Buenos Aires, Argentina, and left her hometown in Argentina when she was 22 years old. She became a citizen of the United States on February 2, 2017.

Ms. Reem's long career in education—from her early years teaching through her tenure at

the helm of one of the most successful Jewish day schools in the country—illustrates how much can be achieved when one is dedicated to a cause and a community.

Madam Speaker, I rise today to ask the House of Representatives to join me in honoring Naomi Reem for her work and service and in wishing her and her school continued success.

RECOGNIZING PETTY OFFICER
KWAME KUSI-APPIAH AS THE
2020 MARGARET FLOWERS
AWARD RECIPIENT

HON. MATT GAETZ

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 25, 2020

Mr. GAETZ. Madam Speaker, I rise to recognize Petty Officer Kwame Kusi-Appiah as the 2020 Margaret Flowers Award recipient. This award goes to military members who have served their communities, apart from their active duty capacity. Petty Officer Kusi-Appiah is a member of the United States Navy, as well as an upstanding citizen of Florida's First Congressional District.

In Northwest Florida, we are fortunate to have some of the bravest individuals in our nation. Our district has been gifted with a population that is deeply rooted in military service. Petty Officer Kusi-Appiah has shown his willingness to serve our nation through his service with the Navy, being the Leading Petty Officer for the Blue Angels' Supply Department, as well as his willing to serve the community around him.

Petty Officer Kusi-Appiah was the Detachment Leading Petty Officer for the 2019 Winter Training Detachment, and supported 32 different sites during the year. Even though he was on the road for much of the year, he devoted 525 hours to the local Big Brothers program, the United Service Organization, and local elementary Schools. He has also been the mentor to a local second grade student. In addition to volunteering, Petty Officer Kusi-Appiah is the command organizing and certifying official for the Presidential Volunteer Service Award, coordinating over 3,000 hours of service to the community and producing 7 awards.

For all of his admirable contributions to our community, I am truly proud to have Petty Officer Kusi-Appiah as a constituent of Florida's First Congressional District.

Madam Speaker, on behalf of the United States Congress, I am privileged to recognize Petty Officer Kwame Kusi-Appiah for his many accomplishments, and his commitment to altruism and excellence in our district. I thank him for all of his service and wish him all the best for his continued success.

RECOGNITION OF CHILDREN'S
DENTAL MONTH

HON. MICHAEL K. SIMPSON

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 25, 2020

Mr. SIMPSON. Madam Speaker, February has been dedicated as the National Children's

Dental Health Month. This is such an important cause and I am pleased to help bring awareness to the value of good oral health in children. Tooth decay is the number one chronic infectious disease among children in the U.S. The impact of not treating decay can lead to other harmful outcomes beyond just oral health. As co-chair of the Congressional Oral Health Caucus, I am pleased to support National Children's Dental Health Month and any activities taking place throughout the month of February.

Give Kids A Smile, which is sponsored by the American Dental Association (ADA) is at the center of National Children's Dental Health Month. Give Kids A Smile day is an important event for all children and dentists throughout the country. Because of this program, the ADA is able to provide assistance to more than 6,500 dentists and 25,000 dental team members, and other volunteers who proudly give their time and effort to make a difference in the health of children. Since this program has started, volunteers have graciously provided services to over 6 million kids across the country, and to all 50 states and the District of Columbia as well. They have truly made a huge impact in their communities and improved the oral health of so many children.

Throughout National Children's Dental Health Month, dentists and dental team members across the country will be providing oral health services for children in need, and this will continue throughout the year. These services will include oral health education, screenings, preventive care and restorative services. Some will provide this in their own dental practice, others will go right into schools and the community to reach the kids that need it most. There are also many major events at dental hygiene schools where hundreds of kids may receive oral health services. Continued public awareness on this issue is so critical. On behalf of the Congressional Oral Health Caucus, I would once again like to state our full endorsement for the month, and push for continued care for good oral health of children.

REINTRODUCTION OF LEGISLA-
TION TO AWARD THE CONGRES-
SIONAL GOLD MEDAL TO HU-
MANITARIAN AND SPORTING
LEGEND MUHAMMAD ALI

HON. ANDRÉ CARSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 25, 2020

Mr. CARSON of Indiana. Madam Speaker, as we celebrate Black History Month, I am proud to reintroduce legislation to award the Congressional Gold Medal to Muhammad Ali in recognition of his contributions to our nation. I believe it is long past time to recognize an American civil rights activist and sporting legend with Congress' highest honor. Unfortunately, Congress failed to act before The Champ's death in 2016, at the age 74, so I ask my colleagues to join me now in honoring an American hero. Over the course of his illustrious career, Muhammad Ali produced some of our nation's most lasting sports memories. From winning a Gold Medal at the 1960 summer Olympics, to lighting the Olympic torch at the 1996 Summer Olympics, his influence as

an athlete and a humanitarian spanned over fifty years.

Despite having been diagnosed with Parkinson's disease in the 1980s, Ali devoted his life to charitable organizations. Ali, and his wife Lonnie, were founding directors of the Muhammad Ali Parkinson Center and Movement Disorders Clinic in Phoenix, AZ and helped raise over \$50 million for Parkinson's research. In addition to helping families cope with illness, Ali led efforts to provide meals for the hungry and helped countless organizations such as the Make-A-Wish-Foundation and the Special Olympics.

Muhammad Ali's humanitarian efforts went beyond his charitable activities in the United States. In 1990 Muhammad Ali travelled to the Middle East to seek the release of American and British hostages that were being held as human shields in the first Gulf War. After his intervention, 15 hostages were freed. Thanks to his devotion to diplomatic causes and racial harmony, Ali was the recipient of many accolades, including being chosen as a "U.N. Messenger of Peace" in 1998 and receiving the Presidential Medal of Freedom in 2005 from President Bush.

Through his unyielding dedication to his sport and to struggling populations around the world, Muhammad Ali still serves an example of service and self-sacrifice for generations of Americans. The Congressional Gold Medal is a fitting commemoration of his life and work, for which he is deservedly known as "the Greatest."

Madam Speaker, I hope my colleagues will join me in recognizing one of our nation's most lasting and influential figures by signing on to this important legislation.

HONORING THE DAVID A. SOLARI
POST 151 OF THE AMERICAN LE-
GION

HON. MARK DeSAULNIER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 25, 2020

Mr. DESAULNIER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the David A. Solari Post 151 of the American Legion on its 100th anniversary.

On November 29, 1919, a meeting was held at City Hall in Pittsburg, California to discuss a new American Legion Veterans Post. On December 18, 1919, the Post received its charter and David Irwin became the first Post Commander with 47 members. The post was named for Private David A. Solari, 91st Division, 362 Infantry Regiment, Company G, who gave his life in service to his country in the Argonne Forest of France during World War I.

Throughout its history, Post 151 has provided services to countless veterans, growing to its largest membership of 567 during the Korean War. In service of our veterans, Post 151 conducts monthly meetings about resources, programs, and benefits for veterans. Members of the Post have provided Color Guards during parades in Contra Costa County and honored survivors of the Bataan Death March. Post 151 has provided Military Honors for as many as 40 veterans and their families in a single year. Its members also serve their community by visiting sick and wounded veterans in the hospital and providing transportation for veterans to VA hospitals and County Veterans Service Offices.

The David A. Solari Post 151 of the American Legion works tirelessly for our community of veterans and their families. We honor the service of our veterans and congratulate the David A. Solari Post 151 of the American Legion on its 100th anniversary.

**HONORING THE BLACK RIFLE
COFFEE COMPANY**

HON. ADAM KINZINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 25, 2020

Mr. KINZINGER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the great work and inspiring mission of the Black Rifle Coffee Company, a veteran-owned coffee company committed to supporting those in uniform in each branch of the armed forces, law enforcement, and first responders.

The Black Rifle Coffee Company was founded in 2014 and was inspired by CEO and Founder Evan Hafer's time in the military where he recognized the impact something as simple as coffee can have on our nation's service members. With a goal of hiring 10,000 veterans, the Black Rifle Coffee Company has expanded greatly from Evan's basement to different locations across the United States and Canada. This growth was made possible by Evan and the rest of the owners, all of whom are veterans themselves: Tom Davin, Mat Best, Jarred Taylor, Richard Ryan, and Logan Stark.

As I have said before, I strongly believe the most important part of returning home from the military is renewing that mission and sense of purpose for our veterans, as well as the community around them. It is inspiring to see the Black Rifle Coffee Company take the initiative to look out for their fellow military brothers and sisters—just as they were trained to do on the battlefield while protecting our freedoms.

I'm proud to recognize the Black Rifle Coffee Company in this Chamber and thank them for their commitment to helping those who have put everything on the line for our country. This team and community of veterans is the embodiment of true patriotism, and I look forward to watching the mission of the Black Rifle Coffee Company continue to grow and inspire others to do the same.

**NORM HURST RECEIVES THE
PRESIDENTS' CHOICE AWARD**

HON. PAUL COOK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 25, 2020

Mr. COOK. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the service and commitment of Norm Hurst, who received the Presidents' Choice Award from the Victor Valley College Foundation on February 22, 2020.

After serving in the United States Air Force, Norm Hurst went on to become a Deputy Sheriff for the San Bernardino County Sheriff's Department. Within the span of his 32-year career in law enforcement, Norm would ultimately be promoted to Deputy Chief. Long before he was a Deputy Chief, Norm's associa-

tion with Victor Valley College began when he received his Associate of Science degree in the Spring of 1974. Not long after receiving his Bachelor's in Criminal Justice, Norm was encouraged to begin teaching within Victor Valley College's Criminal Justice Department. His service to the College continued in 2011 when he joined the Victor Valley College Foundation Board of Directors. Today, Norm continues to be an advocate for student success, and works tirelessly to fundraise for the Foundation's scholarships and grants to VVC's departments.

Norm Hurst has dedicated decades of his life to serving the public. Throughout his career in the military, law enforcement, and education, he has embodied one of the Air Force's core values—Service Before Self. Congratulations, Norm.

**HONORING THE 40TH ANNIVERSARY
OF THE 1980 WINTER
OLYMPICS IN LAKE PLACID**

HON. ELISE M. STEFANIK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 25, 2020

Ms. STEFANIK. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the historic legacy of the Olympic Games in Lake Placid. This week marks the 40th Anniversary of the 1980 Winter Olympics, which featured some of the most iconic moments in Olympic history.

The first Olympics held in Lake Placid took place in February of 1932. The intervening half century saw the massive upheaval of World War II and the rise of the Soviet Union. The Olympics returned to Lake Placid in the winter of 1980 and brought the tensions of the Cold War with them. It was during those games that the amateur USA Hockey Team defeated the heavily favored Soviet Hockey Team on their way to a gold medal in what was dubbed the "Miracle on Ice." In addition, U.S. speed skater Eric Heiden's record-setting five gold medals helped cement the Thirteenth Olympic Winter Games as one for the ages.

Building this legacy has been an ongoing effort for over a century. Since long before the 1932 games, residents of Lake Placid have been working hard to make their community a destination for winter sports athletes and enthusiasts. Lake Placid and surrounding communities have sent at least one athlete to every Winter Olympics since the first one in 1924. In order to maintain that level of success, they have worked tirelessly to host other major international and national competitions that constantly foster new generations of world class athletes. It is for that reason that Lake Placid was chosen as the host city for the 2023 World University Games, where over 2,000 athletes from all over the world will come together to compete in 79 events.

To honor the 40th Anniversary of the 1980 games, throughout this week there will be dozens of events at all of the facilities celebrating athletes from the original winter games and athletes moving towards Olympic goals. On behalf of New York's 21st Congressional District, I want to congratulate the entire Lake Placid community on this important milestone. I look forward to working with local leaders to ensure the continued success of Lake Placid and its athletes.

STRAWBERRY CREST HIGH
SCHOOL GIRLS SOCCER CHAMPIONSHIP

HON. ROSS SPANO

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 25, 2020

Mr. SPANO. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the girls soccer team of Strawberry Crest High School for winning the Class 6A District 11 title.

The team exhibited strength and passion all year long. Then their many hours of practice and commitment to one another gave them an added edge on their run to the district title.

In the semifinals, the team showcased their extraordinary talents by shutting out Tampa Tech, 3–0.

In the championship game against a very talented Plant City team, Strawberry Crest was resilient in their effort and pitched a fierce comeback to ultimately win the game in double overtime.

I congratulate Coach Sean Woodhouse and his staff on this title. The time and effort you invest into our youth to help them develop into strong leaders and community members does not go unnoticed.

I also congratulate the following team members for their fantastic season:

Sheny Anauo, Cristoval Arevalo, Kamila Arevalo Cortes, Stephanie Briseno, Abigail Caballero, Ezra Carpenter, Ariana Diaz Cortes, Avery Fearnow, Isamara Flores-Hernandez, Andrea Garcia.

Alexa Guzman, Madison Hall, Emily Hobbs, Khajah Jeans, Lydia Linares, Amanda Ocegueda, Lizbeth Ortiz, Ashley Parow, Emily Parow, Mei Ramsey.

Olivia Reyes, Emily Rosales, Danielle Seunath, Hanna Trotto, Hali Vician.

I'm proud of them all.

**IN RECOGNITION OF STAFF SERGEANT
JOSEPH EUGENE PROKOP**

HON. MATT CARTWRIGHT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 25, 2020

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Staff Sergeant Joseph Eugene Prokop, a native of Scranton, Pennsylvania, who bravely served his country in the U.S. Army during World War II and was tragically executed by the German Gestapo along with two of his fellow airmen.

Staff Sergeant Prokop, son of John and Anna Prokop, enlisted in the army in 1939 at the age of seventeen. In 1945 near the end of World War II, while on his fiftieth mission in the air corps, the B–17 bomber he was manning took anti-aircraft fire over Frankfurt, Germany and crashed in the city of Hanau. Until recently, it was believed that Prokop and the rest of the plane's crew died in the crash.

However, historians in Hanau recently discovered that Prokop and two of his fellow airmen—Technical Sergeant Charles Bernard Goldstein and Technical Sergeant Warren George Hammond—survived the attack but were subsequently captured by Hanau police and turned over to the Gestapo. Upon learning that one of the three men was Jewish, a Gestapo director ordered all three men to be executed.

Following this discovery, the German Consulate sought to contact Staff Sergeant Prokop's surviving family to inform them of the true cause of his death and extend an offer to honor him in his hometown as well as in Hanau.

On February 17, 2020—the seventy-fifth anniversary of the killings—Staff Sergeant Prokop was honored with a remembrance service organized by the General Theodore J. Wint Veterans of Foreign Wars Post 25 at his gravesite at the Scranton Cathedral Cemetery. His sister, Ann Spearmint, was in attendance. That same day, the city of Hanau, Germany memorialized Prokop and his fellow airmen by erecting a plaque at the site of their execution.

It is an honor to recognize Staff Sergeant Prokop, who made the ultimate sacrifice for our nation at a perilous time in our world's history. May his commitment to defending the United States and the democratic world order never be forgotten.

HONORING DR. GUSTAVO
BALDERAS OF EUGENE, NA-
TIONAL SUPERINTENDENT OF
THE YEAR

HON. PETER A. DeFAZIO

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 25, 2020

Mr. DeFAZIO. Madam Speaker, I am proud to announce my constituent, Dr. Gustavo Balderas, superintendent of Eugene School District 4J, was named Superintendent of the Year by the American Association of School Administrators. Dr. Balderas now makes three Oregon superintendents that have won the prestigious award, two of which hail from Oregon's Fourth Congressional District.

Education has long been a passion for Dr. Balderas. He is the proud son of migrant parents from Piedras Negras, Coahuila Mexico—who, like many migrants, sought a better life for their family in the United States. His parents saw getting an education as a path forward for their son and pushed him to follow this track.

Dr. Balderas is an Oregonian through and through—beginning his education in the Nyssa School District and Treasure Valley Community College in Eastern Oregon, earning a bachelor's degree from Western Oregon University and then a master's degree from Portland State University, and, finally, receiving his doctorate from the University of Oregon. He has spent nearly all his 30-year career in Oregon.

I am not surprised the American Association of School Administrators bestowed their distinguished award to Dr. Balderas. He is well-known and well-respected throughout the state for his leadership in education equity. Dr. Balderas is committed to mentoring and providing counsel and direction to the future leaders of our state's school districts.

He has made great strides in increasing the diversity of Eugene 4J's educator workforce. Under his leadership, 30 percent of all district administrators, including 39 percent of school principals, are people of color, more accurately reflecting the district's 31 percent enrollment among students of color.

He has also partnered with community organizations to combat youth and family homelessness in our district.

In accepting his award, Dr. Balderas said: "This is a 'we' award, not a 'me' award"—accepting the award on behalf of his community rather than himself. I am thrilled that Eugene 4J has such a dedicated, yet modest, leader who recognizes the important work educators contribute towards making our public schools exceptional. In fact, it was the educators in his life that inspired him to follow this path. They made him a better student and the role model he is today.

Dr. Balderas' talents were cultivated in Oregon's public schools, and today our community is reaping the rewards from his capacity, capability, and commitment. I am honored to have an educator of Dr. Balderas' caliber serve our community, and I thank him for the outstanding work he has done and will continue to do on behalf of the students of Eugene 4J and all of public education.

IN RECOGNITION OF RILEY
DOLENCE FOR HER REMARK-
ABLE ACHIEVEMENTS IN CREW

HON. DEBBIE DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 25, 2020

Mrs. DINGELL. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Riley Dolence for her accomplishments in crew. As a four-time world record holder, Riley's impressive achievements are worthy of commendation.

Riley Dolence is a student at Trenton High School in Michigan. Beyond academics, Riley is an accomplished athlete who has recently earned a host of awards and accolades for her involvement in crew. Since last November, Riley has set four world records in her age group including the records for most meters on the erg in sixty minutes, most meters on the erg in four minutes, fastest time to complete a half marathon, and fastest time to complete a full marathon. Despite her overwhelming success, Riley hopes to earn even more world records in the coming months.

Riley Dolence's success in crew is a testament to her unrelenting hard work and dedication to the sport. As a genuine and enthusiastic team-player, Riley is regarded by her teammates and coaches as a humble and passionate leader who motivates others to do their best. Even as a junior, Riley already understands the importance of commitment and discipline. She will carry these values throughout all her future endeavors, and we are confident she will continue to achieve greatness.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Riley Dolence for her remarkable achievements in crew. It is clear Riley's future is bright, and we all wish her continued success in the years ahead.

TRIBUTE TO REVEREND GEORGE
WALKER SMITH

HON. SUSAN A. DAVIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 25, 2020

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Madam Speaker, I rise with admiration and respect to honor and remember the tremendous legacy of Reverend

(Rev.) George Walker Smith, who passed away in San Diego on February 15, 2020 at the age of 91.

Rev. Smith was a champion for racial equality and one of the most impactful educators and civic leaders in San Diego's history.

Rev. Smith was born on a plantation in Haynesville, Alabama in 1928. As the son of sharecroppers, he faced adversity early on in his life, as the local school he attended was segregated, substandard, and only offered schooling through the ninth grade. After noticing Smith's intellectual capacity, the plantation owner decided to send Smith to a nearby church-run school. Capitalizing on his educational momentum, Smith attended Knoxville College in Tennessee and later matriculated on to Pittsburgh Theological Seminary School.

After completing Seminary School, Rev. Smith moved to San Diego with his wife, Elizabeth Irene, in 1956. Once in San Diego, Smith founded a Presbyterian church in Golden Hill. Smith's congregation, Christ United Presbyterian Church, later moved to 30th and Fir Street in South Park, which he led for decades.

While in San Diego, Rev. Smith did not limit his talents to the pulpit. In 1963, Smith became San Diego's first elected black official, after winning a seat on the San Diego School Board. Smith went on to serve on the school board for 16 years and acted as the board's president a total of four times. Rev. Smith left an indelible impact on the school board in his leadership and successful efforts to recruit a diverse faculty, at a time when educators of color were few and far between.

In 1970, Rev. Smith founded the "Catfish Club," a weekly lunch meeting that would become a mainstay for discussions on civic issues, local politics, and social justice. The "Catfish Club" created a safe environment for multiple views and approaches, at a time when the country and city needed it the most.

In 1976, he was elected president of the National School Boards Association. He also served on the National Advisory Commission on Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, the White House Committee on Education and the Arts, the California School Boards Association, the San Diego Community College District, and the San Diego Crime Commission. He was the first president of the Citizens Advisory Review Board, which monitored police practices in the city in the mid-1980s.

As a Member and President of San Diego Unified School District, as well as President of the National School Board Association, Rev. Smith was the strongest voice for the achievement of all children. He was always probing the performance of students who would be first in their family to attend college. He believed strongly in accountability for all adults responsible for a path to opportunity for all young people. Although Rev. Smith retired from his church in 2000, he remained active and served as a mentor in the community.

Rev. Smith is survived by his daughter, son, four grandchildren, and a great grandson.

I was privileged to have the opportunity to personally witness and appreciate his drive to bring people together in order to create a better community. I always admired Rev. Smith's ability to keep education at the center of all he did; a wise and thoughtful approach.

I valued our relationship as I looked to him as a mentor on becoming a member of the

school board in 1983. It was always a personal pleasure to be in his company over the years. He always inspired me to go beyond expectations and do everything possible to make this world a better place. Engaging and demanding, Rev. Smith was a noble champion for justice.

While San Diego has lost a giant, I believe that his life's work will serve as a legacy and example for future generations to come. Madam Speaker, I ask that you please join me in remembering and commemorating the great life of Rev. George Walker Smith.

**JOEL LEWIS RECEIVES THE
ALUMNI HALL OF FAME AWARD**

HON. PAUL COOK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 25, 2020

Mr. COOK. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the service and commitment of Joel Lewis, who received the 2020 Alumni Hall of Fame Award from the Victor Valley College Foundation on February 22, 2020.

A dedicated educational advocate, Joel Lewis has made constant efforts to give back and mentor various students from Victor Valley College (VVC). As an educator at Apple Valley High School, Joel distinguishes himself with unrivaled dedication and energy for his job. His passion for teaching and coaching is constantly on display as he often goes above and beyond for under-served and developmentally challenged students. He has coached for seven seasons at Apple Valley High School (AVHS) and three seasons at VVC. As a coach to economically disadvantaged students, he has personally managed numerous booster events and donation drives for AVHS Basketball. He credits much of his success to his wife and children, his life-long friends, and his students. In 2010, Joel and his family adopted their son, after seeing his struggles and that he had nowhere else to go. Through mentorship, patience, and love, he became the valedictorian of Apple Valley High School and went on to study at Georgetown University.

On behalf of the United States House of Representatives, I would like to congratulate Joel Lewis on this award. Joel has led an incredible life filled with service and dedication to his students and community, and he is most deserving of this award.

**HONORING THE LIFE AND SERVICE
OF RONALD EDWARD KNOTT**

HON. JACK BERGMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 25, 2020

Mr. BERGMAN. Madam Speaker, it is my honor to recognize the life of Ronald Edward Knott, who passed away at the age of 73 after a lifetime of service to his fellow Americans. Through his extreme courage and selflessness, Ronald became an indispensable part of the state of Michigan.

Ronald was born on September 24, 1946. Upon graduating from Walled Lake High School, Ronald joined the United States

Airforce, where he served two tours in Vietnam as a mechanic. Following his military service, Ron married his wife Dawn and began a career at General Motors. Ron retired from GM in 1987 and moved to Mio, where he and Dawn opened Knott's Dairy Barn. Throughout his professional career and into retirement, Ron's dedication to service remained stronger than ever—including service as Commander of the Wixom VFW Post 3952 and the Mio VFW Post 4126. Ron also served as Historian for Mio American Legion Post 348 and as Southeast Michigan District Commander. Ron passed away on February 5, 2020. He is missed dearly by his family and friends, and his legacy will undoubtedly live on for generations for come. Ronald's tireless devotion to the public good touched the lives of countless Michiganders, and the impact of his work cannot be overstated.

Madam Speaker, on behalf of Michigan's First Congressional District, I ask you to join me in honoring the life of Ronald Edward Knott. His legacy will forever live on in his family and through the countless lives he bettered through his service.

**IN CELEBRATION OF THE NAMI
WASHTENAW COUNTY'S THE AD-
VOCATE GALA: TAKING OFF THE
MASK**

HON. DEBBIE DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 25, 2020

Mrs. DINGELL. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize NAMI Washtenaw County and celebrate its 2020 Advocate Gala: Taking Off the Mask. NAMI's lasting commitment to supporting mental health in our community is worthy of commendation.

NAMI Washtenaw County is a nonprofit dedicated to improving the lives of those living with mental health conditions. Established by a group of concerned parents of children with mental health conditions, NAMI Washtenaw County was created in 1984 to address our community's mental health needs. Since its humble beginnings, NAMI Washtenaw County has grown significantly and continues to provide critical mental health educational programs, support groups, and advocacy work that address mental health concerns and work to correct the stigmas that are so often attached. Today, NAMI Washtenaw County ensures thousands of individuals, families, and educators connect with the support and information they need.

The Taking Off the Mask Gala exemplifies NAMI Washtenaw County's continued commitment to addressing mental condition concerns. Although mental conditions impact the lives of many, people remain afraid, unwilling, or embarrassed to talk about mental health in fear of the stigma that is attached. Thanks to NAMI Washtenaw County's dedication, tonight's gala will help lift these damaging stigmas and uncover the stories of people living with mental health conditions that are often hidden behind masks. The gala will explore everyday hopes and struggles that come with caring for someone living with a mental health condition and encourage attendees to create an open future without stigma, judgement, or embarrassment.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring NAMI Washtenaw County as it

hosts its Taking Off the Mask Gala. NAMI Washtenaw County continues to be critical resource to many, and its unrelenting commitment to improving the lives of those living with mental conditions makes a real and lasting difference in our community. We are grateful for NAMI Washtenaw County's meaningful impact and wish it continued success in the years ahead.

**REFLECTIONS ON SENATE JUDG-
MENT NOT TO CONVICT AND RE-
MOVE THE IMPEACHED PRESI-
DENT FOR ABUSE OF POWER
AND OBSTRUCTION OF CON-
GRESS**

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 25, 2020

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, on Wednesday, February 5, 2020, the United States Senate determined not to convict and remove from office Donald John Trump, President of the United States, who was impeached by the House for high crimes and misdemeanors, a decision I firmly believe will be judged harshly by history for all time.

I voted for the two articles of impeachment contained in H. Res. 755, the resolution of the House of Representatives and I rise to discuss in detail the overwhelming evidence assembled by the Committee on the Judiciary and the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, which clearly warranted the conclusion that the President abused the powers placed in him in trust by the Constitution and the American people by endeavoring to coerce a foreign government to announce a phony corruption investigation of his perceived chief election rival so he could remain in office and continue his misconduct.

The President clearly abused his power by putting his personal interests above the national interest and jeopardizing the national security of the United States and, making it a perfect trifecta, enlisting the aid of a foreign power to sabotage the 2020 presidential election.

When this scheme was discovered and made public, the President launched an all-out campaign to impede the ability of Congress to learn all the facts and hold the persons responsible accountable by dishonoring lawful subpoenas, refusing to provide requested information, and directing his subordinates in the Executive Branch not to testify or cooperate with Congress.

The House impeachment managers proved these actions to the country and the world beyond dispute and clearly showed how the evidence warranted the President's conviction and removal by the Senate.

Madam Speaker, it is beneficial to the public and for history to review the material facts that have led to where we are.

In February 2014, Russia annexed Crimea, a stunning display of military aggression unseen since the end of World War II when the maps of post-war Europe were drawn.

Five months later, on July 17, 2014, the Russia-backed Donbass People's Militia (DPM), an organization consisting of pro-Russian separatists who have taken up arms against the Ukrainian Armed Forces and the

Government of Ukraine, shot down Malaysian Airlines Flight 17, killing all 298 persons on board, including 80 children and 15 crew members.

Presidential candidate Donald Trump would later dispute Russia's incursion into Ukraine in a nationally televised interview on July 31, 2016, when he said of Russian President Vladimir Putin:

He's not going into Ukraine, OK, just so you understand. He's not going to go into Ukraine, all right? You can mark it down. You can put it down. You can take it anywhere you want.

In contrast, the United States, the European Union, and the international community, standing in solidarity with Ukraine, strongly condemned Russia's act of aggression and expelled it from membership in the G-8, the organization of the nation's eight richest, industrialized countries.

In June 2016, at the Republican National Convention held in Cleveland, Ohio to nominate Donald Trump as its presidential candidate, the Platform Committee of the Republican Party made but a single change in the party's 2016 platform and that was to water down the platform to make the Republican Party more amenable and sympathetic to Russia and its interests in reestablishing dominance over Ukraine.

In November 2016, Donald Trump was narrowly elected the 45th President of the United States, surprisingly winning the Electoral College 306-224, despite losing the national popular vote by a record 2,833,220 votes to the Democratic presidential candidate, Hillary Rodham Clinton, the former U.S. Secretary of State and U.S. Senator from New York.

On January 6, 2017, President-elect Donald John Trump was provided the unanimous assessment of the United States that concluded that Russian President Vladimir Putin ordered an influence campaign in 2016 aimed at the U.S. presidential election in which Russia's goals were to undermine public faith in the U.S. democratic process, denigrate Democratic presidential candidate Hillary Clinton, the determined and resolute foe of Vladimir Putin, and facilitate the election of Vladimir Putin's preferred candidate, Donald John Trump.

Russia's interference in the election processes of democratic countries is not new but a continuation of the "Translator Project," an ongoing information warfare effort launched by Vladimir Putin in 2014 to use social media to manipulate public opinion and voters in western democracies.

Instead of supporting the unanimous assessment of the United States Intelligence Community, the President consistently attacked and sought to discredit and undermine the agencies and officials responsible for detecting and assessing Russian interference in the 2016 presidential election as well as those responsible for investigating and bringing to justice the conspirators who committed crimes against the United States.

Between March 23, 2018 and February 15, 2019, the Congress appropriated \$391 million in security assistance and foreign military financing support to Ukraine as follows: \$26.5 million FMF funding on March 23, 2018; \$250 million on September 28, 2018; and \$115 million on February 15, 2019.

As documented in the March 2019 Report On The Investigation Into Russian Interference

In The 2016 Presidential Election submitted by Special Counsel Robert S. Mueller III, the Trump presidential campaign benefited from Russia's "sweeping and systematic" interference in the 2016 election through a sophisticated social media campaign coordinated by Russian intelligence officers and by releasing documents stolen from Democratic National Committee computers and the Clinton campaign.

While the Special Counsel's report could not conclusively find evidence of a criminal conspiracy between entities or persons aligned with Russia and the Trump campaign, the report noted that the Special Counsel identified ten instances of unlawful conduct by the President that could constitute obstruction of justice but as an employee of the Justice Department the Special Counsel was bound to abide by the Department of Justice's Office of Legal Counsel 1974 Memorandum which prohibits charging a President with a crime while he is in office.

On April 21, 2019, presidential candidate Volodymyr Zelensky was elected President of Ukraine, winning nearly 70 percent of the vote in the runoff election.

On April 25, 2019, Joseph Robinette Biden, Jr., a distinguished former U.S. Senator and Vice-President of the United States under President Barack Obama, announced his candidacy for President of the United States.

On May 6, 2019, the United States Ambassador to Ukraine, Marie Louise Yovanovitch, was removed from her duty station and recalled to the United States, culminating a months-long smear campaign conceived and coordinated by Rudolph Giuliani, the former mayor of the City of New York, acting in his capacity as the current President's personal attorney.

On May 9, 2019, the New York Times reported that Rudy Giuliani was planning to travel to Ukraine to prevail upon the new president of that country to launch an investigation into alleged corruption by former Vice-President Biden, his son Hunter Biden, and to ignore the widely debunked and discredited conspiracy theory that it was Ukraine, not Russia, that interfered in the 2016 presidential election in "sweeping and systematic fashion."

Four days later, on May 13, 2019, U.S. Attorney General William P. Barr announced that the U.S. Department of Justice was undertaking an investigation into the origins of interference in the 2016 election.

Madam Speaker, it should be noted that the Trump Administration decision to shift responsibility for 2016 election interference from Russia to Ukraine is contrary to the assessment rendered unanimously by the U.S. Intelligence Community and furthers the 'active measures' conspiracy theory hatched in Moscow by Russian President Vladimir Putin and the oligarchic regime governing the Russia Federation.

In fact, a story published December 19, 2019 in the Washington Post, reports that senior advisors to the President believe he was influenced to perpetuate this crackpot conspiracy theory by Vladimir Putin.

On May 20, 2019, Volodymyr Zelensky was inaugurated as only the sixth democratically elected President of Ukraine but it was noteworthy that the American delegation attending the inauguration was not headed by Vice-President MIKE PENCE as originally scheduled but by U.S. Energy Secretary Rick Perry, who replaced the Vice-President at the President's

direction and included lower-level functionaries Kurt Volker, Special Representative for Ukraine Negotiations; Gordon Sondland, Ambassador to the European Union and a large donor to the Trump Inauguration Committee; and Lieutenant Colonel Alexander Vindman, Director of European Affairs at the National Security Council.

Two weeks later, in a nationally televised interview broadcast June 13, 2019 on ABC News, the President stated that he would accept damaging information against an electoral rival from a foreign government, a position disowned in a public statement issued later that day by the Chair of the U.S. Federal Elections Commission, which reemphasized to all candidates and voters that accepting political help from a foreign government would be illegal and a violation of federal election law.

On July 24, 2019, in testimony before the Committee on the Judiciary, on which I sit as the third senior member of the majority, Special Counsel Robert S. Mueller III affirmed the findings and conclusions in his voluminous report, including that the "Russian government interfered in the 2016 presidential election in sweeping and systematic fashion."

The very next day, on July 25, 2019, the President spoke with President Zelensky by telephone in a much-anticipated telephone conversation.

In that call, President Zelensky advised the President that Ukraine was ready to purchase needed Javelin missiles from the United States to defend itself from ongoing armed aggression by Russia.

In his immediate response to President Zelensky's request for military assistance, the President replied: "I would like for you to do us a favor, though" and announce the launch of a corruption investigation against his most feared and formidable electoral rival, former Vice-President Biden, his son Hunter Biden, and the alleged involvement of Ukraine in the 2016 election for President of the United States.

The 'favor' the President wished of the Ukraine President was to be performed not to further United States national security policy since the national security community was unanimous in its collective support of Ukraine in its struggle against Russian military encroachment but to benefit the President personally and politically in his capacity as a candidate for reelection to the office he currently occupies.

On August 12, 2019, a whistleblower complaint was filed with the Inspector General of the Intelligence community, Michael Atkinson, who after receiving the complaint followed applicable procedure and notified in writing the Chairman and Ranking Member of the House Intelligence Committee that the whistleblower's complaint was 'deemed credible' and "related to one of the most important and significant of the [Director of National Intelligence]'s responsibilities to the American people."

On September 11, 2019, after many months, the White House's hold on needed military aid desperately needed by Ukraine was lifted as inexplicably and as swiftly as it was imposed.

Indeed, the only material change in circumstances that had occurred between the imposition and lifting of the hold was the fact that the President and his Administration was now aware that Congress and the public had learned that congressionally appropriated security assistance to an ally under attack by our

adversary was being withheld by the President for no apparent national security reason and that Congress had not been notified of the withholding by the Administration.

In September 2019, Members of the House of Representatives were alerted to a complaint filed by a whistleblower within the Intelligence Community.

The complaint alleged that on a July 25, 2019 call with the President of Ukraine, the President of the United States sought to withhold \$391 million in desperately needed foreign military aid to Ukraine unless and until it—either through procurement or manufacture—produced political dirt against former Vice-President Biden, who was perceived to pose the greatest threat to the current President's reelection in 2020.

On September 24, 2019, Speaker NANCY PELOSI announced the commencement of an impeachment inquiry.

A key witness was Ambassador William Taylor, one of West Point's most distinguished alumna, a Vietnam combat veteran, and the former Ambassador and then chargé d'affaires of the United States Embassy in Ukraine, who testified under oath that he told Gordon Sondland, our Ambassador to the European Union that it was "crazy" to withhold security assistance to Ukraine for a political campaign.

Ambassador Taylor also testified that one of his staff members in the Embassy in Ukraine advised him on July 26, 2019, the day after the President's telephone call with President Zelensky, that he clearly overheard a conversation that day between Ambassador Sondland and the President in which the latter asked Ambassador Sondland whether President Zelensky was "going to do the investigation."

That staffer, David Holmes, affirmed the correctness of Ambassador Taylor's account and went on to testify that in response to the President's question, Ambassador Sondland replied to the President that "[Zelensky] is going to do it" and that President Zelensky "will do anything you ask him to."

When Mr. Holmes asked Ambassador Sondland about the President's commitment to Ukraine, he testified that Ambassador Sondland replied that the President "does not give a [expletive] about Ukraine and that the President only cares about big stuff . . . that benefits the President, like the Biden investigation, that Mr. Giuliani was pushing."

Indispensable to carrying out the plan to announce the launch of a phony corruption investigation into former Vice-President Biden was the removal of the then United States Ambassador to Ukraine, Marie Yovanovitch, the longest serving female member of the diplomatic corps, and an American diplomat with a demonstrated expertise and distinguished record of fighting corruption and leading Ukraine away from its notorious past when it was a satellite of the Soviet Union.

So, led by Rudy Giuliani, the President's personal lawyer, a smear campaign was conducted against Ambassador Yovanovitch, accusing her falsely of impugning the President and allegedly abetting corruption in Ukraine.

This led directly to the Ambassador being recalled from her duty station and referenced in the July 25, 2019 telephone call where the President stated to President Zelensky that "[Ambassador Yovanovitch] from the United States, the woman, was bad news and the people she was dealing with in the Ukraine

were bad news" and that "she's going to go through some things."

David Hale, who as Undersecretary of State for Political Affairs was the third ranking official in the State Department, testified that he witnessed the smear campaign against Ambassador Yovanovitch and urged his departmental superiors to place a full-page advertisement in local Ukrainian press in support of Ambassador Yovanovitch, but this suggestion was refused.

In her appearance before the Intelligence Committee, Ambassador Yovanovitch testified that she was aghast that she was personally mentioned in a telephone call between the President and the President of Ukraine and stated that she felt threatened and intimidated when she heard the President remark that she was "going to go through some things."

Ambassador Yovanovitch relived this fear in real time when she learned the President was live tweeting disparaging things about her as she testified, implying, for example, that she was somehow in part responsible for the 1993 situation in Mogadishu, Somalia.

Three Administration officials with direct knowledge of the July 25, 2019 telephone call testified under oath before the Intelligence Committee: Jennifer Williams, a State Department foreign service officer to the Office of Vice-President MIKE PENCE; and Lt. Col. Alexander Vindman, NSC Director of European Affairs, who was born in the Ukraine on the anniversary of D-Day, immigrated to the United States with his father and twin brother when he was three years old, was later commissioned an officer in the United States Army and deployed overseas to South Korea, Germany, and Iraq, where he was wounded in combat operations and awarded the Purple Heart.

Ms. Williams characterized the President's conduct on the telephone call as "unusual," inappropriate, and partisan in nature.

Lt. Col. Vindman was gravely concerned because the President of the United States was requesting a foreign country to investigate an American citizen, an act so contrary to national policy and interest that he immediately reported the matter to a senior counsel lawyer on the National Security Council.

The third person witnessing the call was Tim Morrison, who at the time of the July 25, 2019 telephone call was Senior Director for Europe and Russia on the National Security Council and a former Republican congressional professional staff member, who testified that the President's behavior on the telephone call gave him a "sinking feeling" because it could easily be characterized as pursuing partisan political interests.

Mr. Morrison testified that he contacted NSC counsel and sought to have the record of the telephone call hidden on a secure server to avoid discovery by official Washington.

The testimony of Gordon Sondland, appointed by the President as the Ambassador to the European Union and a million-dollar Trump donor, was chilling, especially his testimony that "everyone was in the loop."

Ambassador Sondland testified that he communicated directly with the President who directed him to work on the Ukraine matter with Rudy Giuliani, who had no official role with the U.S. government.

Ambassador Sondland stated under oath that Rudy Giuliani pressured the Ukraine government to investigate Burisma, a Ukrainian

gas company that had Hunter Biden, the former vice-president's son as one of its board members.

Further, Ambassador Sondland testified that the President conditioned a White House meeting with President Zelensky and the release of security assistance on his announcement of an investigation designed to blame any 2016 presidential election interference on Ukraine and thus undermine the unanimous assessment of the American Intelligence Community that Russia interfered in the 2016 election to benefit candidate Trump and harm candidate Clinton.

In addition, according to Ambassador Sondland, the highly sought and desired White House visit and security assistance was conditioned on the announcement by President Zelensky of an investigation into his perceived chief domestic political rival, former Vice-President Joseph R. Biden.

It takes no great leap in logic to divine that the President's intent and purpose here was to replicate his 2016 campaign formula from 2016: invite foreign meddling, point to an investigation, and exploit it by rumor and innuendo on social media.

Ambassador Sondland asked rhetorically, "Was there a quid pro quo?" and then said: "As I testified previously, with regard to the requested White House call and White House meeting, the answer is yes."

And according to Ambassador Sondland, "[e]veryone was in the loop," including Secretary of State Mike Pompeo; acting White House chief of staff Mick Mulvaney; Mulvaney's senior adviser, Rob Blair; Secretary Pompeo's counselor, Ulrich Brechbuehl; Lisa Kenna, the State Department executive secretary; National Security Advisor John Bolton, Trump's national security adviser at the time; Bolton's Deputy National Security Advisor Fiona Hill; and NRC senior official Timothy Morrison, and even Vice President MIKE PENCE who Ambassador Sondland testified he told in September 2019 that the Ukraine aid appeared to be stalled because of the demand for investigations.

Finally, Dr. Fiona Hill, who preceded Tim Morrison in the Trump Administration as National Intelligence Officer for Russia and Eurasia testified that after speaking with and listening to Ambassador Sondland she came to understand that United States policy for Ukraine had diverged into one track pursuing standard United States policy objectives of promoting democracy and the rule of law, fighting corruption, and protecting Ukraine from Russia; and another track solely concerned with achieving the more narrow personal and political goal of the President to prevail upon the new Ukrainian president to commit publicly to announcing an investigation of supposed interference by Ukraine in the 2016 presidential election as well as a manufactured wrongdoing by former Vice-President Joseph Biden.

Dr. Hill testified that her direct supervisor, NSA Advisor John Bolton, characterized this second track as a "drug deal" which she stated to Ambassador Sondland that "I do think this is all going to blow up. And here we are."

Madam Speaker, I will further discuss what message this evidence sends to us loud and clear.

FURTHER REFLECTIONS ON SEN-
ATE JUDGMENT NOT TO CON-
VICT AND REMOVE THE IM-
PEACHED PRESIDENT FOR
ABUSE OF POWER AND OB-
STRUCTION OF CONGRESS

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 25, 2020

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, on Wednesday, February 5, 2020, the United States Senate determined not to convict and remove from office Donald John Trump, President of the United States, who was impeached by the House for high crimes and misdemeanors; a decision I firmly believe will be judged harshly by history for all time.

Madam Speaker it is important to understand the seriousness of a determination by the House to exercise the power of impeachment, which under Article I, Section 2, Clause 5 of the Constitution is vested solely in the House of Representatives.

The purpose of impeachment is not to punish the person but to protect the people by removing from office an individual whose misconduct and behavior is so dangerous that it imperils the liberty of the people, the security of the nation, or the vitality of the governmental system.

In short, impeachment is the passionate outcry (*crie de coeur*) of a people alarmed at a pattern of abuses and usurpations that evidence a desire to reduce them to accept absolute despotism or establish tyrannical rule.

The impeachment power is vested in the House of Representatives because it is the body designed by the Framers to be the physical, direct, and immediate representatives of the People, reflecting all of their passions and hopes and fears and concerns.

So, when 'The People' who established the Constitution are acting to preserve and protect their governmental system and their security, there is no higher or countervailing authority to which they must yield.

A refusal by any authority subordinate to 'The People,' including the President of the United States, to cooperate with, or honor a request for information from the House of Representatives when it is exercising its sole power of impeachment is simply another way of saying that the person in question is exalting his or her interests over the sovereign interests of the people, the ultimate repository of all political power in a democratic republic such as the United States.

The impeachment inquiry initiated pursuant to H. Res. 660 by the House of Representatives systematically and methodically revealed the manner in which the President misused the power and authority of his office to extort a beleaguered and besieged ally to conspire with him to sabotage the 2016 presidential election so that he could retain the office he holds and continue to abuse its powers.

Every material allegation set forth in the whistleblower's complaint has been verified, corroborated, or affirmed by a host of witnesses who overcame opposition and threats by the White House and courageously testified from which three unassailable conclusions can be drawn.

First, the President violated his oath of office by placing his personal and political inter-

est above the national interest by scheming to get Ukraine to announce a phony investigation against a potential election opponent.

Second, the President betrayed the national interest by withholding vital, congressionally appropriated security assistance to a beleaguered and besieged ally facing armed aggression from Russia, America's implacable foe.

Third, the essential purpose of the scheme concocted by the President was to enlist a foreign country to help him fix the 2020 presidential election in his favor, the very type of interference most feared by the Framers.

The evidence showed that the President of the United States abused the powers vested in him in the way the Framers most feared and worked hardest to protect against.

What this means in short is that the evidence showed that the President committed the trifecta of the most cardinal political sins that can be committed in a democratic republic.

If American elections are not free, fair, and uninfluenced by foreign actors, then the democracy is extinguished and citizens are reduced to subjects ruled by an authority dependent not on the consent of the governed, but on the assistance and beneficence of unaccountable foreign actors.

The testimony and evidence led to and supported a conclusion that the President abused his power to extort a foreign nation to conspire with him to sabotage an American election and undermine democracy so he could retain his office to abuse his powers.

Madam Speaker, Ukraine is not just another country but a bulwark for the West against Russia, its imperialism, its autocratic tendencies; Ukraine is an ally on the frontline of the United States' containment policy toward Russian expansion that has been in place since 1947.

Thus, withholding desperately needed security assistance to Ukraine not only harms that nation but endangers the security of more than 325 million Americans.

The conduct of the President adduced by the evidence illustrates the reason for the doomsday clause in Article I, section 2, clause 5 as the ultimate protector of a people and system of government in which America is to be ruled by American leaders selected by American voters without the assistance of non-Americans.

Madam Speaker, the hallmarks of a democratic system of government are: (1) an independent judiciary; (2) civilian control of the military; (3) free and independent political parties; (4) fealty to the rule of law; (5) freedom of speech and of assembly; and (6) a free and independent press.

But the lynchpin of a functioning and real democracy is free and fair elections.

As I stated earlier, if American elections are not free, fair, and uninfluenced by foreign actors, then the democracy is extinguished and citizens are reduced to subjects ruled by an authority dependent not on the consent of the governed, but on the assistance and beneficence of unaccountable foreign actors.

The Framers wanted to ensure that the President's allegiance would always be to the nation, which is why the text of the presidential oath is the only one specified in the Constitution and why the Emoluments Clause (Article 1, Section 9, clause 8) prohibits the President from accepting any title of nobility or

thing of value from any King, Prince, or foreign state without the consent of Congress.

The first President of the United States, George Washington, counseling in his famous 1796 Farewell Address to beware of foreign entanglements, said the government sometimes acts to make "the nation subservient to projects of hostility instigated by pride, ambition, and other sinister and pernicious motives. The peace often, sometimes perhaps the liberty, of nations, has been the victim."

President Washington also pointed out the pernicious influence of foreign involvement in American elections:

And it gives to ambitious, corrupted, or deluded citizens (who devote themselves to the favorite nation), facility to betray or sacrifice the interests of their own country, without odium, sometimes even with popularity; gilding, with the appearances of a virtuous sense of obligation, a commendable deference for public opinion, or a laudable zeal for public good, the base or foolish compliances of ambition, corruption, or infatuation.

As avenues to foreign influence in innumerable ways, such attachments are particularly alarming to the truly enlightened and independent patriot. How many opportunities do they afford to tamper with domestic factions, to practice the arts of seduction, to mislead public opinion, to influence or awe the public councils. Such an attachment of a small or weak towards a great and powerful nation dooms the former to be the satellite of the latter.

Madam Speaker, if we are to have government of the people, by the people, for the people, then elections must be decided by Americans, and only Americans, without the influence of foreign leaders or nations.

The only legitimate way political authority is conveyed voluntarily and consensually from the governed to the governors is through free and fair elections uncorrupted by foreign involvement.

In seeking to entangle Ukraine directly in the 2020 presidential election, the actions proved by the House Impeachment Managers showed that the President acted to further his own personal political interests and disregarded his oath registered in Heaven to "preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States."

Instead of advancing America's interests, Russia, America's implacable foe since 1945, has been emboldened and is benefitting from every action that weakens or jeopardizes Ukraine's ability to defend itself from aggression, beginning with the lukewarm embrace of this Administration of NATO, and especially Article 5 of the NATO Treaty, which deems an attack on any NATO member country as an attack on all, a commitment that has kept the peace in Europe since the end of World War II.

The Framers understood that abuse of power is the gravest offense that can be committed in a democratic republic.

Criminal offenses, the Framers understood, could be adjudicated in the judicial system, policy disagreements could be worked out in the political system, and concerns over maladministration could be addressed and decided or corrected in the electoral system.

But acts that by their nature injure the very system of government itself are different, or *sui generis*, and require a different and more immediate remedy, and that is the removal

from the office entrusted to the person or persons causing the injury.

This is done to protect the people and the republic, not to inflict punishment on the person.

The Framers were well aware that some of the most dangerous abuses of power were not violations of the criminal code but the actions of a tyrant who ruled under the divine right of kings and they pledged their lives, honor, and sacred fortunes never to countenance such abuses or usurpations in their new country.

Consider if you will a small sample of the legal acts of abuse and suffering inflicted on Americans in the time of the Framers by their rulers, Great Britain's King George III and the British Parliament, which they documented in the Declaration of Independence:

He has obstructed the Administration of Justice, by refusing his Assent to Laws for establishing Judiciary powers.

He has made Judges dependent on his Will alone, for the tenure of their offices, and the amount and payment of their salaries.

He has kept among us, in times of peace, Standing Armies without the Consent of our legislatures. He has affected to render the Military independent of and superior to the Civil power.

He has combined with [Parliament] to subject us to a jurisdiction foreign to our constitution, and unacknowledged by our laws; giving his Assent to their Acts of pretended Legislation:

For Quartering large bodies of armed troops among us;

For protecting them, by a mock Trial, from punishment for any Murders which they should commit on the Inhabitants of these States;

For imposing Taxes on us without our Consent; For depriving us in many cases, of the benefits of Trial by Jury;

For transporting us beyond Seas to be tried for pretended offences

The principle the Framers were asserting is that removal of the King and Parliament was justified not because they had committed criminal violations of the statute book, but because they had and were exercising their power in a manner that threatened the liberty and security of the people.

In short, the Framers were declaring to the world that their governors had so abused their

powers that it "revealed the character of a tyrant who was unfit to be the ruler of a free people."

And to ensure that did not happen again in the new nation, the Framers wisely included Article I, Section 2, Clause 5 vesting the sole power of impeachment in the House of Representatives and Article II, Section 4 subjecting the President and Vice President to removal from Office "on Impeachment for and Conviction of Treason, Bribery, or other high Crimes and Misdemeanors."

The actions alleged in H. Res. 755, the impeachment resolution, and proved to a certainty by the House Managers bespeak a stunning disregard for the values that sustain our country and a contempt for the institutions that protect our liberties and national security.

As alarming is the fact there has been from the President no expression of regret, no remorse, no contrition, no apology, no atonement, no request for forgiveness, no admission of wrongdoing or even erroneous judgment, and no attempt at reconciliation.

Instead, the President continues to double-down on his previous actions, still claiming, despite all evidence to the contrary, that his telephone call with President Zelensky was "perfect" and inviting other countries, such as China, to become involved in our nation's 2020 presidential election.

This means the clear and present threat to our democracy that moved the House to act is a continuing one, which the Senate should have acted to remove.

Given the disappointing failure to convict and remove by the Senate, it is incumbent on each Member of this body, and all citizens of our great nation, to vigilantly be on guard to safeguard our democratic institutions, values, and principles against further attack.

That is what this moment in history demands of us and we dare not falter or fail in this moment of crisis so as was said in another perilous time, "sail on oh ship of state, sail on oh union great; humanity with all its fears, with all it hopes of future years, is hanging breathlessly on thy fate."

I extend my deepest thanks to thank Speaker PELOSI for the extraordinary leadership she has displayed on behalf of this House, the Congress, and the nation during the present crisis.

I also want to acknowledge and thank Judiciary Committee Chairman JERROLD NADLER and Intelligence Committee Chairman ADAM SCHIFF for the meticulous and thoroughly professional manner in which their committees discharged the responsibilities entrusted to them by H. Res. 660, the impeachment inquiry resolution.

I thank all of the members of the Committees on the Judiciary and on Intelligence for the tremendous contributions they made in compiling such a powerful and overwhelming evidentiary record for impeachment.

I especially wish to recognize the extraordinary advocacy of the House Impeachment Managers in presenting such a persuasive and compelling case for impeachment to the Senate sitting as a Court of Impeachment.

Of course, an enterprise of this magnitude could not be carried out successfully without the assistance, support, and commitment of extremely talented professional staff members of the Judiciary and Intelligence Committees and I thank them for the invaluable service they rendered to our nation.

Finally, I wish to express my deep appreciation and gratitude to members of my personal staff, Gregory Berry, Chief Counsel; Robin Chand, Senior Counsel; and Glenn Rushing, Chief of Staff, for their expertise and tireless efforts in researching and analyzing the unprecedented factual background, legal issues, and constitutional precedents involved in these proceedings.

Madam Speaker, it has been said that what we do in life echoes in history, and Scripture tells us in Psalms 30:5 that "weeping may endure for a night but joy cometh in the morning."

I am confident that if we hold fast and honor the values and principles that we know to be right and true and good, then constitutional government will be preserved and passed on to future generations just as it was to us.

So, it is with love and reverence for this country and its people, that I stood with the Constitution and supported the resolution impeaching Donald John Trump, President of the United States, for high crimes and misdemeanors and it is why I disagree with the conclusion of the Senate not to convict and remove the President from office.

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S1123–S1160

Measures Introduced: Twelve bills were introduced, as follows: S. 3328–3339. **Page S1155**

Measures Reported:

S. 500, to amend title 54, United States Code, to establish, fund, and provide for the use of amounts in a National Park Service Legacy Restoration Fund to address the maintenance backlog of the National Park Service, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

S. 1081, to amend title 54, United States Code, to provide permanent, dedicated funding for the Land and Water Conservation Fund, with amendments.

S. 2418, to amend the Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act of 2006 to modify a definition and the disposition and authorized uses of qualified outer Continental Shelf revenues under that Act and to exempt State and county payments under that Act from sequestration, to provide for the distribution of certain outer Continental Shelf revenues to the State of Alaska, with amendments. **Page S1155**

Measures Considered:

Protect Pain-Capable Unborn Children: Senate resumed consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of S. 3275, to amend title 18, United States Code, to protect pain-capable unborn children. **Pages S1129–36**

During consideration of this measure today, Senate also took the following action:

By 53 yeas to 44 nays (Vote No. 57), three-fifths of those Senators duly chosen and sworn, not having voted in the affirmative, Senate rejected the motion to close further debate on the motion to proceed to consideration of the bill. **Page S1136**

Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act: By 56 yeas to 41 nays (Vote No. 58), three-fifths of those Senators duly chosen and sworn, not having voted in the affirmative, Senate rejected the motion to close further debate on the motion to proceed to consideration of S. 311, to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit a health care practitioner

from failing to exercise the proper degree of care in the case of a child who survives an abortion or attempted abortion. **Pages S1136–37**

Printing of Statements and Opinions—Agreement: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing to modify the order of January 31, 2020, to allow Senators to have until Thursday, February 27, 2020 to have printed statements and opinions in the *Congressional Record*, if they choose, explaining their votes and include those in the documentation of the impeachment proceedings; and that the two page rule be waived. **Page S1160**

Messages from the President: Senate received the following messages from the President of the United States:

Transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the continuation of the national emergency originally declared in Executive Order 13660 on March 6, 2014, with respect to Ukraine; which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs. (PM–47) **Pages S1154–55**

Transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the continuation of the national emergency with respect to Cuba and of the emergency authority relating to the regulation of the anchorage and movement of vessels, as amended; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation. (PM–48) **Page S1155**

Greaves Nomination: Senate resumed consideration of the nomination of Travis Greaves, of the District of Columbia, to be a Judge of the United States Tax Court. **Pages S1137–38, S1138–42**

During consideration of this nomination today, Senate also took the following action:

By 91 yeas to 5 nays (Vote No. EX. 61), Senate agreed to the motion to close further debate on the nomination. **Pages S1137–38**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that at approximately 9:30 a.m., on Thursday, February 27, 2020, Senate resume consideration of the nomination, under the order of Monday, February 24, 2020. **Page S1160**

Nominations Confirmed: Senate confirmed the following nominations:

By unanimous vote of 97 yeas (Vote No. EX. 54), Robert Anthony Molloy, of the Virgin Islands, to be Judge for the District Court of the Virgin Islands for a term of ten years. **Pages S1124–28, S1160**

By unanimous vote of 96 yeas (Vote No. EX. 59), Silvia Carreno-Coll, of Puerto Rico, to be United States District Judge for the District of Puerto Rico. **Pages S1128, S1137, S1160**

During consideration of this nomination today, Senate also took the following action:

By 96 yeas to 1 nay (Vote No. EX. 55), Senate agreed to the motion to close further debate on the nomination. **Page S1128**

By 58 yeas 38 nays (Vote No. EX. 60), Katharine MacGregor, of Pennsylvania, to be Deputy Secretary of the Interior. **Pages S1129, S1137, S1160**

During consideration of this nomination today, Senate also took the following action:

By 59 yeas to 38 nays (Vote No. EX. 56), Senate agreed to the motion to close further debate on the nomination. **Page S1129**

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:

William Jordan Gillis, of Georgia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense.

Douglas Benevento, of Colorado, to be Deputy Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

Michael Pack, of Maryland, to be Chief Executive Officer of the Broadcasting Board of Governors for the term of three years.

Alex Nelson Wong, of New Jersey, to be Alternate Representative of the United States of America for Special Political Affairs in the United Nations, with the rank of Ambassador.

Alex Nelson Wong, of New Jersey, to be an Alternate Representative of the United States of America to the Sessions of the General Assembly of the United Nations during his tenure of service as Alternate Representative of the United States of America for Special Political Affairs in the United Nations.

Aldona Z. Wos, of North Carolina, to be Ambassador to Canada.

Elizabeth Gleason, of Pennsylvania, to be a Member of the National Council on the Arts for a term expiring September 3, 2020.

Jesse Merriam, of Maryland, to be a Member of the National Council on the Humanities for a term expiring January 26, 2024. **Page S1160**

Measures Read the First Time: **Pages S1155, S1160**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S1155–58**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Pages S1158–59**

Additional Statements: **Pages S1153–54**

Authorities for Committees to Meet: **Page S1159**

Record Votes: Eight record votes were taken today. (Total—61) **Pages S1128–29, S1136–38**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 6:38 p.m., until 9:30 a.m. on Thursday, February 27, 2020. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today's Record on page S1160.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

APPROPRIATIONS: DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Department of Homeland Security concluded a hearing to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2021 for the Department of Homeland Security, after receiving testimony from Chad Wolf, Acting Secretary of Homeland Security.

APPROPRIATIONS: DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies concluded a hearing to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2021 for the Department of Health and Human Services, after receiving testimony from Alex Azar, Secretary of Health and Human Services.

DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION REQUEST AND FUTURE YEARS DEFENSE PROGRAM

Committee on Armed Services: Committee concluded a hearing to examine United States European Command and United States Transportation Command in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2021 and the Future Years Defense Program, after receiving testimony from General Tod D. Wolters, USAF, Commander, United States European Command/North Atlantic Treaty Organization Supreme Allied Commander Europe, and General Stephen R. Lyons, USA, Commander, United States Transportation Command, both of the Department of Defense.

DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION REQUEST AND FUTURE YEARS DEFENSE PROGRAM

Committee on Armed Services: Committee received a closed briefing on United States European Command and United States Transportation Command in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2021 and the Future Years Defense Program from General Tod D. Wolters, USAF, Commander,

United States European Command/North Atlantic Treaty Organization Supreme Allied Commander Europe, and General Stephen R. Lyons, USA, Commander, United States Transportation Command, both of the Department of Defense.

SURFACE TRANSPORTATION REAUTHORIZATION

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine surface transportation reauthorization, focusing on public transportation stakeholders' perspectives, including S. 436, to amend title 49, United States Code, to require the development of public transportation operations safety risk reduction programs, and S. 1553, to repeal the debt ceiling, after receiving testimony from Paul P. Skoutelas, American Public Transportation Association, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania; Patrick K. McKenna, American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials, St. Louis, Missouri; Scott Bogren, Community Transportation Association of America, Germantown, Maryland; and Ed Mortimer, U.S. Chamber of Commerce, and Larry I. Willis, Transportation Trades Department, AFL-CIO, both of Washington, D.C.

FOREST SERVICE BUDGET

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 2021 for the Forest Service, after receiving testimony from Vic-

toria Christiansen, Chief, Forest Service, Department of Agriculture.

NORTH KOREA POLICY

Committee on Foreign Relations: Subcommittee on East Asia, the Pacific, and International Cybersecurity Policy concluded a hearing to examine North Korea policy one year after Hanoi, after receiving testimony from Robert R. King, and Sue Mi Terry, both of the Center for Strategic and International Studies, and Bruce Klingner, The Heritage Foundation, all of Washington, D.C.

UNIVERSAL INJUNCTIONS

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee concluded a hearing to examine rule by district judge, focusing on the challenges of universal injunctions, after receiving testimony from Loren L. AliKhan, Solicitor General of the District of Columbia, and Jesse Panuccio, Boies Schiller Flexner LLP, both of Washington, D.C.; Samuel L. Bray, Notre Dame Law School, Notre Dame, Indiana; Mila Sohoni, University of San Diego School of Law, San Diego, California; and Nicholas Bagley, University of Michigan Law School, Ann Arbor.

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: 19 public bills, H.R. 5952–5970; and 4 resolutions, H. Con. Res. 91; and H. Res. 863–865, were introduced.

Pages H1189–90

Additional Cosponsors:

Pages H1191–92

Reports Filed: Reports were filed today as follows:

H.R. 315, to amend the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 to authorize partnerships between States and nongovernmental entities for the purpose of reclaiming and restoring land and water resources adversely affected by coal mining activities before August 3, 1977, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 116–404);

H.R. 3399, to amend the Nutria Eradication and Control Act of 2003 to include California in the

program, and for other purposes, with an amendment (H. Rept. 116–405);

Select Committee on the Modernization of Congress. Recommendations to Improve Transparency in the U.S. House of Representatives (H. Rept. 116–406);

Select Committee on the Modernization of Congress. Recommendations to Streamline House Human Resources, Overhaul the Onboarding Process, Improve Member Continuing Education Opportunities, Modernize House Technology, and Improve Accessibility (H. Rept. 116–407); and

Select Committee on the Modernization of Congress. Recommendations to Encourage Civility and Bipartisanship in Congress, Streamline Processes and Save Taxpayer Dollars, and Increase the Quality of Constituent Communication (H. Rept. 116–408).

Page H1189

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein she appointed Representative Gomez to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H1173**

Guest Chaplain: The prayer was offered by the Guest Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, Chaplain, United States Senate, Washington, DC. **Page H1173**

Recess: The House recessed at 2:08 p.m. and reconvened at 4:15 p.m. **Page H1174**

Suspensions: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measures:

Gold Star Spouses and Spouses of Injured Servicemembers Leasing Relief Expansion Act: H.R. 2227, amended, to amend the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act to authorize spouses of servicemembers who incur a catastrophic injury or illness or die while in military service to terminate leases of premises and motor vehicles; **Pages H1174–75**

Agreed to amend the title so as to read: “To amend the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act to clarify the authority of servicemembers who incur a catastrophic injury or illness while in military service to terminate leases of premises and motor vehicles, and for other purposes.”; **Page H1175**

Legal Services for Homeless Veterans Act: H.R. 3749, amended, to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to make grants to entities that provide legal services for homeless veterans and veterans at risk for homelessness; **Pages H1176–79**

VA Reporting Transparency Act: H.R. 4613, amended, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to establish and maintain a website of the Department that allows the public to obtain electronic copies of certain legislatively requested reports of the Department of Veterans Affairs; and **Pages H1179–80**

Protecting Business Opportunities for Veterans Act: H.R. 561, amended, to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the oversight of contracts awarded by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to small business concerns owned and controlled by veterans. **Pages H1180–82**

Suspension—Proceedings Postponed: The House debated the following measure under suspension of the rules. Further proceedings were postponed.

G.I. and Veterans Education Empowerment Act: H.R. 4852, to amend title 38, United States Code, to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to make available to veterans certain additional information about postsecondary educational institutions. **Pages H1175–76**

Presidential Messages: Read a message from the President wherein he notified Congress that the national emergency with respect to Ukraine that was

declared in Executive Order 13660 of March 6, 2014 is to continue in effect beyond March 6, 2020—referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed (H. Doc. 116–102). **Page H1182**

Read a message from the President wherein he notified Congress that the national emergency with respect to Cuba that was declared on March 1, 1996, in Proclamation 6867, as amended by Proclamation 7757 on February 26, 2004, Proclamation 9398 on February 24, 2016, and Proclamation 9699 on February 22, 2018, is to continue in effect beyond March 1, 2020—referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed (H. Doc. 116–103). **Page H1182**

Senate Referral: S. 995 was held at the desk.

Senate Message: Message received from the Senate by the Clerk and subsequently presented to the House today appears on pages H1173–74.

Quorum Calls—Votes: There were no Yea and Nay votes, and there were no Recorded votes. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 2 p.m. and adjourned at 5:49 p.m.

Committee Meetings

No hearings were held.

Joint Meetings

IMPROVING FAMILY STABILITY

Joint Economic Committee: Committee concluded a hearing to examine improving family stability for the wellbeing of American children, after receiving testimony from Kay Hymowitz, Manhattan Institute, New York, New York; W. Bradford Wilcox, University of Virginia, Charlottesville; Betsey Stevenson, University of Michigan Gerald R. Ford School of Public Policy, Ann Arbor; and Rashawn Ray, The Brookings Institution, Washington, D.C.

DAV LEGISLATIVE PRESENTATION

Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Committee concluded a joint hearing with the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs to examine the legislative presentation of the Disabled American Veterans, after receiving testimony from Stephen Whitehead, Jim Marszalek, Joy J. Ilem, Randy Reese, J. Marc Burgess, Barry A. Jesinoski, Dan Clare, and Diane J. Franz, all of Disabled American Veterans, Washington, D.C.

**COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR WEDNESDAY,
FEBRUARY 26, 2020**

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: to hold a joint hearing with the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs to examine the legislative presentation of multiple veterans service organizations, 2 p.m., SD–G50.

House

Committee on Agriculture, Subcommittee on Conservation and Forestry, hearing entitled “Innovative Wood Products: Promoting Rural Economies and Healthy Forests”, 10 a.m., 1300 Longworth.

Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies, budget hearing on the Department of Health and Human Services, 9:30 a.m., 2358–C Rayburn.

Subcommittee on the Department of Homeland Security, budget hearing on the Department of Homeland Security, 10:30 a.m., 2359 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Financial Services and General Government, budget hearing on the Judiciary Department, 2 p.m., 2362–A Rayburn.

Subcommittee on the Department of Homeland Security, hearing entitled “Member Day”, 2:30 p.m., 2008 Rayburn.

Committee on Armed Services, Full Committee, hearing entitled “The Fiscal Year 2021 National Defense Authorization Budget Request from the Department of Defense”, 10 a.m., 2118 Rayburn.

Committee on Education and Labor, Subcommittee on Workforce Protections, hearing entitled “Asleep at the Switch: How the Department of Labor Failed to Oversee the Black Lung Disability Trust Fund”, 2 p.m., 2175 Rayburn.

Committee on Energy and Commerce, Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, hearing entitled “In the Dark: Lack of Transparency in the Live Event Ticketing Industry”, 10 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Health, hearing entitled “The Fiscal Year 2021 HHS Budget and Oversight of the Coronavirus Outbreak”, 1 p.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Committee on Homeland Security, Subcommittee on Intelligence and Counterterrorism, hearing entitled “Confronting the Rise in Anti-Semitic Domestic Terrorism, Part II”, 2 p.m., 310 Cannon.

Committee on the Judiciary, Full Committee, markup on legislation on the USA FREEDOM Reauthorization Act of 2020; H.R. 2733, the “Savanna’s Act”; H.R. 2438, the

“Not Invisible Act of 2019”; and legislation on the Strengthening the Opposition to Female Genital Mutilation Act, 2:30 p.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Committee on Natural Resources, Full Committee, hearing on H.R. 5435, the “American Public Lands and Waters Climate Solution Act of 2019”; and H.R. 5859, the “Trillion Trees Act”, 10 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

Subcommittee for Indigenous Peoples of the United States, hearing entitled “Destroying Sacred Sites and Erasing Tribal Culture: The Trump Administration’s Construction of the Border Wall”, 2 p.m., 1324 Longworth.

Committee on Oversight and Reform, Full Committee, hearing entitled “Voter Suppression in Minority Communities: Learning from the Past to Protect Our Future”, 11 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Committee on Rules, Full Committee, hearing on H.R. 2339, the “Reversing the Youth Tobacco Epidemic Act of 2019” [Protecting American Lungs and Reversing the Youth Tobacco Epidemic Act of 2020], 4 p.m., H–313 Capitol.

Committee on Small Business, Full Committee, hearing entitled “A Discussion with SBA Administrator Jovita Carranza: Current Issues and the FY2021 Budget”, 11:30 a.m., 2360 Rayburn.

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Full Committee, markup on amending Committee rules; approving revised membership and leadership of the Subcommittee on Economic Development, Public Buildings, and Emergency Management; Fiscal Year 2021 Budget Views and Estimates of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure; H. Con. Res. 90, authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the National Peace Officers Memorial Service and the National Honor Guard and Pipe Band Exhibition; H.R. 4470, to rename the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation the Great Lakes St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation; H.R. 5756, the “Resiliency Enhancement Act of 2020”; H.R. 2914, the “Housing Survivors of Major Disasters Act of 2019”; H.R. 5912, the “Expedited Delivery of Airport Infrastructure Act of 2020”; legislation on the Preventing Disaster Revictimization Act; and General Service Administration’s Capital Investment and Leasing Program Resolutions, 10 a.m., 2167 Rayburn.

Committee on Ways and Means, Full Committee, hearing entitled “U.S.-China Trade and Competition”, 10:30 a.m., 1100 Longworth.

Joint Meetings

Joint Hearing: Senate Committee on Veterans’ Affairs, to hold a joint hearing with the House Committee on Veterans’ Affairs to examine the legislative presentation of multiple veterans service organizations, 2 p.m., SD–G50.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

9:30 a.m., Thursday, February 27

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

10 a.m., Wednesday, February 26

Senate Chamber

Program for Thursday: Senate will resume consideration of the nomination of Travis Greaves, of the District of Columbia, to be a Judge of the United States Tax Court, and vote on confirmation of the nomination at 1:45 p.m.

House Chamber

Program for Wednesday: Consideration of measures under suspension of the Rules.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Banks, Jim, Ind., E204
 Bergman, Jack, Mich., E209
 Brooks, Susan W., Ind., E204
 Brownley, Julia, Calif., E201
 Carson, André, Ind., E206
 Cartwright, Matt, Pa., E202, E207
 Cook, Paul, Calif., E202, E204, E207, E209
 Costa, Jim, Calif., E202

Davis, Susan A., Calif., E208
 DeFazio, Peter A., Ore., E208
 DeSaulnier, Mark, Calif., E206
 Dingell, Debbie, Mich., E205, E208, E209
 Gaetz, Matt, Fla., E206
 Jackson Lee, Sheila, Tex., E209, E212
 Joyce, John, Pa., E204
 Katko, John, N.Y., E204
 Kelly, Trent, Miss., E201
 Kinzinger, Adam, Ill., E207

Miller, Carol D., W.Va. E201
 Norton, Eleanor Holmes, The District of Columbia, E205
 Ryan, Tim, Ohio, E203
 Simpson, Michael K., Idaho, E206
 Smith, Jason, Mo., E202
 Spano, Ross, Fla., E202, E203, E207
 Stefanik, Elise M., N.Y., E203, E207
 Stevens, Haley M., Mich., E203
 Westerman, Bruce, Ark., E201



Congressional Record

printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through the U.S. Government Publishing Office, at www.govinfo.gov, free of charge to the user. The information is updated online each day the *Congressional Record* is published. For more information, contact the GPO Customer Contact Center, U.S. Government Publishing Office. Phone 202-512-1800, or 866-512-1800 (toll-free). E-Mail, contactcenter@gpo.gov. ¶To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 979050, St. Louis, MO 63197-9000, or phone orders to 866-512-1800 (toll-free), 202-512-1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202-512-2104. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Publishing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.

The *Congressional Record* (USPS 087-390). The Periodicals postage is paid at Washington, D.C. The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are