United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 115th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 164 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JULY 10, 2018 *No. 115*

House of Representatives

The House met at noon and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
July 10, 2018.

I hereby appoint the Honorable FRANCIS ROONEY to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

PAUL D. RYAN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 8, 2018, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties. All time shall be equally allocated between the parties, and in no event shall debate continue beyond 1:50 p.m. Each Member, other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip, shall be limited to 5 minutes.

AMERICA'S PEACE CORPS VOLUNTEERS—OUR AMBASSADORS ABROAD

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, America's Peace Corps volunteers are our angels abroad. They represent the very best about America. They give years of their lives to help people they have never met in some of the most remote areas of the world.

Often this means putting their own safety at risk, expecting the United States to have their backs. But right now we are not doing enough to protect them while they are overseas. This will change with the Sam Farr and Nick Castle Peace Corps Reform Act sponsored by myself and JOE KENNEDY of Massachusetts.

Many returning volunteers, like Sara Thompson, struggle to receive the medical care they need while they are in a foreign country. Sara's troubles began when the Peace Corps prescribed a medication called mefloquine to protect her from malaria. But during her service in Burkina Faso, she began to have horrific nightmares and struggled with her mental health. When she turned to the Peace Corps for help, the medical officer excused her symptoms by simply saying: You are not adjusting well.

The nausea and nightmares continued. With no support from the Peace Corps, she started to research the problems. It was then she realized the malaria medicine the Peace Corps had given her was making her sick. But today she still deals with these medical issues and feels abandoned by our Peace Corps.

Peace Corps volunteer Nick Castle died in rural China after an inefficient, under-equipped, and unresponsive Peace Corps-led medical team made gross mistakes in treating his illness.

The Sam Farr and Nick Castle Peace Corps Reform Act establishes criteria for in-country medical doctors and ensures that they have the resources they need to take care of our volunteers. Giving our volunteers the best medical care possible is an absolute necessity when they are serving America.

There is more. A brave volunteer told me recently about the daily sexual harassment she experienced while she served overseas. In broad daylight, men would grope and threaten her as she walked home from school. One afternoon at the market, the cashier threatened to break into her house in the middle of the night and sexually assault her. So she reported this to the Peace Corps, and they assured her that these men were just joking. No surprise, the harassment continued.

Finally, she made the decision to return to America. She could no longer bear the constant hostile environment. The Peace Corps recorded her reason for leaving as difficulty in adapting to the culture. In other words, the sexual assaults were her fault.

Are you kidding me?

Sexual assault and harassment should never be excused as joking and should never be brushed off as a cultural norm.

Mr. Speaker, as a former judge and co-chairman of the Victims' Rights Caucus, I would point out that sexual assault is never the fault of the victim.

This bill creates new trainings and safeguards to protect volunteers from sexual assault and harassment. It also makes the Office of Victim Advocacy a permanent establishment.

Then there is Peace Corps volunteer Jennifer Mamola. Early one morning, Jennifer was walking with two friends to a bus stop. Out of nowhere, a drunk driver ran into them. One volunteer was killed. Both of Jennifer's legs were broken. So she returned home to America still bedridden and loaded on pain medication. She faced an uphill battle of endless bureaucracy to receive treatment and surgeries. After months of fighting government bureaucrats, she was finally granted treatment.

Far too often volunteers fall between the cracks and are forced to pay exorbitant medical bills out of pocket until the Department of Labor decides to cover their medical situation. So this bill would provide medical coverage to returning volunteers while they wait for the Department of Labor to give them the medical benefits they deserve.

The changes in this bill will go a long way in keeping our volunteers safe.

Printed on recycled paper.

The bill provides Peace Corps volunteers critical information regarding the country that they are going to serve in. It also requires the Peace Corps to provide volunteers with access to medical doctors while they are overseas. And it makes the Sexual Assault Advisory Council and Office of Victims' Advocacy permanent. It also extends volunteers' medical benefits upon their return home until their coverage kicks in from the Department of Labor.

Mr. Speaker, we must not continue to send our volunteers out into the world without adequate protections against harm. Give them a qualified medical doctor, and we must have an effective healthcare system to take care of them when they return. Our government should fight for our Peace Corps volunteers, not fight against them.

And that is just the way it is.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 6 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BANKS of Indiana) at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

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

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

Bless the Members of this people's House with wisdom and the courage to address the pressing difficulties of our time. You know each one personally, through and through, and how they relate with one another.

Help them to know You. Impel them by Your spirit to act justly and walk humbly with You. May their actions and those of our government be marked by kindness and decency, especially toward those who are most vulnerable among us.

Inspire all of our citizens, as well, to look first to their blessings, and then charitably, to the work of this people's House. Each Member chooses to serve another day; may each serve with honor and merit the appreciation of those whom they serve.

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

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 gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. FOXX 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.

NATO: BELLY UP TO THE BAR

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this week President Trump will join our allies for the important NATO summit. At the top of this list must be countering Russia's aggression and imperialism against our allies and the U.S.

But to achieve this, everyone must contribute to the cause. Of the 29 nations within NATO, only 8 members—including the United States—are meeting the 2 percent of GDP pledge for defense spending.

For years, there has been a historical problem of excuses made for noncompliance by some of our NATO allies. President Trump is right to bluntly encourage our friends to meet their obligations to deter Czar Putin.

Neighbors in Texas ask me: Why does the United States spend more money defending some European countries than the countries do themselves?

Fair question.

Mr. Speaker, I support NATO, but our NATO allies would do well to stop criticizing the U.S. commitment to NATO and, rather, fully fulfill their commitment to our mutual defense. It is time to belly up to the bar and pay their share.

And that is just the way it is.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the 29 countries and whether they are meeting their 2 percent guideline or not.

NATO MEMBERS MEETING 2% GUIDELINE

1. United States
2. United Kingdom
3. Greece
4. Estonia
5. Poland
6. Lithuania
7. Latvia
8. Romania

NATO MEMBERS NOT MEETING THE 2% GUIDELINE

1. Albania
2. Belgium
3. Bulgaria
4. Canada
5. Croatia
6. Czech Republic
7. Denmark
8. France
9. Germany
10. Hungary
11. Italy
12. Luxembourg
13. Montenegro
14. Netherlands
15. Norway
16. Portugal
17. Slovak Republic
18. Slovenia
19. Spain
20. Turkey

REUNITE IMMIGRANT FAMILIES

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

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, a Federal court has ordered the Trump administration to reunite every child under 5 years old who is separated from his or her family by today. Unfortunately, the Trump administration has no plan for family reunifications and will fail to reunite as many as half of those children who were taken from their parents. This is completely unacceptable.

Last week I visited some of those young children, one who looked about 6 months old and many who were 3 and 4. At the facility I visited, caseworkers there were calling detention facilities around the country to locate those parents. They had to call the facilities to try to find the parents. Many of them did.

But it is clear that the administration had no plan other than to separate these kids from their parents as a tactic to try to dissuade people who are seeking shelter from violence from coming to the United States. Shame on them.

This will be a dark period in our history. It is a sad day.

RECOGNIZING BETTY WALKER

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize Betty Walker of Roaring Gap, North Carolina. This remarkable and talented woman has been the coordinator for the Alleghany Memorial Hospital Thrift Shop for 15 years.

Betty began volunteering at the Thrift Shop in 2000 and became coordinator in 2003. During her time as coordinator, Betty has expanded and renovated the Thrift Shop in addition to managing its volunteers.

The Alleghany Memorial Hospital Thrift Shop opened in 1991 and has raised nearly $1 million for Alleghany Memorial Hospital. Those funds are extremely important in this small county.

In 2011, Betty and the shop's volunteers received the Governor's Award for Volunteer Service, which recognizes the top 20 volunteers in North Carolina.

Betty Walker is an extremely dedicated volunteer, a role model for us all, and a pillar in her community. Alleghany County is fortunate to call this hardworking citizen one of its own.

MAVNI AND COMBATING LEGAL IMMIGRATION

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

Mr. CORREA. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to pose a simple question: What is merit-based immigration? Because it would seem that we have a different interpretation from that of our President.

Panshu Zhao came to this country legally and joined the Army while pursuing a Ph.D. He came to our country to be an American and to contribute to the greatness of our Nation just like other generations before all of us. He is one of the more than 10,000 legal immigrants offered a chance to become a citizen through service and sacrifice.

These legal immigrants enlist in our Armed Forces with vital skills. They have education, they are meritorious, and they are needed. But this administration has now made going after legal immigrants one of its primary goals.

When they threaten to deport doctors in the Army, the administration is going after legal immigrants. When ICE arrests green card holders over minor charges in their distant past, they are going after legal immigrants.

If a soldier pursuing a Ph.D. does not qualify for merit-based immigration, then who does?

HONORING STATE REPRESENTATIVE RON LOLLAR

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

Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of my good friend, Tennessee State Representative Ron Lollar, who passed away on July 6, 2018, at the age of 69.

Ron valiantly served his country as a United States marine in the Vietnam war, receiving accolades, including the Vietnam Gallantry Cross and the Good Conduct Medal.

Ron also served multiple terms on the Shelby County School Board and was a strong advocate for education and agriculture as a member of the Tennessee House of Representatives.

To his wife, Brenda, and their three children: I hope you take comfort in the memories of Ron and the legacy he leaves behind. May his lifelong service to our local community, to Tennessee, and to the United States never be forgotten.

We will miss you.

SUPREME COURT NOMINEES

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

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I represent the Eighth Congressional District in Maryland, and I want to give you a tale of two of my constituents.

One is Merrick Garland of Bethesda, the chief judge of the D.C. Court of Appeals, who was nominated to the Supreme Court in March of 2016. A celebrated judge who had more judicial experience under his belt than anyone ever nominated to the Supreme Court before, a graduate of Harvard College and Harvard Law School, Judge Garland was often described as the most qualified person ever nominated to the Court.

But Senator MCCONNELL and the GOP in the Senate vowed they would have no hearings, no action, and no vote on his nomination because there was an election coming up in 9 months and the people should be heard. This was unprecedented, but, fair enough, if that is the new standard.

Now, I have another constituent, Brett Kavanaugh of Chevy Chase, who serves on the exact same court as Judge Garland does and who has been nominated to the Supreme Court only 4 months before a national election. He is a graduate of Yale College and Yale Law School. But the Senate now says that they are going to speed through hearings and a vote on Judge Kavanaugh's nomination.

Why? Is he better qualified?

Not even Judge Kavanaugh would say that.

Why is it?

We have one-party control of the House, the Senate, the White House, and the Supreme Court. This is nothing but a power play here in Washington. They are doing it simply because they can do it, and it is wrong.

We should have one standard that governs nominations from both parties.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 4 of rule I, the following enrolled bills were signed by Speaker pro tempore MCHENRY on Friday, July 6, 2018:

H.R. 1496, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 3585 South Vermont Avenue in Los Angeles, California, as the ''Marvin Gaye Post Office'';

H.R. 2673, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 514 Broadway Street in Pekin, Illinois, as the ''Lance Corporal Jordan S. Bastean Post Office'';

H.R. 3183, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 13683 James Madison Highway in Palmyra, Virginia, as the ''U.S. Navy Seaman Dakota Kyle Rigsby Post Office'';

H.R. 4301, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 201 Tom Hall Street in Fort Mill, South Carolina, as the ''J. Elliot Williams Post Office Building'';

H.R. 4406, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 99 Macombs Place in New York, New York, as the ''Tuskegee Airmen Post Office Building'';

H.R. 4463, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 6 Doyers Street in New York, New York, as the ''Mabel Lee Memorial Post Office'';

H.R. 4574, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 108 West Schick Road in Bloomingdale, Illinois, as the ''Bloomingdale Veterans Memorial Post Office Building'';

H.R. 4646, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1900 Corporate Drive in Birmingham, Alabama, as the ''Lance Corporal Thomas E. Rivers, Jr. Post Office Building'';

H.R. 4685, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 515 Hope Street in Bristol, Rhode Island, as the ''First Sergeant P. Andrew McKenna Jr. Post Office'';

H.R. 4722, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 111 Market Street in Saugerties, New York, as the ''Maurice D. Hinchey Post Office Building'';

H.R. 4840, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 567 East Franklin Street in Oviedo, Florida, as the ''Sergeant First Class Alwyn Crendall Cashe Post Office Building''.

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:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, July 10, 2018.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,
The Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. 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 July 10, 2018, at 12:12 p.m.:

Appointment:

Commission on Social Impact Partnerships.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 11 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1430

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BANKS of Indiana) at 2 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

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.

TRANSPORTATION WORKER IDENTIFICATION CREDENTIAL ACCOUNTABILITY ACT OF 2018

Mr. KATKO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5729) to restrict the department in which the Coast Guard is operating from implementing any rule requiring the use of biometric readers for biometric transportation security cards until after submission to Congress of the results of an assessment of the effectiveness of the transportation security card program, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5729

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 ''Transportation Worker Identification Credential Accountability Act of 2018''.

SEC. 2. RESTRICTION ON IMPLEMENTATION OF TRANSPORTATION WORKER IDENTIFICATION CREDENTIAL BIOMETRIC READER RULE.

The department in which the Coast Guard is operating may not implement the rule entitled ''Transportation Worker Identification Credential (TWIC)–Reader Requirements'' (81 Fed. Reg. 57651), and may not propose or issue a notice of proposed rulemaking for any revision to such rule except to extend its effective date, or for any other rule requiring the use of biometric readers for biometric transportation security cards under section 70105(k)(3) of title 46, United States Code, before the end of the 60-day period beginning on the date of the submission under paragraph (5) of section 1(b) of Public Law 114–278 (130 Stat. 1411 to 1412) of the results of the assessment required by that section.

SEC. 3. PROGRESS UPDATES.

Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 90 days thereafter until the submission under paragraph (5) of section 1(b) of Public Law 114–278 (130 Stat. 1411 et seq.) of the results of the assessment required by that section, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall report to the Committee on Homeland Security and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate regarding the implementation of that section.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. KATKO) and the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. KATKO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 5729, as amended.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, to comply with the Maritime Transportation Security Act of 2002 and the Security and Accountability for Every Port Act of 2006, the Coast Guard is establishing rules requiring electronic readers for use at high-risk vessel facilities.

The intent of the rule is to ensure that, prior to being granted unescorted access to a designated secure area, an individual will have his or her Transportation Worker Identification Credential, or TWIC, authenticated.

The Coast Guard issued a proposed rule to this effect in March 2013. The proposed rule limited the scope of the TWIC authentication requirements at facilities to secure areas that handle certain dangerous cargos in bulk through a vessel-to-facility interface. This was consistent with existing Coast Guard policy.

Industry commented on the proposed rule, and the Coast Guard also held four public meetings across the country and worked with the Transportation Security Administration to conduct a pilot program.

The Coast Guard issued its final rule in August of 2016, with an implementation date of August 23, 2018. The service noted that the final rule made a number of changes from the proposed rule, including flexibility with regard to purchase, installation, and use of electronic readers; clarifying that the rule only affects risk group A vessels and facilities; and eliminating the distinction between risk group B and C for both vessels and facilities.

However, industry was surprised by the expanded scope of the final rule where facility areas subject to the TWIC reader requirement went beyond what was included in the proposed rule and regulatory analysis accompanying that rule.

The Coast Guard has acknowledged the discrepancy between the proposed and final rules. To date, the service has not been able to identify any security benefits to the expanded scope of the final rule or definitively state how it will address industry concerns.

The Office of Management and Budget recently completed its review of a proposed rule to delay the implementation date of the TWIC reader requirements. The text of the proposed rule was released on June 22, 2018, 2 months prior to the implementation date.

Unfortunately, the rule proposed only partially addresses industry concerns. It delays implementation of the requirements until August 23, 2021, for two categories of facilities that handle certain dangerous cargo in bulk but do not transfer it. However, for facilities and vessels that handle certain dangerous cargo in bulk and transfer that cargo to or from a vessel or from facilities that receive large passenger vessels, the final rule requirements go into effect on August 23, 2018.

Industry has been involved and willing to address security concerns, but facilities should not have to bear the burden of implementing a final rule proposal that has not yet been fully vetted to understand the impacts of the requirements.

H.R. 5729 requires the Secretary to submit to Congress the comprehensive security assessment of the transportation security card program, as required in section 1(b) of Public Law 114–278, before implementation of its final rule. Doing so will provide Congress and stakeholders further information on any deficiencies in the effectiveness of the program.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5729, the Transportation Worker Identification Credential Accountability Act of 2018.

Since 2002, when Congress passed the Maritime Transportation Security Act, problems have beset the Transportation Worker Identification Credential card, or TWIC card, as it is called, a maritime security credential.

Since its inception, concerns and questions about the reliability of background check information, the efficacy of fraud detection capabilities, and the relatively high cost of the credential have been persistent shortfalls that the Department of Homeland Security has never gotten right.

As explained by the bill's sponsor, the Coast Guard issued a flawed final rule in 2016 for the use of TWIC card biometric readers at high-risk maritime facilities. The Coast Guard issued this rule despite Congress directing the Department of Homeland Security in 2016 to conduct a ''top-to-bottom'' review of the effectiveness of the entire TWIC program.

If there was ever an example of the left hand not knowing what the right hand was doing, the issuance of this reader rule was it. Considering the history and pattern of mismanagement of TWIC credentials, I agree with the purpose of this legislation. It makes prudent sense to put a hold on any new TWIC rulemaking until such time that the Department of Homeland Security completes its effectiveness review as required by Congress.

Ensuring the security of high-risk maritime facilities remains a vitally important homeland security priority. If the TWIC card is not up to the task, it is best for Congress to understand why and how the deficiencies might best be resolved.

On the other hand, if it is determined that the best course of action is to abandon the TWIC card, we need to evaluate alternative security measures that might fill the gap immediately.

I urge my colleagues to join me and support this noncontroversial legislation.

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

Mr. KATKO. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the comments of my colleague from the District of Columbia.

H.R. 5729 is a very straightforward bill. It fixes something that needs to be fixed quickly, and I urge Members to support it.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. KATKO) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5729, 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.

IMPROVING INVESTMENT RESEARCH FOR SMALL AND EMERGING ISSUERS ACT

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 6139) to require the Securities and Exchange Commission to carry out a study to evaluate the issues affecting the provision of and reliance upon investment research into small issuers.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 6139

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 ''Improving Investment Research for Small and Emerging Issuers Act''.

SEC. 2. RESEARCH STUDY.

(a) STUDY REQUIRED.—The Securities and Exchange Commission shall conduct a study to evaluate the issues affecting the provision of and reliance upon investment research into small issuers, including emerging growth companies and companies considering initial public offerings.

(b) CONTENTS OF STUDY.—The study required under subsection (a) shall consider—

(1) factors related to the demand for such research by institutional and retail investors;

(2) the availability of such research, including—

(A) the number and types of firms who provide such research;

(B) the volume of such research over time; and

(C) competition in the research market;

(3) conflicts of interest relating to the production and distribution of investment research;

(4) the costs of such research;

(5) the impacts of different payment mechanisms for investment research into small issuers, including whether such research is paid for by—

(A) hard-dollar payments from research clients;

(B) payments directed from the client's commission income (i.e., ''soft dollars''); or

(C) payments from the issuer that is the subject of such research;

(6) any unique challenges faced by minority-owned, women-owned, and veteran-owned small issuers in obtaining research coverage; and

(7) the impact on the availability of research coverage for small issuers due to—

(A) investment adviser concentration and consolidation, including any potential impacts of fund-size on demand for investment research of small issuers;

(B) broker and dealer concentration and consolidation, including any relationships between the size of the firm and allocation of resources for investment research into small issuers;

(C) Securities and Exchange Commission rules;

(D) registered national securities association rules;

(E) State and Federal liability concerns;

(F) the settlement agreements referenced in Securities and Exchange Commission Litigation Release No. 18438 (i.e., the ''Global Research Analyst Settlement''); and

(G) Directive 2014/65/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 15 May 2014 on markets in financial instruments and amending Directive 2002/92/EC and Directive 2011/61/EU, as implemented by the European Union (''EU'') member states (''MiFID II'').

(c) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Securities and Exchange Commission shall submit to Congress a report that includes—

(1) the results of the study required by subsection (a); and

(2) recommendations to increase the demand for, volume of, and quality of investment research into small issuers, including emerging growth companies and companies considering initial public offerings.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MAXINE WATERS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KATKO). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, initial public offerings, or IPOs, have historically been one of the most meaningful steps in the lifecycle of a company.

Going public was the ultimate goal for many entrepreneurs. You start a business from scratch, build it into a successful enterprise, and then open up an opportunity for the public to share in your success. Going public not only affords companies many benefits, including access to the capital markets, but IPOs are also important to the investing public. By completing an IPO, a company is able to raise much-needed capital for job creation and expansion opportunities, while allowing Main Street investors an opportunity to have an economic piece of the action and the ability to participate in the growth phase of a company.

However, over the past two decades, our Nation has experienced a 37 percent decline in the number of U.S.-listed companies. Equally troubling, we have seen the number of public companies fall to around 5,700. These statistics are concerning because they are similar to the data we saw in the 1980s when our economy was less than half of its current size.

For a myriad of reasons, the public model is no longer viewed as the most attractive means of raising capital. Instead, small and emerging growth companies are choosing to go public much later in their lifecycle or, frankly, choosing not to go public at all.

We must work to change that trajectory, in my mind. In speaking to the New York Economic Club, SEC Chairman Jay Clayton stated: ''Regardless of the cause, the reduction in the number of U.S.-listed public companies is a serious issue for our markets and the country more generally. To the extent companies are eschewing our public markets, the vast majority of Main Street investors will be unable to participate in their growth. The potential lasting effects of such an outcome to the economy and society are, in two words, not good.''

That is from SEC Chairman Jay Clayton.

I share Chairman Clayton's concerns. We need to ensure that our capital markets are open for innovators and job creators, and we must work to rightsize regulations for smaller companies as well.

One way that Congress worked to lift burdensome regulations and help small companies gain access to these capital markets was the bipartisan Jumpstart Our Business Startups Act, commonly known as the JOBS Act. Section 105 of the JOBS Act changed the ''gun-jumping rules'' to provide an exception from the definition of an offer to allow for the publication or distribution by a broker or dealer of a research report about an emerging growth company that is the subject of a proposed public offering.

However, few investment banks have published any pre-IPO research since passage of the JOBS Act, and research coverage, in general, on small issuers continues to be an issue. This negatively affects investor interest and awareness in a company as well as its trading liquidity and, therefore, does not allow the company to launch the way that it properly could.

□ 1445

This provision is intended to increase research, but, unfortunately, it has had the opposite effect, and, instead, there has been a significant decline—we have seen a significant decline over recent years in analyst research covering small public companies.

According to the U.S. Chamber, ''61 percent of all companies listed on a major exchange with less than $100 million market capitalization have no research coverage at all.''

For equities with a market cap below $750 million, the average number of research analysts covering that stock is one, while equities above $750 million

in market cap have an average of 12 research analysts covering the stock.

Additionally, the amount of research written on small companies has declined even as the percentage of individual ownership in small cap companies has gone up, has increased. Little or no research coverage generally corresponds with lower stock liquidity, and reduced research coverage may particularly be disadvantageous to individual investors who have limited research capabilities on their own.

In fact, one study published in June of 2017 in The Journal of Finance found that an increase in the number of analysts covering an industry improved the quality of analyst forecasts and information flow to investors. For that reason, it is important to examine current SEC rules and regulations affecting the ability of investment research coverage regarding these small issuers.

The Treasury report on Capital Markets recommended a holistic review of the rules and regulations regarding research, including the global settlement, to determine which provisions should be retained, amended, or removed.

Our bipartisan bill, the Improving Investment Research for Small and Emerging Issuers Act would direct the SEC to study and evaluate issues affecting the ability of emerging growth companies and other small issuers in obtaining research coverage, including SEC rules, FINRA rules, State and Federal liability concerns, the 2003 Global Research Analyst Settlements, and MiFID II.

And not later than 180 days after enactment of that, the SEC will be required to submit to Congress a report that includes the results of the study and recommendations to assist these emerging growth companies, or EGCs, and other small issuers to obtain research coverage.

Among the issues the SEC must consider are factors related to the demand for such research by institutional and retail investors, cost considerations for such research, and the impact on the availability of research coverage for small issuers due to a variety of market and regulatory conditions.

The SEC's report must include recommendations to increase the demand for, volume of, and quality of investment research into small issuers, including EGCs. This legislation is supported by Biotechnology Industry Organization, also known as BIO; the U.S. Chamber of Commerce; Nasdaq; the Securities Industry and Financial Markets Association, also known as SIFMA; and the National Venture Capital Association.

I thank the ranking member, Ms. WATERS, for recognizing the importance of this research in our capital markets and working with me to address this issue and being a cosponsor of this.

So I urge all of my colleagues to support this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 6139, the Improving Investment Research for Small and Emerging Issuers Act.

I first would like to thank Mr. HUIZENGA for working with me to develop a bipartisan approach to identifying and addressing gaps in investment research coverage for small issuers.

Investment research helps to raise investor awareness, understanding, and interest about a company, which can, in turn, promote liquidity and overall trading in the company's securities. Unfortunately, research of small public companies has been on the decline in recent years.

According to a report from Capital IQ, nearly two-thirds of companies with less than $100 million in market capitalization have no research coverage at all. At a recent Capital Markets, Securities, and Investment Subcommittee hearing, Tyler Gellasch, executive director of the Healthy Markets Association, testified about some of the factors contributing to low research coverage of small issuers.

According to Mr. Gellasch, one such factor is the bundling of research and execution services by investment banks, which ''increases cost for investors and competitively disadvantages smaller independent research providers versus their larger peers.''

H.R. 6139 directs the SEC to study competition in the research market and other factors affecting the availability of research coverage for small issuers, including emerging growth companies and companies considering an initial public offering. It also directs SEC to consider any unique challenges faced by minority women and veteran-owned businesses in obtaining research coverage.

Finally, the bill directs the SEC to report its findings to Congress within 6 months, along with recommendations to improve the quality and availability of investment research for small issuers. This bipartisan effort will help identify the barriers small businesses face when attempting to get their story out to investors in our public capital markets.

I would urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Speaker, I want to, again, thank the ranking member for her work on this and being able to move forward on this very important issue. And I, again, want to encourage all of our friends on all sides, on both sides of the aisle, to be supportive of this. It is a very important thing as we figure out the situation with the IPOs here in the United States.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 6139.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE LARRY DOBY CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL ACT

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1861) to award a Congressional Gold Medal in honor of Lawrence Eugene ''Larry'' Doby in recognition of his achievements and contributions to American major league athletics, civil rights, and the Armed Forces during World War II.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1861

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 ''The Larry Doby Congressional Gold Medal Act''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) Larry Doby was born in Camden, South Carolina, on December 13, 1923, and moved to Paterson, New Jersey, in 1938, where he became a standout 4 sport athlete at Paterson Eastside High School;

(2) Larry Doby attended Long Island University on a basketball scholarship before enlisting in the United States Navy during World War II;

(3) upon his honorable discharge from the Navy in 1946, Larry Doby played baseball in the Negro National League for the Newark Eagles;

(4) after playing the 1946 season, Larry Doby's contract was purchased by the Cleveland Indians of the American League on July 3, 1947;

(5) on July 5, 1947, Larry Doby became the first African-American to play in the American League;

(6) Larry Doby played in the American League for 13 years, appearing in 1,533 games and batting .283, with 253 home runs and 970 runs batted in;

(7) Larry Doby was voted to 7 All-Star teams, led the American League in home runs twice, and played in 2 World Series;

(8) in 1948, Larry Doby helped lead the Cleveland Indians to a World Series Championship over the Boston Braves and became the first African-American player to hit a home run in a World Series game;

(9) after his stellar playing career ended, Larry Doby continued to make a significant contribution to his community;

(10) Larry Doby was a pioneer in the cause of civil rights and received honorary doctorate degrees from Long Island University, Princeton University, and Fairfield University;

(11) in 1978, Larry Doby became the manager of the Chicago White Sox, only the second African-American manager of a Major League Baseball team;

(12) Larry Doby was the Director of Community Relations for the New Jersey Nets of the National Basketball Association, where he was deeply involved in a number of inner-city youth programs; and

(13) Larry Doby was inducted to the National Baseball Hall of Fame in 1998.

SEC. 3. CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL.

(a) PRESENTATION AUTHORIZED.—The Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President pro tempore of the Senate shall make appropriate arrangements for the presentation, on behalf of Congress, of a gold medal of appropriate design, in honor of Larry Doby and in recognition of his achievements and contributions to American major league athletics, civil rights, and the Armed Forces during World War II.

(b) DESIGN AND STRIKING.—For the purpose of the presentation referred to in subsection (a), the Secretary of the Treasury (referred to in this Act as the ''Secretary'') shall strike a gold medal with suitable emblems, devices, and inscriptions to be determined by the Secretary.

(c) TRANSFER OF MEDAL AFTER PRESENTATION.—Following the presentation of the gold medal in honor of Larry Doby pursuant to subsection (a), the gold medal shall be given to his son, Larry Doby, Jr.

SEC. 4. DUPLICATE MEDALS.

The Secretary may strike and sell duplicates in bronze of the gold medal struck pursuant to section 2 under such regulations as the Secretary may prescribe, at a price sufficient to cover the cost thereof, including labor, materials, dies, use of machinery, and overhead expenses, and the cost of the gold medal.

SEC. 5. STATUS OF MEDALS.

(a) NATIONAL MEDALS.—The medals struck under this Act are national medals for purposes of chapter 51 of title 31, United States Code.

(b) NUMISMATIC ITEMS.—For purposes of sections 5134 and 5136 of title 31, United States Code, all medals struck under this Act shall be considered to be numismatic items.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MAXINE WATERS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous materials on this bill.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RENACCI).

Mr. RENACCI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge support for H.R. 1861, the Larry Doby Congressional Gold Medal Act.

Over the last 2 years, my good friend and colleague, Representative BILL PASCRELL, and I have had the privilege of sharing the inspirational story of Larry Doby with our friends and colleagues in the House of Representatives. Through those conversations, more than 290 Members of the House agreed that Larry Doby deserved to be awarded the Congressional Gold Medal, the highest civilian award that Congress can award.

Larry Doby's legacy is one known well to northeast Ohio and to Clevelanders, but it is one that is often overshadowed by the great Jackie Robinson. Doby himself was a pioneer in the civil rights movement, breaking the color barrier in professional sports, and becoming the first African American to play in the American League.

As the Baseball Hall of Fame states, Doby suffered the same indignities as Jackie Robinson, but his struggles did not get the media attention Robinson received. Whether it was being forced to stay in separate hotels or eat in separate restaurants on the road or not being accepted by some of his teammates, Doby persevered. In fact, Doby broke the color barrier in the American League just 3 months after Jackie Robinson made his major league debut.

During his professional career, he became the first African American to hit a home run in the World Series, helping lead the Cleveland Indians to the 1948 World Series championship. He appeared in seven all-star games and went on to become only the second African American to become a manager prior to being inducted into the Major League Baseball Hall of Fame in 1998.

Upon his number being retired by the Cleveland Indians, the great Hank Aaron said to Doby: ''I want to thank you for all that you went through, because if it had not been for you, I wouldn't have been able to have the career that I had.''

In addition to that, though, his storied baseball career, Doby also served in the United States Navy during World War II. In fact, Larry Doby took time away from professional sports in order to serve his country, eventually being stationed in the Pacific theater. He was honorably discharged from the military in 1946.

Larry Doby led a humble yet courageous life. His achievements in helping break the color barrier in professional sports make him worthy of the highest civilian award that Congress can offer.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1861, the Larry Doby Congressional Gold Medal Act. Again, I want to thank all of my colleagues who supported this legislation and helped make this day possible. I especially want to thank my great friend, Mr. PASCRELL, for his dedication to recognizing Larry Doby with the Congressional Gold Medal.

I encourage my colleagues to support this legislation.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise today in support of H.R. 1861, legislation to posthumously award the Congressional Gold Medal to Larry Doby in recognition of his athletic and civil rights achievements.

But I must say that we would not be here today but for Mr. PASCRELL, who has been dedicated and committed to the proposition that Larry Doby should be recognized for his tremendous talent and for his tremendous contribution not only to athletics but to civil rights and other efforts that he was involved in.

Larry Doby became the first African American professional baseball player in the American League in July 1947, 3 months after Jackie Robinson had become the first African American professional baseball player in the National League. While the name, Jackie Robinson, is known in almost every American household, Larry Doby did not receive nearly as much media attention, though he is every bit as deserving.

Larry Doby played an integral role in breaking down the color barrier and in integrating the American League. Larry Doby signed with the Cleveland Indians in 1947, and at the time, was not even welcomed by his own teammates, several of whom refused to shake his hand upon meeting him for the first time. Outside of his own team, Doby faced racism and prejudice from opposing players and fans, having to endure racial slurs and death threats.

Despite the adversity he faced, Doby paved the way for countless African American players with dignity and class. In 1948, Doby became one of the first African American players to win a World Series championship when the Indians beat the Boston Braves. In game four of the series, he became the first African American player to hit a home run in World Series history. He also helped the Indians win a franchise record, 111 games, and the American League pennant in 1954, and was the American League RBI leader and home run champion.

After playing with the Indians, Doby had a long and successful baseball career playing with the Chicago White Sox, the Detroit Tigers, and the Dragons before retiring in 1962.

Following his retirement, he served as a manager for various teams and became the second African American manager in the majors with the Chicago White Sox. He also served as a director with the New Jersey Nets in the NBA. In 1998, he was elected to the National Baseball Hall of Fame by the hall's Veterans Committee.

His athletic contributions to major league baseball are, without a doubt, impressive and admirable, but Larry Doby's tenacity, determination, and his role as a pioneer in the face of tremendous hardship to integrate baseball are deserving of the utmost recognition and respect.

I would urge all of my colleagues to join me in passing this legislation to recognize Larry Doby with the Congressional Gold Medal.

And let me just say, more than anybody, I think that my colleague, Mr. PASCRELL, must again be commended and recognized for the fact that he insisted that this should take place, that this gold medal should be presented on behalf of Larry Doby, and so it is because of him that we find ourselves here today.

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

□ 1500

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

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL), the lead Democratic sponsor of this bill, who has been tireless in his efforts to bring this legislation to the floor.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Larry Doby, a sports legend, a pioneer of American civil rights, a man who proudly served his country, and a fellow native of the streets of my hometown, Paterson, New Jersey, where he was a star multisport athlete at Eastside High School, well known for his character.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman HUIZENGA for the work that he did, tirelessly trying to get enough signatures, both last year and this year—a great job—and I know the brothers and sisters in Ohio are very proud of him.

I thank MAXINE WATERS, who made it very, very possible to bring this to the floor today, my deepest, deepest thanks.

Larry Doby served in the United States Navy in the Pacific during World War II. After an honorable discharge in 1946, he returned to New Jersey to pursue his career in baseball with the Newark Eagles after being scouted at Hinchliffe Stadium in Paterson. Hinchliffe Stadium is now in the historic district of Paterson, the same field I played on as a kid, which gave me the delusions of making it to the major leagues—almost, but not quite. We were proud that Larry Doby achieved that greatness.

In 1946, Larry helped the Eagles win the Negro World Series championship over the legendary Satchel Paige—think about that—and the Kansas City Monarchs. Larry Doby hit .372, with one home run, five RBIs, and three stolen bases in that world series.

Many believed Larry Doby would be the first to break Major League Baseball's infamous color barrier, but we know what happened. On April 15, 1947, Jackie Robinson took to the field in Ebbets Field; and on July 5, 1947, Larry Doby integrated the American League with the Cleveland Indians, 71 years ago last week.

Being second did not make his challenge any less difficult or his courage any less remarkable. Larry was also treated to horrible racism. Even some of his teammates shunned him. Larry Doby took that abuse wherever he went.

Imagine that burden. Imagine the courage it would take to stand in front of that every day, and yet he handled the adversity with bottomless strength, poise, and dignity.

There was no interleague play back in 1947 and certainly no ESPN. Baseball fans from American League only areas—like northern Ohio, Michigan, and around Washington, D.C.—would never be able to see Jackie Robinson play. It was Larry Doby who integrated the American League parks.

The poise and courage of Larry Doby was a source of inspiration for so many. I knew his family very well, as well as Larry. He knew it, too. Larry once said: ''I knew being accepted was going to be hard, but I knew I was involved in a situation that was going to bring opportunities to other Blacks.''

Besides being a pioneer, Larry Doby was no slouch on the diamond. He played 13 years. He led the Indians to their last World Series in 1948, and I remind Mr. RENACCI of that point. They are due. He was voted to seven all-star teams. When it was all done, he finished with 253 home runs, nearly a thousand RBIs, and a cool lifetime .283 batting average.

Even when he was retired, Larry Doby continued to break barriers. As Mr. RENACCI pointed out, in 1978, he became manager of the Chicago White Sox. He became only the second African American manager of a major league team.

His play on the field might have been good enough by itself, but for his ability and for his courage, Larry Doby was rightly elected to the National Baseball Hall of Fame in 1998. I made that trip to Cooperstown, as many folks from Ohio and many people from Paterson, New Jersey, did. I was filled with pride watching this product of Paterson ascend to the Parthenon of America's game.

But even after he was finished in baseball, Larry Doby wasn't finished. He continued to make significant contributions to his community. He served as the director of community relations for the National Basketball Association's New Jersey Nets, where he was deeply involved with building several inner-city youth programs. This was a special, special person, Mr. Speaker.

This bipartisan bill would posthumously award Larry Doby with a Congressional Gold Medal, the highest award bestowed by the United States Congress on extraordinary individuals. It is right recognition for Larry Doby's athletic feats, his courageous leadership, the opportunities he created for others, and the inspiration he gave to millions.

H.R. 1861, The Larry Doby Congressional Gold Medal Act, I introduced with my friend Representative JIM RENACCI is a big deal.

I also thank the Senate sponsors of the companion legislation: Senators ROB PORTMAN, ROBERT MENENDEZ, CORY BOOKER, SHERROD BROWN, TIM SCOTT, and LINDSEY GRAHAM.

Since coming to Congress, I have tried to support the legacy of Larry Doby. We passed an act of Congress to name the post office in Paterson after him. We worked hard to make sure he was recognized by the United States Postal Service with a beautiful postage stamp.

We are fortunate to have heroes who inspire us to achieve our best and lead our communities towards positive change. These are uniters in our community, and that is what we need more of. Today, we are proud to recognize Lawrence Eugene Doby as one of those heroes.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I have no additional speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, what an incredible story that we see here.

I, too, want to congratulate both Congressman PASCRELL, as well as Congressman RENACCI for their work on this.

As I was doing a little research and hearing the stories and looking at Wikipedia and some other things, it led to lots of different places. The amazing athleticism of this man was clear—the fact that he was 17 when he started playing baseball professionally; the fact that he played basketball professionally; the fact that he went on to be a major force in two different sports, both with the New Jersey Nets as well as with the White Sox as a player and as a manager—well deserved and, unfortunately, as has been pointed out, far too long in the making.

Mr. Speaker, I commend my colleagues for their tenacity in going after this. It is not easy to get 300 of your colleagues in this body to agree on anything. That it is Tuesday would be difficult to get them to agree on, much less awarding a Gold Medal. So kudos and thanks to those gentlemen who worked so hard.

Again, as I said, one of the things that struck me is the camaraderie that it sounds like he and Jackie Robinson had—speaking on the phone often; being the first two members of their race to break that color barrier in their respective leagues—what a wonderful story that is.

Congratulations to the Doby family and to my colleagues.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MITCHELL). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1861.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

OPTIONS MARKETS STABILITY ACT

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5749) to require the appropriate Federal banking agencies to increase the risk-sensitivity of the capital treatment of certain centrally cleared options, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5749

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 ''Options Markets Stability Act''.

SECTION 2. RULEMAKING.

Within 180 days of the date of enactment of this Act, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, and the Comptroller of the Currency shall, jointly, issue a proposed rule, and finalize such rule within 360 days of the date of enactment of this Act, to adopt a methodology for calculating the counterparty credit risk exposure, at default, of a depository institution, depository institution holding company, or affiliate thereof to a client arising from a guarantee provided by the depository institution, depository institution holding company, or affiliate thereof to a central counterparty in respect of the client's performance under an exchange-listed derivative contract cleared through that central counterparty pursuant to the risk-based and leverage-based capital rules applicable to depository institutions and depository institution holding companies under parts 3, 217, and 324 of title 12, Code of Federal Regulations. In issuing such rule, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, and the Comptroller of the Currency shall consider—

(1) the availability of liquidity provided by market makers during times of high volatility in the capital markets;

(2) the spread between the bid and the quote offered by market makers;

(3) the preference for clearing through central counterparties;

(4) the safety and soundness of the financial system and financial stability, including the benefits of central clearing;

(5) the safety and soundness of individual institutions that may centrally clear exchange-listed derivatives or options on behalf of a client, including concentration of market share;

(6) the economic value of delta weighting a counterparty's position and netting of a counterparty's position;

(7) the inherent risk of the positions;

(8) barriers to entry for depository institutions, depository institution holding companies, affiliates thereof, and entities not affiliated with a depository institution or depository institution holding company to centrally clear exchange-listed derivatives or options on behalf of market makers;

(9) the impact any changes may have on the broader capital regime and aggregate capital in the system; and

(10) consideration of other potential factors that impact market making in the exchange-listed options market, including changes in market structure.

SEC. 3. REPORT TO CONGRESS.

At the end of the 5-year period beginning on the date the final rule is issued under section 2, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System shall submit to the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate a report detailing the impact of the final rule during such period on the factors described under paragraphs (1) through (10) of section 2.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MAXINE WATERS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the bill.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 5749, the Options Markets Stability Act, which would adjust the risk sensitivity of the capital treatment of centrally cleared options.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate my friend from Illinois and fellow member of the Financial Services Committee, Mr. HULTGREN, for his tireless work on this. Mr. Speaker, it may come as no surprise that this may not be the most exciting portion of the work that is done in our committee, it is not necessarily the most sexy of issues that we deal with, but it is extremely important. I appreciate the work of the gentleman as well as members on the committee from all sides.

As I said, Mr. Speaker, options are incredibly useful and powerful risk mitigation tools that can help protect an investor's financial portfolio. From buying puts to hedge the downside risk of owning a stock to writing covered calls to collect income and cap potential losses, listed options strategies are protective tools employed by individual investors, institutions, and pension funds.

But options do have a sensitivity to the price of the underlying stock such that, at any given point in time, the value of an option will respond differently to changes in the price of the option's underlying shares.

Increased volatility in equity markets during recent months has revealed that certain bank capital requirements using the current exposure method—or CEM, as it is known—from the Basel Committee on Banking Supervision discourages the use of central clearing, which is a central tenet of the Dodd-Frank Act. This is actually counterintuitive and the reason why we are here today trying to fix that.

Title VII of the Dodd-Frank Act requires derivatives, including options, to be centrally cleared in order to take advantage of the risk-mitigating benefits of clearing. As a result, the role of clearing members, or houses, and the amount of transactions cleared by these institutions has expanded significantly.

However, businesses and end users which use these options to manage business risks can only trade through a clearing member, as they are unable to access clearinghouses directly.

The risk-based and leverage-based capital requirements for banks have made it cost prohibitive for clearing members to expand their derivatives clearing services when there is higher volume. As a result, liquidity providers who depend on banks to centrally clear their options are having trouble providing liquidity during instances of market volatility, therefore making it more expensive for individuals and institutions to hedge their positions through the use of options contracts. As I pointed out, Mr. Speaker, that is exactly the opposite of what the intent of the Dodd-Frank Act was in this area.

Although the Basel Committee agreed to replace CEM by January of 2017 with a more risk-sensitive method known as the standardized approach for measuring counterparty credit risk, or SA-CCR, exposures, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve has not yet implemented SA-CCR, and the transition is not imminent.

To remedy these problems, H.R. 5749, the Options Markets Stability Act introduced by Representative HULTGREN and Representative FOSTER, two colleagues from Illinois, will help alleviate the unnecessary adverse impact of the current exposure method, or CEM, on the listed options market.

This legislation would require the Federal Reserve Board, Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation to implement a risk-adjusted approach to value centrally cleared options as it relates to capital rules to better and more accurately reflect exposure and promote options market-making activity.

Specifically, the bill changes how the calculation of the CEM on options contracts is calculated on their notional face value rather than through a risk-adjusted value, which reflects actual exposures.

□ 1515

By changing this calculation, it will incentivize the use of hedged positions and would reduce the amount of capital required to place these positions and reduce overall exposure.

Market-maker liquidity is critical to vibrant options markets, and the knock-on effects are increased costs to investors, a heightened possibility of market dislocation during volatile environments, and the discouragement of centrally cleared products that help limit the systemic risk that we are all trying to eliminate.

This bipartisan bill, which passed the Financial Services Committee by a vote of 54–0, is a modest adjustment to the risk- and leverage-based capital rules to better take into account the actual risk of clearing options.

I commend my colleagues, Representative HULTGREN and Representative FOSTER, for their bipartisan work on this important bill, and I urge all of my colleagues to vote in favor of H.R. 5749.

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

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5749, which is a tailored, bipartisan solution to the problems facing our Nation's options markets.

Options are a type of derivative contract that provide investors with the right to buy or sell stock or other securities at some point in the future. According to the Chicago Board Options Exchange, which supports the bill, bank affiliates that clear options on behalf of large traders have been restricting their services because of the current bank capital calculation and resulting costs.

As a consequence, they argue that large options traders, known as market-makers, are not readily able to trade when investors need them to and are having to charge more when they do trade. There are also fewer market-makers overall and more trading activity concentrated among the top five firms.

H.R. 5749 would direct the bank regulators to consider this problem while still focusing on the benefits of bank capital to reduce systemic risk.

Now, I am aware that the Federal Reserve just proposed to significantly change banks' capital requirements, including through a rollback of the supplementary leverage ratio. If the Fed's proposals are finalized, FDIC-insured banks could shed as much as $121 billion in capital, making it more likely that one of the Wall Street megabanks will fail in a future downturn and cause untold damage to the economy.

On top of that, the President signed into law S. 2155, which will recklessly reduce capital and other requirements on the Nation's largest banks. I am very concerned with these developments and urge our regulators to ensure the safety and soundness of megabanks and our financial system.

H.R. 5749 would make sure that this is the case for bank capital associated with cleared options. Specifically, the bill would require the bank regulators to conduct a rulemaking after considering several important factors, including the safety and soundness of the financial system, financial stability, and the impact of the changes on the broader capital regime.

Unlike the introduced version of the bill, which would only reduce capital, the bill, as amended, would direct the regulators to increase capital for riskier derivatives.

It also would create a retrospective rule review so that, 5 years after implementation, the regulators would study the impact of their rule.

So I want to thank Representative FOSTER and Representative HULTGREN for working together to promote trading in our options markets without sacrificing bank safety and soundness.

I encourage my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 5749, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HULTGREN), the vice chair of the Capital Markets, Securities, and Investment Subcommittee.

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Chairman HUIZENGA for his work on this and so many other important things on the Financial Services Committee and the Capital Markets, Securities, and Investment Subcommittee.

I also want to begin by giving special thanks to Leader MCCARTHY for providing time for consideration of the Options Markets Stability Act. This legislation is very important to a number of stakeholders in Illinois, but also to market stability as a whole and the investors who depend on having access to reliable products.

I also do want to thank Chairman HENSARLING and Ranking Member WATERS. Without their support, my legislation would not have received a unanimous vote in the Financial Services Committee, and I am grateful for their help; and my colleague, BILL FOSTER, as well, for his help.

Title VII of the Dodd-Frank Act requires derivatives, including options, to be centrally cleared in order to take advantage of the risk-mitigating benefits.

Liquidity providers, many of which are in Illinois, can trade only through a clearing member; they cannot access clearinghouses directly. As a result, the role of clearing members and the amount of transactions cleared by these institutions has expanded significantly.

The risk-based and leverage-based capital requirements for bank clearing members makes it cost prohibitive to provide clearing services for listed options. This is especially acute when there is higher than expected volume.

Chicago Trading Company, one of the key liquidity providers for listed options, wrote in a letter to the Treasury Department last summer that: ''These requirements force banks to direct capital away from the exchange-listed, centrally cleared options market, thereby hindering our ability to provide liquidity and acting in direct contravention of a core principle of post-crisis regulation: strengthening exchange-based trading and central clearing, especially for many derivatives that were previously traded on an over-the-counter basis.''

The Options Markets Stability Act, as amended, requires Federal banking regulators to more accurately measure counterparty risk by adjusting the risk- and leverage-based capital rules, and requires them to provide a report to Congress about these changes 5 years after they go into effect.

While market participants have long expressed concern about the current capital requirements for listed options, volatility in equity markets earlier this year exposed the extent to which existing rules are restricting liquidity when it is needed the most.

Volatility contributes to an increase in volume of listed options because of an interest by market participants to hedge their positions. However, the binding capital constraint under current rules makes it cost prohibitive to centrally clear the increased volume of equity options contracts demanded by the market.

The market-makers who provide liquidity for listed options are indirectly constrained by the bank capital rules from fulfilling their role in maintaining price stability.

Key financial regulators have underscored these issues. CFTC Chairman Giancarlo noted in testimony before the House Appropriations Committee that: ''We have some anecdotal information that shows that, during the recent market volatility, the supplementary leverage ratio impacted larger market-makers' ability to take on certain positions, thus exacerbating market volatility. The SLR is not specifically mandated in Title VII of Dodd-Frank, and it has had the opposite effect intended: pushing trades away from central clearing.''

Chairman Powell has noted that the current exposure method generally treats potential future credit exposures on derivatives as a fixed percentage of the notional amount, which ignores whether a derivative is margined and undervalues netting benefits.

The problem is that banking regulators are taking far too long to actually address the issues in our derivatives markets. Our options markets are encountering liquidity issues now because of the poorly calibrated capital rules. Investors do not have the luxury of waiting any longer on our bank regulators.

Finally, this legislation has a long list of supporters: Cboe Global Markets, the Options Clearing Corporation, NASDAQ, NYSE, CME Group, SIFMA, the Futures Industry Association, IMC, Chicago Trading Company, TD Ameritrade, just to name a handful.

A vote in support of the Options Markets Stability Act is a vote in support of listed options and central-clearing that is a cornerstone of Dodd-Frank. It is a vote in support of maintaining options for investors and their ability to manage risk in volatile markets.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers. I encourage my colleagues to vote for H.R. 5749, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5749, as amended.

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. HUIZENGA. Mr. 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.

MAIN STREET GROWTH ACT

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5877) to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to allow for the registration of venture exchanges, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5877

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 ''Main Street Growth Act''.

SEC. 2. VENTURE EXCHANGES.

(a) SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934.—Section 6 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78f) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(m) VENTURE EXCHANGE.—

''(1) REGISTRATION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—A person may register themself (and a national securities exchange may register a listing tier of such exchange) as a national securities exchange solely for the purposes of trading venture securities by filing an application with the Commission pursuant to subsection (a) and the rules and regulations thereunder.

''(B) PUBLICATION OF NOTICE.—The Commission shall, upon the filing of an application under subparagraph (A), publish notice of such filing and afford interested persons an opportunity to submit written data, views, and arguments concerning such application.

''(C) APPROVAL OR DENIAL.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Within 90 days of the date of publication of a notice under subparagraph (B) (or within such longer period as to which the applicant consents), the Commission shall—

''(I) by order grant such registration; or

''(II) institute a denial proceeding under clause (ii) to determine whether registration should be denied.

''(ii) DENIAL PROCEEDING.—A proceeding under clause (i)(II) shall include notice of the grounds for denial under consideration and opportunity for hearing and shall be concluded within 180 days of the date of the publication of a notice under subparagraph (B). At the conclusion of such proceeding the Commission, by order, shall grant or deny such registration. The Commission may extend the time for conclusion of such proceeding for up to 90 days if the Commission finds good cause for such extension and publishes the Commission's reasons for so finding or for such longer period as to which the applicant consents.

''(iii) CRITERIA FOR APPROVAL OR DENIAL.—The Commission shall grant a registration under this paragraph if the Commission finds that the requirements of this title and the rules and regulations thereunder with respect to the applicant are satisfied. The Commission shall deny such registration if it does not make such finding.

''(2) POWERS AND RESTRICTIONS.—In addition to the powers and restrictions otherwise applicable to a national securities exchange, a venture exchange—

''(A) may only constitute, maintain, or provide a market place or facilities for bringing together purchasers and sellers of venture securities;

''(B) may not extend unlisted trading privileges to any venture security;

''(C) may only, if the venture exchange is a listing tier of another national securities exchange, allow trading in securities that are registered under section 12(b) on a national securities exchange other than a venture exchange; and

''(D) may, subject to the rule filing process under section 19(b)—

''(i) determine the increment to be used for quoting and trading venture securities on the exchange; and

''(ii) choose to carry out periodic auctions for the sale of a venture security instead of providing continuous trading of the venture security.

''(3) TREATMENT OF CERTAIN EXEMPTED SECURITIES.—A security that is exempt from registration pursuant to section 3(b) of the Securities Act of 1933 shall be exempt from section 12(a) of this title to the extent such securities are traded on a venture exchange, if the issuer of such security is in compliance with—

''(A) all disclosure obligations of such section 3(b) and the regulations issued under such section; and

''(B) ongoing disclosure obligations of the applicable venture exchange that are similar to those provided by an issuer under tier 2 of Regulation A (17 C.F.R. 230.251 et seq).

''(4) VENTURE SECURITIES TRADED ON VENTURE EXCHANGES MAY NOT TRADE ON NON-VENTURE EXCHANGES.—A venture security may not be traded on a national securities exchange that is not a venture exchange during any period in which the venture security is being traded on a venture exchange.

''(5) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subsection may be construed as requiring transactions in venture securities to be effected on a national securities exchange.

''(6) COMMISSION AUTHORITY TO LIMIT CERTAIN TRADING.—The Commission may limit transactions in venture securities that are not effected on a national securities exchange as appropriate to promote efficiency, competition, capital formation, and to protect investors.

''(7) DISCLOSURES TO INVESTORS.—The Commission shall issue regulations to ensure that persons selling or purchasing venture securities on a venture exchange are provided disclosures sufficient to understand—

''(A) the characteristics unique to venture securities; and

''(B) in the case of a venture exchange that is a listing tier of another national securities exchange, that the venture exchange is distinct from the other national securities exchange.

''(8) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this subsection:

''(A) EARLY-STAGE, GROWTH COMPANY.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The term 'early-stage, growth company' means an issuer—

''(I) that has not made any registered initial public offering of any securities of the issuer; and

''(II) with a public float of less than or equal to the value of public float required to qualify as a large accelerated filer under section 240.12b–2 of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations.

''(ii) TREATMENT WHEN PUBLIC FLOAT EXCEEDS THRESHOLD.—An issuer shall not cease to be an early-stage, growth company by reason of the public float of such issuer exceeding the threshold specified in clause (i)(II) until the later of the following:

''(I) The end of the period of 24 consecutive months during which the public float of the issuer exceeds $2,000,000,000 (as such amount is indexed for inflation every 5 years by the Commission to reflect the change in the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, setting the threshold to the nearest $1,000,000).

''(II) The end of the 1-year period following the end of the 24-month period described under subclause (I), if the issuer requests such 1-year extension from a venture exchange and the venture exchange elects to provide such extension.

''(B) PUBLIC FLOAT.—With respect to an issuer, the term 'public float' means the aggregate worldwide market value of the voting and non-voting common equity of the issuer held by non-affiliates.

''(C) VENTURE SECURITY.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The term 'venture security' means—

''(I) securities of an early-stage, growth company that are exempt from registration pursuant to section 3(b) of the Securities Act of 1933;

''(II) securities of an emerging growth company; or

''(III) securities registered under section 12(b) and listed on a venture exchange (or, prior to listing on a venture exchange, listed on a national securities exchange) where—

''(aa) the issuer of such securities has a public float less than or equal to the value of public float required to qualify as a large accelerated filer under section 240.12b–2 of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations; or

''(bb) the average daily trade volume is 75,000 shares or less during a continuous 60-day period.

''(ii) TREATMENT WHEN PUBLIC FLOAT EXCEEDS THRESHOLD.—Securities shall not cease to be venture securities by reason of the public float of the issuer of such securities exceeding the threshold specified in clause (i)(III)(aa) until the later of the following:

''(I) The end of the period of 24 consecutive months beginning on the date—

''(aa) the public float of such issuer exceeds $2,000,000,000; and

''(bb) the average daily trade volume of such securities is 100,000 shares or more during a continuous 60-day period.

''(II) The end of the 1-year period following the end of the 24-month period described under subclause (I), if the issuer of such securities requests such 1-year extension from a venture exchange and the venture exchange elects to provide such extension.''.

(b) SECURITIES ACT OF 1933.—Section 18 of the Securities Act of 1933 (15 U.S.C. 77r) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (e); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (c) the following:

''(d) TREATMENT OF SECURITIES LISTED ON A VENTURE EXCHANGE.—Notwithstanding subsection (b), a security is not a covered security pursuant to subsection (b)(1)(A) if the security is only listed, or authorized for listing, on a venture exchange (as defined under section 6(m) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934).''.

(c) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of the Congress that the Securities and Exchange Commission should—

(1) when necessary or appropriate in the public interest and consistent with the protection of investors, make use of the Commission's general exemptive authority under section 36 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78mm) with respect to the provisions added by this section; and

(2) if the Commission determines appropriate, create an Office of Venture Exchanges within the Commission's Division of Trading and Markets.

(d) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section or the amendments made by this section shall be construed to impair or limit the construction of the antifraud provisions of the securities laws (as defined in section 3(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78c(a))) or the authority of the Securities and Exchange Commission under those provisions.

(e) EFFECTIVE DATE FOR TIERS OF EXISTING NATIONAL SECURITIES EXCHANGES.—In the case of a securities exchange that is registered as a national securities exchange under section 6 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78f) on the date of the enactment of this Act, any election for a listing tier of such exchange to be treated as a venture exchange under subsection (m) of such section shall not take effect before the date that is 180 days after such date of enactment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MAXINE WATERS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on this bill.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5877, the Main Street Growth Act, introduced by my friend and colleague from the Financial Services Committee, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. EMMER), which would help further facilitate capital formation for smaller issuers.

Specifically, the Main Street Growth Act would provide for the creation and registration of venture exchanges. Venture exchanges would be prohibited from extending unlisted trading privileges, or UTP, as they are known, to any venture security, which would prevent venture securities from trading on exchanges other than the one that it is listed on, in order to concentrate liquidity onto the venture exchange. In addition, venture exchanges would also be exempt from decimalization.

The U.S. capital markets have, and continue to be, a vibrant ecosystem, fueling America's economic growth and generating millions of private sector jobs. These markets provide financing and needed resources to the smallest startups, as well as the largest international companies.

However, a company's size has often impacted how easily it is to access capital, as larger companies generally found the capital markets easier to access than smaller companies.

While the number of IPOs in the U.S. has rebounded from its post-crisis collapse—thanks, in part, to the success of the JOBS Act—smaller companies still face significant regulatory and market impediments that disincentivize them from accessing capital via the public markets.

There are differing perspectives as to why fewer companies, particularly smaller companies, have gone public over the past few decades. In fact, Chairman Clayton recently said, at the end of the day, no matter what those reasons are, it is ''not good'' that would be happening.

The data suggests that, in order to fulfill its capital formation mandate, the SEC needs to tailor its approach to account for the varying nature and size of companies, including the one-size-fits-all regulatory structure of the current equity markets.

As a natural extension of the JOBS Act and the new securities offerings available to startup enterprises, venture exchanges offer one possible solution to the liquidity and capital access challenges faced by smaller issuers.

A venture exchange construct would expand access to capital for entrepreneurs; enable earlier public participation in the company's lifecycle; and attract post-issuance support, including research, sales, and capital commitments by market-makers.

In fact, the SEC's Commissioners, market participants, and other interested parties have all expressed interest in the concept of venture exchanges as a means to provide secondary market liquidity to smaller companies.

NASDAQ recently testified at a hearing held on May 23 of this year: ''NASDAQ recommends permitting issuers to choose to trade in an environment with consolidated liquidity as would be allowed under the Venture Exchange Legislation. By creating a market for smaller issuers that is voluntary for issuers to join and largely exempt from the UTP obligations, subject to key exemptions, we can concentrate liquidity to reduce volatility and improve the trading experience.''

Additionally, at that same hearing, the U.S. Chamber stated: ''While the JOBS Act did a great deal to help EGCs raise capital in primary offerings, it did comparatively little to address the secondary market trading in these same companies.''

Legislation like the Main Street Growth Act is an important bipartisan step to better tailoring market structure rules for small issuers and helping to facilitate capital formation.

I commend my colleague, Mr. EMMER, on his bipartisan work on the Main Street Growth Act, which passed the Financial Services Committee by a vote of 56–0, and I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of H.R. 5877.

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

□ 1530

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5877, the Main Street Growth Act, a new and innovative idea that will help our Nation's small businesses raise funds to grow by issuing stock that investors are able to easily buy and sell in the secondary markets.

Specifically, H.R. 5877 would create a venture exchange for investors to trade in the stock of emerging growth companies and early stage growth companies.

Unlike a similar partisan bill last Congress, H.R. 5877, as amended, would allow companies to create a venture exchange in a way that balances the needs of small companies and the protection of their investors in the secondary markets.

Most importantly, the bill would retain State regulatory oversight over these small unregistered companies, which are more prone to fraud and failure. For example, small companies that are not regularly traded are frequent targets of scammers that use pump-and-dump schemes to dupe investors into thinking the stock is worth more than it is by spreading fake news and hot tips and then selling the stock at artificially high prices.

So it makes sense for our State regulators, who are very familiar with these scams, to regulate and oversee these companies.

I am also pleased that the bill ensures that companies trading on a venture exchange have a minimum level of disclosure and ongoing disclosure, including annual and semi-annual reports, that detail the health of the company's finances, business, and management, as well as the company's related party transactions and share ownership.

This is important to investors buying shares on a venture exchange who may have little to no relationship to the company to otherwise have access to such information.

In addition, the bill would allow the SEC to establish additional restrictions on any over-the-counter trading that is not on a venture exchange.

If our goal is to centralize trading on a single exchange to make it easier for investors to buy and sell small company stock, then I think it makes sense for the SEC to have the authority to limit over-the-counter trading.

Mr. Speaker, I support H.R. 5877, and I thank Representative EMMER for working with Democrats to support our Nation's small businesses and their investors.

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

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. EMMER), the author of this legislation.

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Speaker, I too rise in support of H.R. 5877, the Main Street Growth Act.

Ever since the JOBS Act was signed into law, Congress has worked hard to build on its success to ensure American businesses, entrepreneurs, and investors are able to realize the real and potential benefits that make our markets the envy of the world.

The Main Street Growth Act continues that discussion. Approved by the House Financial Services Committee by a vote of 56–0, this legislation will facilitate the creation of venture exchanges, a concept many see as a viable means to encourage more early-stage IPOs and improve capital formation.

When businesses go public, jobs are created and new centers of wealth are formed. In fact, a 2012 study found that for the 2,766 companies that participated in an IPO between 1996 and 2010, total employment across these businesses increased by 2.2 million jobs, while total revenue increased by over $1 trillion.

Unfortunately, sustaining and encouraging more companies to move forward with an IPO has proven difficult over time. Every year for the past two decades, the number of public companies in the United States has dropped,

with the only exception being the year Congress passed the JOBS Act.

Since 2009, the number of U.S.-listed IPOs, on average, has hovered at fewer than 200 a year, well below the previous decade's average.

While there are a multitude of factors that a company takes into consideration when determining whether to go public, one such calculation is whether or not the current market structure fosters an active and liquid secondary trading environment for that company's securities.

Ensuring there is a place for investors to easily trade and sell their securities is often a key determinant in a decision not to list, if the business owner is not confident that such a marketplace exists.

Small business hesitation when making this determination is not unfounded. According to the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission, small cap stocks, or those with capitalization below $100 million, typically exhibit the least liquidity, while mid cap stocks, with capitalization between $2 billion and $5 billion, tend to exhibit a greater amount of liquidity.

Recognizing the continued challenges we face in courting new IPOs, and understanding that liquidity is key for small companies interested in going public, as well as securities currently trading in the marketplace, it is clear that we must take steps to better tailor our markets in order to account for the varying size and nature of potential public companies if we are to encourage new capital formation.

Here is where the Main Street Growth Act can help.

Under the Main Street Growth Act, an entity can register with the SEC to establish a venture exchange; a market designed specifically to support the trading of small and emerging companies, as well as currently listed but liquidity-challenged securities.

These venture exchanges will trade venture securities, which include early stage and emerging growth companies, as well as securities currently trading in the marketplace but are below a certain public float or average daily trade volume threshold.

In my home State of Minnesota, there are more than 30 companies currently listed on an exchange that may meet the necessary criteria to explore the benefits of a new venture exchange as envisioned by this legislation.

Additionally, there are over 130 Minnesota-based companies that are not listed publicly and have utilized private means of funding for their businesses, but could qualify to list on a venture exchange to improve their ability to create new growth and employment opportunities.

The Main Street Growth Act includes important provisions to concentrate liquidity by ensuring that the trading of securities listed on a venture exchange may only occur on that venture exchange.

Also, utilizing the current exchange model serves as an efficient way to ensure investor protection while improving their standing in our capital markets.

The Main Street Growth Act is a consensus bill with input from my colleagues on both sides of the aisle and with the administration as well. It directly complements SEC Chairman Clayton's ongoing efforts to ''examine whether the current market structure meets the needs of all types of companies that have the potential to be public companies.''

Mr. Speaker, I would like to extend my gratitude to the chairman and ranking member of the Financial Services Committee and their staff for their tireless work on this legislation and the issues related to improving capital formation in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 5877.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Speaker, I also have no further speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5877, 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.

BUILDING UP INDEPENDENT LIVES AND DREAMS ACT

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5953) to provide regulatory relief to charitable organizations that provide housing assistance, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5953

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''Building Up Independent Lives and Dreams Act'' or the ''BUILD Act''.

SEC. 2. MORTGAGE LOAN TRANSACTION DISCLOSURE REQUIREMENTS.

(a) TILA AMENDMENT.—Section 105 of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1604) is amended by inserting after subsection (d) the following:

''(e) DISCLOSURE FOR CHARITABLE MORTGAGE LOAN TRANSACTIONS.—With respect to a mortgage loan transaction involving a residential mortgage loan offered at zero percent interest primarily for charitable purposes by an organization having tax-exempt status under section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, forms HUD–1 and GFE (as defined under section 1024.2(b) of title 12, Code of Federal Regulations), together with a disclosure substantially in the form of the Loan Model Form H–2 (as defined under Appendix H to section 1026 of title 12, Code of Federal Regulations) shall, collectively, be an appropriate model form for purposes of subsection (b).''.

(b) RESPA AMENDMENT.—Section 4 of the Real Estate Settlement Procedures Act of 1974 (12 U.S.C. 2603) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(d) With respect to a mortgage loan transaction involving a residential mortgage loan offered at zero percent interest primarily for charitable purposes, an organization having tax-exempt status under section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 may use forms HUD–1 and GFE (as defined under section 1024.2(b) of title 12, Code of Federal Regulations) together with a disclosure substantially in the form of the Loan Model Form H–2 (as defined under Appendix H to section 1026 of title 12, Code of Federal Regulations), collectively, in lieu of the disclosure published under subsection (a).''.

(c) REGULATIONS.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection shall issue such regulations as may be necessary to implement the amendments made by subsections (a) and (b).

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsections (a) and (b) shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MAXINE WATERS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on this bill.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 5953, the Building Up Independent Lives and Dreams, or BUILD, Act, which would cut some of the regulatory red tape and alleviate unnecessary burdens that were created by Dodd-Frank.

The Truth in Lending Act, or TILA, as it is referred to, and the Real Estate Settlements Procedures Act, also known as RESPA, required lenders to provide consumers disclosures about the estimated and actual real estate settlement costs and financial terms of the mortgages that they offer.

Among other requirements, RESPA required standardized disclosures, such as good faith estimates, of the costs that the borrower should expect to pay at closing, and a list of closing costs commonly known as the HUD–1 document.

TILA required lenders to disclose the cost of credit and the repayment terms of mortgage loans before borrowers entered into a transaction. These disclosures were intended to help consumers compare the terms and make informed decisions regarding the suitability of various mortgage products and services that they were looking at purchasing.

However, Dodd-Frank mandated that the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection promulgate ''a single integrated disclosure for mortgage loan transactions . . . to aid the borrower . . . in understanding the transaction by utilizing readily understandable language to simplify the technical nature of the disclosures.''

It seems to me that in an effort to simplify the language, we might have added some more complicated language. But nonetheless, it remains compliant with both TILA and RESPA, which are very important.

I can tell you, as a former licensed Realtor, these disclosures and these closing documents are extremely important.

What we have seen, though, under this current situation, the TILA-RESPA Integrated Disclosure, or TRID, as it is called, the TRID rule was born out of this.

The final TRID forms combined elements of the good faith estimate, the HUD–1, and the TILA disclosure.

While these new forms were designed to be more consumer friendly—they include sections on balloon loans and adjustable rate mortgages that may be applicable to traditional mortgage lenders—these forms are not relevant to charitable organizations like Habitat for Humanity, however.

Additionally, the TRID integrated disclosure forms pose significant implementation and compliance challenges for these charitable organizations because they include difficult-to-understand timing and delivery requirements and other practical implementation issues that go well beyond the previous content requirements, such as requiring purchasing and training of costly complex software intended for traditional mortgage lenders. Therefore, many charitable organizations have difficulty with fulfilling the needed compliance related to the origination and servicing of their loans.

The BUILD Act, introduced by Representative LOUDERMILK and Representative SHERMAN, would roll back requirements of the TILA-RESPA Integrated Disclosures Rule for charities, and only charities, like Habitat for Humanity and others, and, instead, allow these charities to use the good faith estimate and HUD–1 mortgage forms that had been in place previously.

Groups like Habitat for Humanity and their local State organizations specialize in providing housing for low income and rural communities. The financing that is done at a zero percent interest rate to provide minimal cost to the occupant is commendable and a goal that we all have.

This bill cuts yet another senseless and poorly written provision of Dodd-Frank that will help provide affordable housing for low income Americans in search of the American Dream.

Specifically, this bipartisan bill would provide tax-exempt nonprofit organizations originating these zero interest mortgage loans the flexibility to choose the simplest and most cost effective delivery of the mortgage disclosures.

Now these charitable organizations will be able to use their very scarce resources for building, repairing, and rehabilitating housing instead of spending it on costly compliance software.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the bipartisan work of Representatives LOUDERMILK and SHERMAN on the BUILD Act, which passed the Financial Services Committee by a vote of 35–0. I urge all of my colleagues to vote in favor of H.R. 5953, the BUILD Act, and I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1545

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN), a senior member of the Financial Services Committee and the lead Democratic sponsor of this bill.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

I would like to thank my colleague from Georgia (Mr. LOUDERMILK) for working with me on this bill, titled the Building Up Independent Lives and Dreams, or BUILD Act. This has been a collaborative process, and I am pleased to serve as the chief Democratic sponsor.

We have heard from a variety of chapters of Habitat for Humanity. They are having difficulty dealing with the new TILA-RESPA Integrated Disclosure form, chiefly because they don't have the software to deal with that form. The new form is a good form. The old forms were pretty good as well, but what is really good for the consumer in this case is that they are getting a zero percent loan.

So what this bill says is that, if you are a bona fide nonprofit organization providing the new homeowner with a zero percent loan, you have the flexibility to either use the new form or to use the old forms.

The new form is good. The old forms were pretty good, too. A zero percent loan is very good for the consumer.

This bill is supported by Habitat for Humanity International and the National Housing Conference. It passed the Financial Services Committee 53–0, and I urge everyone to vote ''yes.''

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LOUDERMILK), my colleague from the Financial Services Committee, the author of the BUILD Act.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA) for yielding time for me to speak on what I think is a very important bill.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of this bill, the bill which is entitled Building Up Independent Lives and Dreams Act, also better known as the BUILD Act. This bill is proof that, even in this Chamber, we can rise above politics and let common sense prevail occasionally.

I would like to first start by thanking my colleagues on both sides of the aisle who have worked with me and my staff to make this a very strong, bipartisan effort. I appreciate my colleague Mr. SHERMAN, who just spoke, for negotiating reasonable changes to the bill and for being an original cosponsor. I also want to thank Ms. TENNEY, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, and Mr. BUDD for their work and for cosponsoring the bill as well.

Mr. Speaker, the Dodd-Frank Act required the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau to combine the TILA loan estimate and the RESPA closing disclosure forms into one integrated form, which, as you have heard, is called the TRID.

While the TRID forms were well intended to help ensure that home buyers receive essential information about the costs and terms of their home loan, the TRID rule has some unintended consequences on nonprofit organizations such as Habitat for Humanity.

The TRID rule is a whopping 1,888 pages long and is very complicated. The forms include sections on balloon loans and adjustable-rate mortgages, things that may be relevant to traditional mortgage lenders but are not applicable to nonprofits that solely offer low-cost housing to needy families. The complex and complicated TRID forms cause confusion to Habitat home buyers, staff, and their volunteers.

Besides the complexity, the TRID disclosures require software for lenders to be able to fill them out, which has been too costly for many local Habitat organizations. The vast majority of the more than 1,200 local Habitat affiliates nationwide are small, community-based organizations with very small mortgage portfolios and few, if any, full-time staff.

These organizations have experienced challenges with the cost and complexity of these new mortgage disclosure forms. To address these problems, the BUILD Act relieves charities from the costs and the complexity of the TRID rule but ensures that the terms of these mortgage loans are disclosed.

Currently, all mortgage lenders making five or fewer loans a year are exempt from TRID and, instead, use the same mortgage disclosure forms that were in place before Dodd-Frank. The BUILD Act simply extends this exemption to nonprofits which are eligible for tax-exempt charitable donations and are making zero interest mortgage loans, regardless of how many mortgage loans they are making per year.

The BUILD Act will allow local Habitat organizations to choose whether to use the previous, simplified reporting or the more complex TRID reporting. The BUILD Act is supported by Habitat for Humanity International and the National Housing Conference.

In closing, I want to reiterate that the purpose of this bill is to help nonprofits spend more time fulfilling their

mission of providing low-cost housing to needy families and less time sitting in an office doing regulatory paperwork. The BUILD Act recognizes that one size does not fit all when it comes to regulating these charities and gives themselves the flexibility to choose which mortgage disclosure forms work best for them.

Mr. Speaker, the BUILD Act passed the Financial Services Committee with a unanimous vote of 53–0. I urge all of my colleagues to support this bill.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague, Mr. SHERMAN, for working across the aisle to develop H.R. 5953, the Building Up Independent Lives and Dreams Act, or the BUILD Act, which will assist nonprofits in providing affordable housing to those in need.

Some nonprofit organizations, like Habitat for Humanity, help borrowers who would otherwise not be able to afford a home by offering zero percent interest mortgages with terms that ensure the borrowers have the ability to repay the loans while also taking care of other household expenses. Oftentimes, these nonprofits rely heavily on limited staffs or volunteer labor to underwrite mortgages for families in need.

Because of these unique dynamics, some smaller affiliates of these types of organizations have had a bit of difficulty adapting to the current updated disclosure forms that are used to inform mortgage borrowers about the material terms and costs of their loans. This bill would give those nonprofits the flexibility to choose whether to use truth-in-lending, good-faith estimate, and HUD–1 mortgage disclosure forms when originating a mortgage or the TILA-RESPA integrated disclosure, or TRID, forms.

Even though this very narrow exemption already applies to organizations that make five or fewer mortgages annually, I believe we are all in agreement that extending this flexibility to charitable nonprofits with a unique business model like Habitat is a positive change.

Nonprofits like Habitat for Humanity operate with different business models and traditional financing institutions. They are and they serve a different clientele. It is clear that the BUILD Act does not provide any opportunity for other types of lenders to take advantage of the carve-out in a way that could potentially harm borrowers. With that in mind, I support this bill, and I encourage my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. Speaker, I have no more requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Speaker, I, too, want to commend our colleagues for working in a bipartisan manner, Mr. LOUDERMILK and Mr. SHERMAN, not only for dealing with this in committee; there was some trust that was shown on all sides to move forward on that, and this is the way the system is supposed to work. Congratulations.

I look forward to supporting this bill and request that all of my colleagues do the same.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5953.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INTERNATIONAL INSURANCE STANDARDS ACT OF 2018

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4537) to preserve the State-based system of insurance regulation and provide greater oversight of and transparency on international insurance standards setting processes, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4537

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 ''International Insurance Standards Act of 2018''.

SEC. 2. CONGRESSIONAL FINDINGS.

The Congress finds the following:

(1) The State-based system for insurance regulation in the United States has served American consumers well for more than 150 years and has fostered an open and competitive marketplace with a diversity of insurance products to the benefit of policyholders and consumers.

(2) Protecting policyholders by regulating to ensure an insurer's ability to pay claims has been the hallmark of the successful United States system and should be the paramount objective of domestic prudential regulation and emerging international standards.

(3) The Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (Public Law 111–203) reaffirmed the State-based insurance regulatory system.

SEC. 3. REQUIREMENT THAT INSURANCE STANDARDS REFLECT UNITED STATES POLICY.

(a) REQUIREMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Parties representing the Federal Government in any international regulatory, standard-setting, or supervisory forum or in any negotiations of any international agreements relating to the prudential aspects of insurance shall not agree to, accede to, accept, or establish any proposed agreement or standard if the proposed agreement or standard fails to recognize the United States system of insurance regulation as satisfying such proposals.

(2) INAPPLICABILITY.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply to any forum or negotiations relating to a covered agreement (as such term is defined in section 313(r) of title 31, United States Code).

(b) FEDERAL INSURANCE OFFICE FUNCTIONS.—Subparagraph (E) of section 313(c)(1) of title 31, United States Code, is amended by inserting ''Federal Government'' after ''United States''.

(c) NEGOTIATIONS.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to prevent participation in negotiations of any proposed agreement or standard.

SEC. 4. STATE INSURANCE REGULATOR INVOLVEMENT IN INTERNATIONAL STANDARD SETTING.

In developing international insurance standards pursuant to section 3, and throughout the negotiations of such standards, parties representing the Federal Government shall, on matters related to insurance, closely consult, coordinate with, and seek to include in such meetings State insurance commissioners or, at the option of the State insurance commissioners, designees of the insurance commissioners acting at their direction.

SEC. 5. CONSULTATION WITH CONGRESS.

(a) REQUIREMENT.—Parties representing the Federal Government with respect to any agreement under section 3 shall provide written notice to and consult with the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate, and any other relevant committees of jurisdiction—

(1) before initiating negotiations to enter into the agreement, regarding—

(A) the intention of the United States to participate in or enter into such negotiations; and

(B) the nature and objectives of the negotiations; and

(2) during negotiations to enter into the agreement, regarding—

(A) the nature and objectives of the negotiations

(B) the implementation of the agreement, including how it is consistent with and does not materially differ from or otherwise affect Federal or State laws or regulations;

(C) the impact on the competitiveness of United States insurers; and

(D) the impact on United States consumers.

(b) CONSULTATION WITH FEDERAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON INSURANCE.—Before entering into an agreement under section 3, the Secretary of the Treasury shall seek to consult with the Federal Advisory Committee on Insurance formed pursuant to section 313(h) of title 31, United States Code.

SEC. 6. REPORT TO CONGRESS ON INTERNATIONAL INSURANCE AGREEMENTS.

Before entering into an agreement under section 3, parties representing the Federal Government shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees and leadership a report that describes —

(1) the implementation of the agreement, including how it is consistent with and does not materially differ from or otherwise affect Federal or State laws or regulations;

(2) the impact on the competitiveness of United States insurers; and

(3) the impact on United States consumers.

SEC. 7. COVERED AGREEMENTS.

(a) PREEMPTION OF STATE INSURANCE MEASURES.—Subsection (f) of section 313 of title 31, United States Code, is amended by striking ''Director'' each place such term appears and inserting ''Secretary''.

(b) DEFINITION.—Paragraph (2) of section 313(r) of title 31, United States Code, is amended—

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

(2) in subparagraph (B), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(C) applies only on a prospective basis.''.

(c) CONSULTATION; SUBMISSION AND LAYOVER; CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW.—Section 314 of title 31, United States Code is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (2)(C), by striking ''laws'' and inserting the following: ''and Federal law, and the nature of any changes in the laws of the United States or the administration of such laws that would be required to carry out a covered agreement''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(3) ACCESS TO NEGOTIATING TEXTS AND OTHER DOCUMENTS.—Appropriate congressional committees and staff with proper security clearances shall be given timely access to United States negotiating proposals, consolidated draft texts, and other pertinent documents related to the negotiations, including classified materials.'';

(2) by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (d);

(3) by inserting after subsection (b) the following new subsection:

''(c) REQUIREMENTS FOR CONSULTATIONS WITH STATE INSURANCE COMMISSIONERS.—Throughout the negotiations of a covered agreement, parties representing the Federal Government shall closely consult and coordinate with State insurance commissioners.'';

(4) in subsection (d), as so redesignated by paragraph (2)—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking ''only if—'' and inserting the following: ''only if, before signing the final legal text or otherwise entering into the agreement—'';

(B) in paragraph (1), by striking ''congressional committees specified in subsection (b)(1)'' and inserting ''appropriate congressional committees and leadership and to congressional committee staff with proper security clearances''; and

(C) by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following new paragraph:

''(2)(A) the 90-day period beginning on the date on which the copy of the final legal text of the agreement is submitted under paragraph (1) to the congressional committees, leadership, and staff has expired; and

''(B) the covered agreement has not been prevented from taking effect pursuant to subsection (e).''; and

(5) by adding at the end the following new subsections:

''(e) PERIOD FOR REVIEW BY CONGRESS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—During the layover period referred to in subsection (d)(2)(A), the Committees on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs and Finance of the Senate and the Committees on Financial Services and Ways of Means of the House of Representatives should, as appropriate, exercise their full oversight responsibility.

''(2) EFFECT OF ENACTMENT OF A JOINT RESOLUTION OF DISAPPROVAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, if a joint resolution of disapproval relating to a covered agreement submitted under subsection (d)(1) is enacted in accordance with subsection (f), the covered agreement shall not enter into force with respect to the United States.

''(f) JOINT RESOLUTIONS OF DISAPPROVAL.—

''(1) DEFINITION.—In this subsection, the term 'joint resolution of disapproval' means, with respect to proposed covered agreement, only a joint resolution of either House of Congress—

''(A) that is introduced during the 90-day period referred to in subsection (d)(2)(A) relating to such proposed covered agreement;

''(B) which does not have a preamble;

''(C) the title of which is as follows: 'A joint resolution disapproving a certain proposed covered agreement under section 314 of title 31, United States Code.'; and

''(D) the sole matter after the resolving clause of which is the following: 'Congress disapproves of the proposed covered agreement submitted to Congress under section 314 (c)(1) of title 31, United States Code, on _____ relating to _____.', with the first blank space being filled with the appropriate date and the second blank space being filled with a short description of the proposed covered agreement.

''(2) INTRODUCTION.—During the layover period referred to in subsection (d)(2)(A), a joint resolution of disapproval may be introduced—

''(A) in the House of Representatives, by any Member of the House, and

''(B) in the Senate, by any Senator,

and shall be referred to the appropriate committees.

''(3) RULES OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AND SENATE.—This subsection is enacted by Congress—

''(A) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate and the House of Representatives, respectively, and as such is deemed a part of the rules of each House, respectively, and supersedes other rules only to the extent that it is inconsistent with such rules; and

''(B) with full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change the rules (so far as relating to the procedure of that House) at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of that House.

''(g) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES AND LEADERSHIP DEFINED.—In this section, the term 'appropriate congressional committees and leadership' means—

''(1) the Committees on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs and Finance, and the majority and minority leaders, of the Senate; and

''(2) the Committees on Financial Services and Ways and Means, and the Speaker, the majority leader, and the minority leader, of the House of Representatives.''.

SEC. 8. INAPPLICABILITY TO TRADE AGREEMENTS.

This Act and the amendments made by this Act shall not apply to any forum or negotiations related to a trade agreement.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MAXINE WATERS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include any extraneous material on the bill.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, first I would like to commend my friends, Mr. DUFFY and Mr. HECK, for their work on this very important issue. For over 150 years, U.S. insurance companies of every kind—including property-casualty, life, reinsurance, health, and auto—have all been regulated primarily by the States.

Congress and the States have occasionally reviewed the effectiveness of the State-based regulation of insurance and coordinated efforts that they have to achieve greater regulatory uniformity. In fact, in 1945, Congress passed the McCarran-Ferguson Act, which confirmed the States' regulatory authority over insurance except where a Federal law expressly provides otherwise.

As a former State representative in the Michigan Legislature, I know firsthand that Michigan does a better job of protecting policyholders within their borders than the Federal Government can do. I have seen it in action. Even more, Michigan certainly knows how to maintain a robust insurance marketplace that works for Michigan consumers. I would assume the exact same thing in Wisconsin and in Washington and in California and all throughout the States.

However, there are those who believe Washington knows best. In fact, title V of the Dodd-Frank Act enlarged the Federal Government's role in the insurance industry by creating a Federal office specifically tasked with insurance matters. The Dodd-Frank Act established FIO, or the Federal Insurance Office, at the U.S. Department of the Treasury and charged the FIO Director with the responsibility to both represent the interests of U.S. insurers during the negotiation of international agreements and then advise the Office of the United States Trade Representative during trade negotiations.

At the same time, the Dodd-Frank Act changed domestic insurance regulation. Dodd-Frank led to changes in the U.S. participation at the International Association of Insurance Supervisors, also known as IAIS, which develops international insurance regulations for its 190 jurisdictions in more than 140 countries.

Mr. Speaker, I know that I am not the only one who is concerned that this could influence the Federal Government to look at replacing our State-based regulatory insurance model with some sort of international standards that were created, frankly, by unelected European bureaucrats. The outcomes of these discussions could have significant impact on the U.S. insurance markets, consumers, and the companies that provide those products.

Therefore, the U.S. needs to maintain a strong, unified voice that will ensure our successful State-based, policyholder-centric system of insurance regulation is the model for the discussions and the basis of the official United States position abroad.

H.R. 4537, the International Insurance Standards Act, introduced by my friend and colleague, Representative DUFFY, would require the United States to recognize the primacy of the U.S. State-based insurance regulatory regime when entering into and agreeing to international insurance negotiations. Additionally, this bill would provide needed transparency throughout the negotiation process and provide Congress with final approval authorization.

As the IAIS works on topics like global capital standards, governance,

and market conduct, H.R. 4537 would position the U.S. to participate in the discussions, while also protecting itself from European standards that could be detrimental to U.S. consumers, insurers, and markets.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend, again, Representative DUFFY and Representative HECK for their bipartisan work on this important bill, which passed the Financial Services Committee on a vote of 56–4. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to protect an insurance regulatory model that has worked well for over 150 years and vote in favor of H.R. 4537.

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

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, June 22, 2018.

Hon. JEB HENSARLING,
Chairman, Committee on Financial Services, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN HENSARLING: I am writing with respect to the jurisdictional interest of the Committee on Ways and Means in matters being considered in H.R. 4537, the International Insurance Standards Act of 2018.

As a result of your having consulted with us on provisions in H.R. 4537 that fall within the Rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means, I agree to waive formal consideration of this bill so that it may move expeditiously to the floor. The Committee on Ways and Means takes this action with the mutual understanding that we do not waive any jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in this or similar legislation, and the Committee will be appropriately consulted and involved as the bill or similar legislation moves forward so that we may address any remaining issues that fall within our jurisdiction. The Committee also reserves the right to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this or similar legislation, and requests your support for such request.

Finally, I would appreciate your response to this letter confirming this understanding, and would ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in the Congressional Record during floor consideration of H.R. 4537.

Sincerely,

KEVIN BRADY,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVE,
COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES,
Washington, DC, June 25, 2018.

Hon. KEVIN BRADY,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN BRADY: Thank you for your June 22, 2018 letter regarding H.R. 4537, the ''International Insurance Standards Act of 2017''.

I am most appreciative of your decision to forego action on H.R. 4537 so that it may move expeditiously to the House floor, I acknowledge that although you are waiving action on the bill, the Committee on Ways and Means is in no way waiving its jurisdictional interest in this or similar legislation. In addition, if a conference is necessary on this legislation, I will support any request that your committee be represented therein.

Finally, I shall be pleased to include your letter and this letter in our committee's report on H.R. 4537 and in the Congressional Record during floor consideration of the same.

Sincerely,

JEB HENSARLING,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON RULES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, June 25, 2018.

Hon. JEB HENSARLING,
Chairman, Committee on Financial Services, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: On December 13, 2017, the Committee on Financial Services favorably ordered H.R. 4537, the ''International Insurance Standards Act of 2017,'' reported to the House. As you know, the Committee on Rules was granted an additional referral upon the bill's introduction pursuant to the Committee's jurisdiction under rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives over the rules of the House and special orders of business.

Because of your willingness to make the necessary changes to provisions that fall within Rules Committee jurisdiction prior to floor consideration of the bill. I will waive consideration of the bill by the Rules Committee. By agreeing to waive consideration of the bill, the Rules Committee does not waive its jurisdiction over H.R. 4537. In addition, the Committee reserves its authority to seek conferees on any provisions of the bill that are within its jurisdiction during any House-Senate conference that may be convened on this legislation. I ask your commitment to support any request by the Rules Committee for conferees on H.R. 4537 or related legislation.

I also request that you include our exchange of letters on this matter in the committee report to accompany H.R. 4537 and in the Congressional Record during consideration of this legislation on the House floor. Thank you for your attention to these matters.

Sincerely,

PETE SESSIONS,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES,
Washington, DC, June 26, 2018.

Hon. PETE SESSIONS,
Chairman, Committee on Rules, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN SESSIONS: Thank you for your June 25, 2018 letter regarding H.R. 4537, the ''International Insurance Standards Act of 2017''.

I am most appreciative of your decision to forego action on H.R. 4537 so that it may move expeditiously to the House floor I acknowledge that although you are waiving action on the bill, the Committee on Rules is in no way waiving its jurisdictional interest in this or similar legislation. In addition, if a conference is necessary on this legislation, I will support any request that your committee be represented therein.

Finally, I shall be pleased to include your letter and this letter in our committee's report on H.R. 4537 and in the Congressional Record during floor consideration of the same.

Sincerely,

JEB HENSARLING,
Chairman.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

H.R. 4537, as amended, would ensure that international insurance standards or agreements are consistent with our domestic insurance system. The bill also encourages greater transparency, accountability, and congressional involvement in the development of international insurance standards and covered agreements.

□ 1600

H.R. 4537, the International Insurance Standards Act of 2018, is a product of months of bipartisan negotiations. I am pleased to be able to support the final compromise bill that is before us today.

Today's bill is a reflection of the work of the bill's sponsors, Mr. DUFFY and Mr. HECK, and many others, including myself, to narrow and streamline the bill so that we do not intentionally weaken the United States' ability to negotiate strong rules internationally.

This is important. We cannot forget that, during 2007 and 2009, the United States faced the most severe financial crisis since the Great Depression. One of the most notable events during the crisis was the near collapse of insurance giant AIG, which threatened the stability of the entire U.S. financial system.

AIG's rapid demise and need for a Federal bailout underscored the importance of consolidated supervision and appropriate prudential standards for certain types of nonbank financial institutions, including large, global insurance companies.

The Dodd-Frank Act helped us fill in these gaps. I would like to note that the core Dodd-Frank reforms, in this respect, remain intact in this bill.

Again, I would like to thank Mr. DUFFY, Mr. HECK, and their staffs for working with me and my staff to improve the bill.

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

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. DUFFY). My friend and colleague is a leader of this effort.

Mr. DUFFY. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Michigan, who is also a very good friend of mine, for yielding.

I rise in support of H.R. 4537, the International Insurance Standards Act. I first want to start with thanking the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HECK) for the countless hours and effort that he put in, in a bipartisan effort, crafting this bill that would allow us to get an incredibly wonderful bipartisan vote.

On top of that, we had some jurisdictional issues, so we had two chairmen from Texas, of the Ways and Means and Rules Committees, Chairman BRADY and Chairman SESSIONS, who also worked with us to navigate those jurisdictional issues.

I also want to thank the ranking member, Ms. WATERS, for working with both Mr. HECK and me to navigate some of the issues that she had with this bill to allow us to craft a piece of legislation that could get bipartisan support. I know at a time when a lot of people don't think that bipartisanship necessarily happens in this Chamber or in this town, because it doesn't make great news, it happens. People work together; they compromise; and they find a pathway forward. I think this is a

great example of that, and I want to thank the ranking member for her help in this effort and for her support. Again, it passed out of committee 56–4.

In essence, what we are doing here is saying that we have had a State-based model in America that has served this country very well for 150 years. We have been focusing on policyholder protection and solvency protection. Our insurance industry has been pretty resilient, and we are proud of it.

But we also recognize that the world is changing. It has become a far smaller world. We have different standards in different countries, and we have to be able to navigate those differences. As Americans, we have to be able to engage with the rest of the world. That is a good thing. But as we engage, we also want to make sure that we don't sell our State-based American model for some other model in some other country.

If we want to change an insurance model of regulation in America, that is our job in this Chamber. We shouldn't have some executive appointee negotiate a trade deal that undermines our State-based model. So that was the vision of what we are trying to accomplish.

In essence, we provide parameters to U.S. negotiators to prevent Federal U.S. negotiators from entering into an international insurance agreement unless it is consistent and reflective of the existing U.S. system of insurance regulation. So, again, it has to be consistent and reflective of our model.

It creates more transparency in the international insurance negotiation process, as U.S. negotiators have to regularly inform Congress as to the state and content of the negotiations that are being undertaken. It also ensures that our State insurance regulators are closely consulted in a process of the international insurance standards setting.

So this is a well-crafted bill that took in concerns that both sides of the aisle had.

I would like to note, as a Member of this body, and I think both sides feel this way, and whether it was President Clinton or President Bush or President Obama or now President Trump, we have a role in this Chamber, and, oftentimes, we cede power to the executive. I think it is important for us to exert some authority here to say that, if we are going to change the rules, then you just can't do it without us and through international negotiations.

I think this is a look to that point that, again, we have a great model. If we are going to change it, we need to be a part of it. We need to be consulted.

So with that, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the ranking member, and I want to thank Mr. HECK and the gentleman from Michigan.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a special moment to thank Mr. DUFFY and Mr. HECK. They worked very hard to resolve the concerns and the differences that arose in trying to put together this legislation.

As Mr. DUFFY has said, the world has changed, and we cannot be isolated in any way, just thinking about regulations that absolutely are impacted by what is going on internationally. I think, with all the hard work that was done by these two Members, we were able to figure out how to protect the work of the States and the laws that we have, but, at the same time, recognize that we are working in an international atmosphere. We must understand that gaps must be closed; I think we have done that sufficiently.

Again, I would like to thank them. Mr. HECK is just getting off the plane. He wanted to be here, because he has worked so hard on this legislation. He is not able to make it, but I want everybody to recognize that he did a tremendous job in helping us work through the difficulties of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I have no additional speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out to the ranking member that that could, too, be a unifying part of the House of Representatives, our collective frustration with the airlines and delays in getting us all here in a timely fashion for important things like this.

But that little bipartisan sentiment aside, I, too, want to commend Mr. HECK and Mr. DUFFY for their work on this, and I urge all of my colleagues to support this underlying bill.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4537, 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.

HOUSING CHOICE VOUCHER MOBILITY DEMONSTRATION ACT OF 2018

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5793) to authorize the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to carry out a housing choice voucher mobility demonstration to encourage families receiving such voucher assistance to move to lower-poverty areas and expand access to opportunity areas.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5793

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 ''Housing Choice Voucher Mobility Demonstration Act of 2018''.

SEC. 2. HOUSING CHOICE VOUCHER MOBILITY DEMONSTRATION.

(a) AUTHORITY.—The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development (in this section referred to as the ''Secretary'') may carry out a mobility demonstration program to enable public housing agencies to administer housing choice voucher assistance under section 8(o) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f(o)) in a manner designed to encourage families receiving such voucher assistance to move to lower-poverty areas and expand access to opportunity areas.

(b) SELECTION OF PHAS.—

(1) REQUIREMENTS.—The Secretary shall establish requirements for public housing agencies to participate in the demonstration program under this section, which shall provide that the following public housing agencies may participate:

(A) Public housing agencies that together—

(i) serve areas with high concentrations of holders of rental assistance vouchers under section 8(o) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f(o)) in poor, low-opportunity neighborhoods; and

(ii) have an adequate number of moderately priced rental units in higher-opportunity areas.

(B) Planned consortia or partial consortia of public housing agencies that—

(i) include at least one agency with a high-performing Family Self-Sufficiency (FSS) program; and

(ii) will enable participating families to continue in such program if they relocate to the jurisdiction served by any other agency of the consortium.

(C) Planned consortia or partial consortia of public housing agencies that—

(i) serve jurisdictions within a single region;

(ii) include one or more small agencies; and

(iii) will consolidate mobility focused operations.

(D) Such other public housing agencies as the Secretary considers appropriate.

(2) SELECTION CRITERIA.—The Secretary shall establish competitive selection criteria for public housing agencies eligible under paragraph (1) to participate in the demonstration program under this section.

(3) RANDOM SELECTION OF FAMILIES.—The Secretary may require participating agencies to use a randomized selection process to select among the families eligible to receive mobility assistance under the demonstration program.

(c) REGIONAL HOUSING MOBILITY PLAN.—The Secretary shall require each public housing agency applying to participate in the demonstration program under this section to submit a Regional Housing Mobility Plan (in this section referred to as a ''Plan''), which shall—

(1) identify the public housing agencies that will participate under the Plan and the number of vouchers each participating agency will make available out of their existing programs in connection with the demonstration;

(2) identify any community-based organizations, nonprofit organizations, businesses, and other entities that will participate under the Plan and describe the commitments for such participation made by each such entity;

(3) identify any waivers or alternative requirements requested for the execution of the Plan;

(4) identify any specific actions that the public housing agencies and other entities will undertake to accomplish the goals of the

demonstration, which shall include a comprehensive approach to enable a successful transition to opportunity areas and may include counseling and continued support for families;

(5) specify the criteria that the public housing agencies would use to identify opportunity areas under the plan;

(6) provide for establishment of priority and preferences for participating families, including a preference for families with young children, as such term is defined by the Secretary, based on regional housing needs and priorities; and

(7) comply with any other requirements established by the Secretary.

(d) FUNDING FOR MOBILITY-RELATED SERVICES.—

(1) USE OF ADMINISTRATIVE FEES.—Public housing agencies participating in the demonstration program under this section may use administrative fees under section 8(q) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f(q)), their administrative fee reserves, and funding from private entities to provide mobility-related services in connection with the demonstration program, including services such as counseling, portability coordination, landlord outreach, security deposits, and administrative activities associated with establishing and operating regional mobility programs.

(2) USE OF HOUSING ASSISTANCE FUNDS.—Public housing agencies participating in the demonstration under this section may use housing assistance payments funds under section 8(o) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f(o)) for security deposits if necessary to enable families to lease units with vouchers in designated opportunity areas.

(e) WAIVERS; ALTERNATIVE REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) WAIVERS.—To allow for public housing agencies to implement and administer their Regional Housing Mobility Plans, the Secretary may waive or specify alternative requirements for the following provisions of the United States Housing Act of 1937:

(A) Sections 8(o)(7)(A) and 8(o)(13)(E)(i) (relating to the term of a lease and mobility requirements).

(B) Section 8(o)(13)(C)(i) (relating to the public housing plan for an agency).

(C) Section 8(r)(2) (relating to the responsibility of a public housing agency to administer ported assistance).

(2) ALTERNATIVE REQUIREMENTS.—The Secretary shall provide additional authority for public housing agencies in a selected region to form a consortium that has a single housing choice voucher funding contract, or to enter into a partial consortium to operate all or portions of the Regional Housing Mobility Plan, including agencies participating in the Moving To Work Demonstration program.

(3) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Any waiver or alternative requirements pursuant to this subsection shall not take effect before the expiration of the 10-day period beginning upon publication of notice of such waiver or alternative requirement in the Federal Register.

(f) IMPLEMENTATION.—The Secretary may implement the demonstration, including its terms, procedures, requirements, and conditions, by notice.

(g) EVALUATION.—Not later than five years after implementation of the regional housing mobility programs under the demonstration program under this section, the Secretary shall submit to the Congress and publish in the Federal Register a report evaluating the effectiveness of the strategies pursued under the demonstration, subject to the availability of funding to conduct the evaluation. Through official websites and other methods, the Secretary shall disseminate interim findings as they become available, and shall, if promising strategies are identified, notify the Congress of the amount of funds that would be required to expand the testing of these strategies in additional types of public housing agencies and housing markets.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MAXINE WATERS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include any extraneous material on the bill.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of much-needed legislation that would authorize the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to carry out a housing choice voucher mobility demonstration program that would encourage families receiving such voucher assistance to move to communities of their own choice and to expand their access to opportunity areas.

The Housing Choice Voucher Mobility Demonstration Act of 2018 is a bipartisan piece of legislation that passed out of our committee with a vote of 53–0. This unanimous vote shows its need and showcases the broad support of the legislation across the political spectrum.

The legislation would further improve voucher mobility to help more households using housing vouchers move to communities of their choice, including those with access to better paying jobs, good schools, transportation, and greater healthcare opportunities.

Through the demonstration, HUD and the public housing agencies, also known as PHAs, would be able to develop new models for improving voucher mobility and provide counseling to help HUD-assisted families move to these areas of opportunity.

A recent Harvard study showed that giving housing vouchers to low-income families significantly improved their lives and provided children with greater opportunity and a better shot at success. The study estimated that moving a child out of public housing to a low-poverty area will increase the child's total lifetime earnings by nearly $302,000.

The study clearly demonstrates that offering low-income families housing vouchers and assistance in moving to these lower poverty neighborhoods has substantial benefits for the families themselves, for the communities, and for taxpayers.

Helping all Americans afford decent, stable homes is the key to ensuring that people have the opportunity to lead healthy and productive lives. Enacting this legislation is an important step that Congress can and should take to address this challenge.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, it is an unfortunate reality in our country that a child's ZIP Code can determine her future and that families often have limited options in choosing where to live.

Rigorous studies have demonstrated that giving a low-income family the opportunity to move to a lower poverty neighborhood can have a profound impact, particularly for young children.

For example, one study found that young boys and girls in families that used a voucher to move to lower poverty neighborhoods were 32 percent more likely to attend college and earn 31 percent more annually compared to their counterparts in families that did not receive a voucher.

However, families with housing choice vouchers continue to face significant challenges if they want to move to a better neighborhood. In fact, data shows that only one in eight families with children with a housing choice voucher used their vouchers to live in low-poverty areas.

H.R. 5793 will help reduce barriers to mobility for families with housing choice vouchers by establishing a demonstration program that would enable and incentivize public housing agencies to form regional collaborations that will enhance opportunities for mobility across jurisdictions.

This is a bipartisan proposal that was included in previous HUD budget requests under the Obama administration. The Center on Budget and Policy Priorities estimates that this demonstration will allow more than 7,000 families to move to areas of opportunity.

I am pleased to support this legislation, and, of course, I urge my colleagues to do the same.

I would like to say that Mr. CLEAVER and Mr. DUFFY have worked very hard to get this demonstration. I am very pleased about that because it is well known that I have big concerns about HUD and HUD's ability to give the kind of support to the least of these and families that need it so desperately. But this may be an indication that we can get more positive action from HUD.

So, again, I am very pleased to support this legislation, and I would like all of my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on the bill.

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

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. DUFFY), who is the chairman of the Housing and Insurance Subcommittee. I commend him on his fine work.

Mr. DUFFY. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Michigan for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5793, the Housing Choice Voucher Mobility Demonstration Act.

I want to thank Mr. CLEAVER. We have worked together on a number of different pieces of legislation.

□ 1615

This is just another example of two like-minded people seeing a problem. This isn't earth-shattering, earthquakes and lightning aren't happening, but this is a small demonstration project that can modify a program that can have a true impact on people's lives.

The insight that Mr. CLEAVER, the gentleman from Missouri, brings to this issue was incredibly helpful. I just want to thank him for his friendship and his help in working on this bill.

We should evaluate Federal programs and look at how successful they are. What are the results of the programs that we implement?

I strongly believe that, as we evaluate these programs, we should focus on supporting the programs and ideas that lead people away from dependency on the government and bring people toward self-sufficiency. Money is a component. How much we spend to help people is relevant.

But how much we spend on Federal Government programs isn't the end-all, be-all. It is the actual success of the program and the money that we spend and the leading people out of poverty and dependency into self-sufficiency and opportunities.

We have to give families the opportunity to pick themselves up so they can find a better job, they can live in a safer environment, and they can better provide for their children. H.R. 5793 moves toward those goals by authorizing the HUD Secretary to carry out a housing choice voucher demonstration program designed to help those receiving housing vouchers move to areas of lower poverty and to opportunity, helping them better their lives.

So, currently, the housing choice voucher program works with around 2,200 public housing authorities to administer 2.2 million vouchers across the Nation. While you would think that a lot of the PHAs would translate into more people being helped, it actually creates some complexity and inefficiency.

In some cases, not all cases, PHAs are fighting to keep as many vouchers and government resources as possible. They are trying to keep those resources to themselves when operating in the same general region.

When that happens, when someone might want to take that voucher and go somewhere else, there are roadblocks and barriers put it place that make it more challenging. So, instead of cooperating, the PHAs compete and put up barriers that prevent individuals from moving to a different area and actually bettering their lives.

This bill would allow HUD to implement a plan to regionalize various PHAs in one area to allow for portability and movement to higher opportunity areas.

The gentleman from Michigan mentioned this. We know that low-income children whose families move to areas of lower poverty have higher earnings as adults. We must eliminate the cycle of poverty that keeps generations of families living within the same area with a limited amount of opportunity. Helping people move to better opportunities will increase the chances for them to achieve academic success and reduce intergenerational poverty.

I think, as we look around the country, we have help wanted signs everywhere. Everyone is looking for help. Different regions have different starting wages. So, if you live in one area and you might not have as much opportunity or as great of wages, you don't have the money to go to a different part of town or a different area of your State and you can't take advantage of a better paying job.

What we are saying is let people go. Give them the voucher and let them move. Let them get that great job. That mobility that we give them helps them actually start climbing the economic ladder and, hopefully, get off dependence of the Federal Government. What that does is, again, launch them on their economic career, but it frees up resources to help somebody else out. This is a win-win deal.

So, again, it is a demonstration project. I think it is going to work. I know Mr. CLEAVER and the ranking member do as well. Again, this is just another sign of parties working together to help people. We don't always agree on everything, but this was, again, a commonsense proposal that can make HUD work better and help more people out.

I want to thank both the ranking member and Mr. CLEAVER for working so diligently on this effort and allowing this to go under suspension.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLEAVER), the ranking member of the Housing and Insurance Subcommittee on the Financial Services Committee and the lead Democratic sponsor of this bill.

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Speaker, let me, first of all, thank Chairman DUFFY from our subcommittee for working on this significant piece of legislation, as well as the chair and the ranking member of the full committee. I am not going to take long. I think most of the salient points have already been made.

If I had a chance to rename this piece of legislation, it would be the Living in Higher Opportunity Neighborhoods Act. That is exactly what we are doing when we pass this act.

This bill should pass without anyone even doing third-level thinking. All you have to do is read the Harvard research project from Raj Chetty, Nathaniel Hendren, and Lawrence Katz, which spoke about the improved opportunities for children based on their location. Higher opportunity neighborhoods offer just about everything that we would want a child to have growing up in this country.

This choice voucher act, under section 8 of the 1937 housing bill, will provide opportunities for people to move out of areas of high poverty concentration into neighborhoods where there are opportunities. As a former mayor, this is the part I wish we could do on a lot of projects, and that is, if public housing authorities want to participate in this program, they must submit a regional plan, which means that they will work beyond their own special interests.

In the case of PHAs in Kansas City, Missouri, we are separated by five other cities by one street, called State Line. So this would also provide an opportunity for Kansas City, Kansas, and Kansas City, Missouri, to work together. I am sure that there are situations all across the country which will provide opportunities for PHAs to work together.

I will just end by saying that this program is one that I think we are going to find people in these neighborhoods strongly supporting. Should this legislation be signed by the President, I hope that we will do everything we can to make sure that the communities, as a whole, understand what this bill is, because I think it speaks to the overall needs in the urban core in particular.

I am appreciative of the fact that I was allowed to be involved in this piece of legislation. I appreciate all the great work that my colleague and my neighbor across the hall, Mr. DUFFY, has made available.

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

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly support this bill because we all must have hope. We all must have hope that we can get rid of poverty, that we can open up opportunities, that we can do something that would allow families who are locked into very poor neighborhoods be able to escape those neighborhoods and have better opportunities.

It is not always clear how that is going to happen, but given this legislation by Mr. DUFFY and Mr. CLEAVER, they certainly are attempting to put something together that may be able to move these families and give them better opportunities.

We know that we support housing with Section 8 and public housing projects, et cetera, and we know that we have people who have Section 8 certificates who have been desperately looking for a decent place to live and would love to be able to move into higher opportunity neighborhoods.

We have got to think in this collaboration that is going to be done about

how we are going to convince landlords to be more open to accepting voucher choice participants. We have got to think about what public housing programs can do. Most, of course, public housing is in poor neighborhoods. But certainly, if we have those who are in stronger neighborhoods, better neighborhoods, perhaps there can be the kind of collaboration that can see to it that people in some of the poorer neighborhoods and public housing would have an opportunity for moving into these better neighborhoods.

So, again, I think we must be hopeful. We don't always know how it is going to be done, but to give it a try is certainly worthwhile.

Mr. Speaker, I would certainly ask my colleagues to support this legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, there is an old adage: If it ain't broke, don't fix it. Well, guess what, folks; this is kind of broke. We need to look for different ways of fixing it.

This bill today that my colleague from Missouri (Mr. CLEAVER) and my colleague from Wisconsin (Mr. DUFFY) have been working on is that attempt to look for those answers. We do truly have common goals. They are common goals of opportunity, reward, and upward mobility for all Americans and to give them that opportunity.

Whether you are watching on C–SPAN or maybe in the gallery right now, what you are seeing on the floor may not compute with what you are seeing in the news all the time. We actually are agreeing on things. We actually are trying to move ahead and trying to better our citizens and our constituents in a way that will ultimately benefit not just them and their families individually, but their communities, our collective State, and, by extension, our country. That is what we are trying to do here today.

I just, again, want to commend the gentlemen from Wisconsin and Missouri for their work on this and for the leadership of the ranking member and Chairman HENSARLING, as well, on this.

As we move forward to try to provide that opportunity to provide that upward mobility, to give citizens the real choice of what to do with their lives and how to live their lives, I can think of no better way than starting off with this pilot program.

And, hopefully, as I share the confidence with my friend from Wisconsin, I believe this will work. When it works, we will have that proof to go back and to use things like that Harvard study and others that have shown that upward mobility is achievable and that people aren't locked into one location or one mindset or one community. They can choose to be a part of that, but if they know they are going to have greater opportunity somewhere else, then the Federal Government shouldn't stand in the way of that opportunity. This bill does exactly that.

Mr. Speaker, I want to suggest to my colleagues that they vote for this very important piece of legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5793.

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. HUIZENGA. Mr. 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.

MODERNIZING DISCLOSURES FOR INVESTORS ACT

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5970) to require the Securities and Exchange Commission to implement rules simplifying the quarterly financial reporting regime, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5970

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 ''Modernizing Disclosures for Investors Act''.

SEC. 2. FORM 10-Q ANALYSIS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Securities and Exchange Commission shall conduct an analysis of the costs and benefits of requiring reporting companies to use Form 10-Q for submitting quarterly financial reports. Such analysis shall consider—

(1) the costs and benefits of Form 10-Q to emerging growth companies;

(2) the costs and benefits of Form 10-Q to the Commission in terms of its ability to protect investors, maintain fair, orderly, and efficient markets, and facilitate capital formation;

(3) the costs and benefits of Form 10-Q to other reporting companies, investors, market researchers, and other market participants, including the costs and benefits associated with—

(A) the public availability of the information required to be filed on Form 10-Q;

(B) the use of a standardized reporting format across all classes of reporting companies; and

(C) the quarterly disclosure by some companies of financial information in formats other than Form 10-Q, such as a quarterly earnings press release;

(4) the costs and benefits of alternative formats for quarterly reporting for emerging growth companies to emerging growth companies, the Commission, other reporting companies, investors, market researchers, and other market participants; and

(5) the expected impact of the use of alternative formats of quarterly reporting by emerging growth companies on overall market transparency and efficiency.

(b) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commission shall issue a report to Congress that includes—

(1) the results of the analysis required by subsection (a); and

(2) recommendations for decreasing costs, increasing transparency, and increasing efficiency of quarterly financial reporting by emerging growth companies.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MAXINE WATERS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

□ 1630

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I commend my colleague, Mrs. WAGNER, from Missouri for her work on this very important bill. This is part of a series of bills that we have seen, not just today but throughout the time that we have put forth on the Capital Markets Subcommittee, as well as the Financial Services Committee overall, because we know that there is no one thing that has ground the gears of our economy to a halt or to slow it down, and there is also no one magic thing that can happen or be passed that will suddenly spring it to life. It is a little like throwing sand in the gears of a machine. Over time, it just gets harder and harder and harder for that machine to grind on.

We are here through a whole series of bills, both today and at other times, to add a little oil to the machine, to try to make sure that our capital markets are continuing to move and to be the envy of the world. We know, Mr. Speaker, that our capital markets here in the United States have been and continue to be the envy of the world, and they are a vibrant ecosystem fueling America's economic growth and generating millions of private sector jobs.

These capital markets provide financing and needed resources to the smallest startups and to the very largest of the international companies that we have here in the United States. However, smaller companies have often been penalized for their size.

As we have talked about in previous bills, the number of IPOs, or initial public offerings, that have occurred in the United States have plummeted. We have tried to fix that or tried to help improve that through things like the JOBS Act, but these small companies still face significant regulatory and market impediments that disincentivize them from accessing capital via the public markets.

The Federal securities laws require that most SEC registrants disclose certain information on an ongoing basis, including a quarterly report on what is called the form 10Q. Form 10Q includes condensed financial information and

other data prepared by a company and reviewed, though generally unaudited, by its independent auditor.

The purpose is to provide a continuing view of the company's financial position during the year. The report must be filed for each of the first three fiscal quarters of the company's fiscal year.

The SEC's current corporate disclosure system imposes a number of outdated, duplicative, burdensome, and unnecessary requirements on U.S. companies diverting private sector resources toward regulatory compliance and away from innovation, growth, and job creation, where it really should be. Moreover, this outdated disclosure regime leads to unnecessarily long, complicated, and often immaterial public company disclosures, resulting in widespread investor confusion and, potentially, suboptimal investment decisions.

While the SEC has often recognized the need to study and streamline the corporate disclosure regime, it has recently been Congress that has actually spurred them on in this regard. Through provisions such as the JOBS Act and the FAST Act, the SEC is required to study current regulations and then eliminate these outdated, duplicative, and unnecessary disclosure obligations.

Form 10Q can create extreme administrative costs. A 2011 report of the IPO Task Force found that 92 percent of public companies said that ''administrative burden of public reporting'' was a significant challenge to completing an IPO and becoming a public company.

We have talked about, Mr. Speaker, earlier, that lack of ability for retail investors, the Joe and Jane investor, to have the same opportunity that some sort of well-financed, professional investor or fund that is out there is going to have.

We need to allow them to have access into these pools of companies so that they may catch the upside of so many of these companies that are seeing extreme growth. That is the reason why we need to have these IPOs.

In addition to filing forms 10K annually and 10Q quarterly, companies must file current reports on form 8K, often within 4 business days after the occurrence of specified events; these are things that could move their stock price, for example, and is relevant disclosure that needs to happen. They are then required to file these form 8Ks.

In other words, by the time a quarterly report is filed, many material events have already been reported by a company through these 8Ks; and according to widespread economic views regarding efficiency of markets, that information has then been priced into the cost of an equity. Granting early growth companies the option of issuing a press release or other short form that includes earnings results, as opposed to a full 10Q form, would provide investors with important quarterly financial information but reduce unnecessary burdens and complexities associated with the current quarterly reporting system.

Again, it is extremely important that investors have access to that information. This bill does nothing to diminish that. In fact, it makes it more approachable and more accessible to the average investor.

Nonetheless, this bill does not require any action by the SEC to change the 10Q reporting regime. It simply requires the SEC to consider the issue and report back to Congress on it. In doing so, the SEC can consider the substantial costs of these financial disclosures and aim to modernize the disclosure process in a manner that encourages investors to make more efficient use of the information filed with the SEC.

Specifically, H.R. 5970, the Modernizing Disclosures for Investors Act, would require the SEC to provide a report to Congress with a cost-benefit analysis for emerging growth companies' use of the SEC form 10Q and recommendations for decreasing costs, increasing transparency, and increasing efficiency of quarterly financial reporting by emerging growth companies within 180 days after enactment of this bill.

I would like to commend my colleagues, Representative WAGNER and Representative GOTTHEIMER, for their bipartisan work on this very important bill. This bill, it is important to note, Mr. Speaker, passed the Financial Services Committee by a vote of 56–0. That is very important information because I believe that this is bipartisan and should be a bicameral step toward maintaining the health of our capital markets.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to vote for H.R. 5970, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, robust and regular disclosures by public companies, such as the detailed quarterly financial information filed on a form 10Q, make our markets more attractive to investors by enabling informed investment decisions and ensuring shareholders can hold corporate boards accountable for practices that may undermine the value of the company.

Standardized quarterly financial reporting on form 10Q also provides a means for regulators to conduct efficient and effective oversight of public companies and protect investors from fraud and other corporate misconduct.

When investors have faith in the integrity of our markets, they are more likely to entrust their capital to public companies, thereby providing opportunities for economic growth and job creation.

The benefits of quarterly reporting are well recognized by the investor community. In a June 2016 letter to the SEC's Division of Corporate Finance, the SEC's Investor Advisory Committee wrote, ''The current degree, quality, and frequency of disclosure for U.S. issuers overall is appropriate and a source of strength for the U.S. capital markets. The current system greatly benefits retirees, pension funds, endowments, and households that are directly and indirectly market participants.''

Additionally, in May and June of this year, investors and investor advocacy groups wrote to the Financial Services Committee expressing their support for the SEC's current quarterly reporting regime, including the form 10Q.

According to CalPERS, the largest public pension fund in the United States with more than $350 billion in global assets, ''10Qs provide substantial and important information and serve as a great historical resource. Any modification of standard quarterly filings should be preceded by significant study with ample opportunity for investor input.''

While some business groups have called for the elimination of the 10Q as a cost-saving measure for corporations, I agree that any attempt to alter the existing quarterly reporting requirements first requires a careful and balanced study that considers the impact of any changes on investors and our markets.

H.R. 5970, as amended, requires the SEC to conduct such a study, to include consideration of the benefits of form 10Q reporting to the SEC, public companies, investors, market researchers, and other market participants.

I support the bill as amended, and I thank Mr. GOTTHEIMER and Mrs. WAGNER for working together to develop a bipartisan approach to the study. I hope that the SEC takes this study as an opportunity to hear from investors about the disclosures they find important and ensure that our public markets and the companies which seek to access them continue to enjoy the benefits of comprehensive and standardized financial disclosure.

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

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Speaker, it has been a long afternoon. We have covered a lot of territory, eight different bills, I think, today. As I had said earlier, there is no magic bill that is going to somehow cure or remedy some of the challenges that our capital markets have seen over the last number of years, but this is a step towards that.

H.R. 5970 and so many of these other bills are important steps that this House is taking on a very bipartisan basis. I commend everybody who has worked on this—Mr. GOTTHEIMER and Mrs. WAGNER in this particular case—and I look forward to continuing to work with my colleagues across the aisle to search for true solutions in policy and to set aside the politics of what needs to happen.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of H.R. 5970, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5970, 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 require the Securities and Exchange Commission to carry out a cost benefit analysis of the use of Form 10–Q and for other purposes.''.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INTERCOUNTRY ADOPTION INFORMATION ACT OF 2018

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5626) to amend the Intercountry Adoption Act of 2000 to require the Secretary of State to report on intercountry adoptions from countries which have significantly reduced adoption rates involving immigration to the United States, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5626

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 ''Intercountry Adoption Information Act of 2018''.

SEC. 2. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION TO BE INCLUDED IN ANNUAL REPORT ON INTERCOUNTRY ADOPTIONS.

(a) REPORT ELEMENTS.—Section 104(b) of the Intercountry Adoption Act of 2000 (42 U.S.C. 14914(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

''(9) A list of countries that established or maintained a law or policy that prevented or prohibited adoptions involving immigration to the United States, regardless of whether such adoptions occurred under the Convention.

''(10) For each country listed under paragraph (9), the date on which the law or policy was initially implemented.

''(11) Information on efforts taken with respect to a country listed under paragraph (9) to encourage the resumption of halted or stalled adoption proceedings involving immigration to the United States, regardless of whether the adoptions would have occurred under the Convention.

''(12) Information on any action the Secretary carried out that prevented, prohibited, or halted any adoptions involving immigration to the United States, regardless of whether the adoptions occurred under the Convention.''.

(b) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY OF REPORT.—Section 104 of the Intercountry Adoption Act of 2000 (42 U.S.C. 14914) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(c) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY OF REPORT.—The Secretary shall make the information contained in the report required under subsection (a) available to the public on the website of the Department of State.''.

(c) PRIVACY CONCERNS.—In complying with the amendments made by subsections (a) and (b), the Secretary shall avoid, to the maximum extent practicable, disclosing any personally identifiable information relating to United States citizens or the adoptees of such citizens.

(d) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 104(a) of the Intercountry Adoption Act of 2000 (42 U.S.C. 14914(a)) is amended by striking ''International Relations'' and inserting ''Foreign Affairs''.

(e) APPLICATION DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to reports required to be submitted under section 104 of the Intercountry Adoption Act of 2000 (42 U.S.C. 14914) beginning on the date that is 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include any extraneous material in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this measure. It is the Intercountry Adoption Information Act, H.R. 5626.

Here in Congress, I have been honored, as has my friend here, DOUG COLLINS, the author of this measure, to help bring families together through overseas adoptions.

□ 1645

These children are deeply loved by American parents from all different backgrounds who give them incredible care and give them opportunity. Sadly, international adoptions do not always go as planned.

Over the years, I have met with countless families who were matched with a child, bonded with that child, financially supported that child, only to have their child's adoption stalled or, worse, stopped completely due to policy changes in the child's birth country. Obviously, this is devastating, devastating to the child, devastating to the families involved.

In September of 2013, President Joseph Kabila of Congo suspended exit permits for more than 1,000 children already adopted by international couples, mainly from the United States and France. These adoptions had already been approved by the Congolese courts. The children had been issued passports from their new countries. Parents had come to spend time with those children, but without the exit visas from the Congolese Government, they could not leave. The children could not leave.

Families were forced to spend thousands of dollars, travel across oceans, and navigate foreign courts to fight to bring those adopted children home. Making matters worse, many children had serious medical issues. Tragically, I have to report to you that 25 died while stuck in this bureaucratic chokehold. They were living in horrid conditions, lacking the most basic care.

Thankfully, through a coordinated push by the previous administration and Congress, hundreds of children in the DRC were freed to come home to the United States. It took multiple trips to get the job done. I personally traveled to the Democratic Republic of the Congo to raise these issues at the highest levels of the Congolese Government. Within 60 days afterward, more than 400 children were released to their adoptive American families.

But still, many children remain at risk worldwide. We do not know exactly how many children are waiting to be united with their families in the U.S. and elsewhere. The Intercountry Adoption Information Act introduced by our colleague from Georgia, DOUG COLLINS, seeks to lessen this problem by enhancing the information available to families who are adopting.

Those families wish to adopt overseas, and they need to know. They need to know the situation. This bill requires the State Department to include in its existing annual report information on countries that have enacted new laws or policies that would impact intercountry adoptions.

This information would have been helpful, for example, when the Congo and Ethiopia imposed sweeping new policies that put a hold on adoptions for American families.

With the passage of this legislation, families could see not only how many children are being adopted by American families from certain countries and how long these adoption proceedings are taking, but if the country has recently changed its laws or if policies have been changed by a head of state that could make adoption more difficult or shut it down completely.

Just as importantly, this legislation would also require that the annual report include what positive steps the U.S. Government is taking to reduce the burdens or barriers on stalled adoptions to unite children with their families.

I urge my colleagues to support the passage of the Intercountry Adoption Information Act, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume as I rise in support of this measure.

First of all, let me thank Congressman DOUG COLLINS and Congresswoman BRENDA LAWRENCE for their work in bringing this bill forward.

This bill before us, the Intercountry Adoption Information Act of 2018, will create more transparency in the adoption process.

Mr. Speaker, the adoption process can be long, emotional, and expensive

for Americans who seek to expand their families and give children a forever home. The reason families put themselves through this is because they love these children and want to give them a chance to be part of a loving family. But foreign governments sometimes abruptly change their policies on adoptions, leaving families in the dark as they anxiously wait to be united with their adoptive children. This measure would help make sure adoptive parents get the information they need when this happens.

H.R. 5626 requires the Secretary of State to report whether countries have enacted new laws or policies that would affect intercountry adoptions for American families. This will help create a more transparent adoption process that benefits everyone, the parents and the child as well.

Mr. Speaker, we owe to these families and children to illuminate the dark corners of the adoption process. With 140 million children orphaned worldwide, we need to make it easier for families to come together, regardless of the child's birth country. These children need loving and supportive homes, and this bill gives them a better chance at being adopted into one.

Mr. Speaker, I support this measure strongly, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

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

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS), who is the author of this bill.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman and the ranking member so much for their support in this and bringing this forward.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 5626, the Intercountry Adoption Information Act. I introduced this legislation to make it easier for American families to get crucial information as they pursue adoptions from foreign countries.

American families hoping to adopt from a foreign country can face many obstacles on the road to being united with their adoptive children. Too often, these challenges require parents to navigate confusing and complicated foreign adoption policies.

The chairman did a great job explaining why this is opening up, why we are providing transparency, and also providing a great basis for this bill.

Mr. Speaker, many times we come to this floor and we talk about the mechanics of a bill, but I want to talk about what I call the faces behind the bill.

For this, for me, I have watched northeast Georgians from my district, like the Romano family, struggle under shifting adoption policies and changing international standards.

In 2012, Pam and Mark Romano traveled to Russia to adopt a young boy named Bogdon, a decision they reached after much prayer and family discussion. While there, the Romanos discovered that Bogdon had a brother, Yura, although the boys were living separately. The family immediately felt a calling to welcome both boys into their home and began the process of adopting Yura as well.

Sadly, Russia then instituted a ban on adoptions to the United States, halting these adoption proceedings. This left the Romanos devastated. They worked to be reunited with their sons, but they needed concrete information about how to do that and what was happening in Russia, as well as diplomatically.

Since that time, Pam Romano has refused to give up on welcoming their 2 boys into her family. She is fighting to bring her sons home, and the boys' room is furnished and ready for their arrival. Pam and her family have been tireless advocates for not only Bogdon and Yura, but also for families across the country who are facing similar trials.

I hope that this will be a wonderful time to bring this up, in light of the meeting this week with the President and Mr. Putin. To bring this issue up would be a great time to remind that we can work together on some things.

Today, American families like the Romanos still need more accurate, up-to-date information as they labor to bring their adoptive children into loving homes. Changing foreign practices can leave adoptive parents mystified and desperately seeking answers as they pursue intercountry adoptions in different countries.

The Intercountry Adoption Information Act takes steps to shrink this information gap. It ensures families in the intercountry adoption process are equipped with a more thorough outlook on the status of intercountry adoptions in specific countries and on the State Department's actions to resume these adoptions currently stalled.

Again, I would like to thank Chairman ROYCE and the ranking member of the Foreign Affairs Committee for their support in moving this bill forward, and also my partners in this, Representatives LAWRENCE, FITZPATRICK, LAMBORN, CICILLINE, LANGEVIN, WILSON, and YOHO, for being cosponsors of this bill and to highlight their advocacy on behalf of these loving families and innocent children.

The Romanos brought this to my attention, but it is not left there. I would also like to thank my staff, Erica Barker, who has not let this issue go and has brought it to my attention constantly in moving this bill forward.

I urge my colleagues to join me in working for American families so that we can benefit and see the benefits of our Intercountry Adoption Information Act.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. LAWRENCE), the coauthor of the measure.

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Intercountry Adoption Information Act. As co-chair of the Congressional Coalition on Adoption and an original cosponsor with Congressman COLLINS, I am pleased to see the House take up this bill on suspension.

There are an estimated 140 million orphaned children worldwide and many families waiting to provide a permanent, loving home.

However, in recent years, countries have carried out policy changes that have reduced our intercountry adoptions altogether. Many of these changes are suddenly implemented, leading to confusion for families in the middle of the adoption process.

H.R. 5626 adds reporting requirements to the act of 2000 to track foreign countries that have made changes to their adoption policies.

This bill is a simple fix that allows families to access accurate, updated information. It gives clarity to prospective families and the millions of children who are in need of a permanent, loving home.

Again, I want to say thank you to my ranking member and to Representative COLLINS, and I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time, and I will close.

I want to say again that I am pleased to support the Intercountry Adoption Information Act. Let me add that too often we hear these heart-wrenching stories of American families whose adoption processes were halted by a foreign government's change in policy. To make matters worse, these families often have no idea why the process grinds to a halt.

This bill presents a straightforward fix, requiring the State Department to provide information that affects prospective adoptive American families. So I support this bill and agree with what the chairman has said as well and encourage all my colleagues to do the same.

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

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, let me just thank my colleagues; the ranking member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, Mr. ELIOT ENGEL; as well as Congressman COLLINS, the author of this bill; and two other Members who worked hard on it, Congressman KINZINGER and Congressman SCHNEIDER. They made improvements to the legislation during markup.

In closing, I urge my colleagues to support the Intercountry Adoption Information Act. I think it is very important.

Mr. 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.

ROYCE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5626, 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.

CONDEMNING SLAVE AUCTIONS OF MIGRANTS AND REFUGEES IN LIBYA

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 644) strongly condemning the slave auctions of migrants and refugees in Libya, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 644

Whereas Libya has become the primary transit hub for migrants and refugees attempting to reach Southern Europe;

Whereas in December 2016, the United Nations Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights reported that many migrants and refugees in Libya are forced to work without pay as farm laborers, domestic workers, construction workers, and rubbish collectors;

Whereas beginning in 2017, multiple news and international organizations began reporting on the existence of slave auctions of migrants and refugees in Libya;

Whereas the Department of State's Trafficking in Persons Report 2017 for Libya stated that migrants held in detention centers controlled by both Libya's Department to Combat Irregular Migration (DCIM) and non-state armed groups are subject to severe abuse, rampant sexual violence, forced labor, and other human rights abuses;

Whereas on February 12, 2018, the United Nations Secretary-General reported to the United Nations Security Council that the humanitarian situation in Libya had recently deteriorated further, and that ''Refugees and migrants continued to be subjected to violence, forced labor, and other grave violations and abuses.'';

Whereas the Presidency Council of the Government of National Accord affirmed the depravity of slavery and human trafficking and initiated an investigation into such acts within Libya;

Whereas a September 2017, report from the United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund (UNICEF) determined that unaccompanied children who crossed the Mediterranean from Libya suffered enslavement, violence, and sexual abuse at the hands of smugglers and traffickers;

Whereas in November 2017, a joint European Union-African Union-United Nations Task Force was established to protect migrants along migration routes to, from, and in Libya;

Whereas since December 2017, the International Organization for Migration has facilitated the return of more than 15,000 migrants to their homes from Libya through a voluntary humanitarian program, and the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees has evacuated more than 1,300 refugees from Libya as of March 2018;

Whereas the fall of Muammar Gaddafi in Libya in 2011 led to significant political turmoil and insecurity within the country;

Whereas in December 2017, the Libyan Political Agreement was reaffirmed as the internationally-supported framework for creating a unified Libyan government;

Whereas, despite this agreement, the prolonged and continuing absence of a unified Libyan government has resulted in a power vacuum in which human trafficking and smuggling have emerged as a lucrative trade and funds obtained from the transfer, sale, and exploitation of migrants are used to fund armed militias competing for territory, influence, and control of institutions; and

Whereas the United States has repeatedly condemned slavery, involuntary servitude, and other elements of trafficking as a grave violation of human rights and a matter of pressing international concern: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) strongly condemns slave auctions and the exploitation of migrants and refugees as forced laborers in Libya;

(2) calls upon all parties to the conflict in Libya, including parties to the Libyan Political Agreement, to—

(A) investigate and eradicate slave auctions and forced labor involving migrants and refugees;

(B) hold those identified in the investigation accountable in courts of law;

(C) manage migration flows and migrant detention centers in a humane manner; and

(D) investigate how funds earned through the transfer, sale, and exploitation of migrants are used and the extent to which such profits are fueling and prolonging Libya's civil conflict;

(3) calls upon the United Nations to—

(A) investigate allegations of the slave trade and other forced labor in Libya;

(B) advocate that all parties to the conflict in Libya, including parties to the Libyan Political Agreement, allow the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights to regularly monitor and publicly report on the situation of all refugees and migrants in Libya, including those in detention centers; and

(C) expand sanctions under United Nations Security Council Resolution 2174 (2014) against individuals and entities responsible for slave auctions and forced labor of migrants and refugees in Libya;

(4) calls upon the Secretary of State and the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development to ensure that any strategies, programs, or other efforts to address the political and security situation in Libya appropriately address the vulnerabilities faced by migrants and refugees; and

(5) urges the Secretary of State to ensure that the country narrative for Libya in the annual Trafficking in Persons Report fully and accurately reflects the scope of trafficking in persons in that country, including any complicity by parties to the Libyan Political Agreement or other governmental entities, as required by section 110 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7107).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include any extraneous material in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, let me start by thanking Congresswoman BASS, the ranking member of our subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, Global Human Rights, and International Organizations. I thank her for authoring this important resolution, because modern-day slavery continues to devastate the lives of tens of millions of human beings around the world. The perpetrators of these dastardly, disgusting acts prey on the defenseless. They prey on those without power, including preying on young children.

□ 1700

I think many of us have had an opportunity or a responsibility to work with survivors of human trafficking in our districts. I can tell you that one of the things that it taught me was the horror of trafficking lies not in statistics; it lies in stolen lives.

These crimes are common for one reason: they are profitable and people get away with it. The International Labor Organization estimates that there is $150 billion in illegal profit made from forced labor each year, making human trafficking the third most valuable criminal enterprise on the planet and providing fuel to violent extremist organizations.

Unfortunately, Libya has become a major center of human trafficking. The country continues to be a fractured and failed state. There is no government to control its territory. This vacuum, when combined with Libya's proximity to Europe, has made Libya the primary transit hub for migrants from sub-Saharan Africa attempting to reach Europe.

Various bad actors, including extremist groups, have taken advantage, profiting from the unrest by mercilessly preying on migrants and refugees from some of the poorest and most war-torn countries in the world. News reports tell of people being forced to work without pay; others have shown people being sold at slave auctions in Libya.

The resolution before us today rightfully condemns these dehumanizing acts and calls on all parties in Libya to investigate these crimes and to hold perpetrators accountable. It urges the United Nations to investigate and to impose sanctions against those responsible for these abuses, and it calls for greater access for the U.N. High Commissioner for Human Rights to monitor and publicly report on refugees and migrants in Libya.

Finally, the resolution calls on the administration to address these issues in a strategy to tackle Libya's political and security challenges, and to ensure

that the Department of State's annual Trafficking in Persons Report fully reflects the situation in Libya.

The Government of National Accord in Tripoli has made some encouraging steps toward investigating some of these crimes, but all parties, nationally and internationally, must do more to stop this exploitation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan resolution, which puts the House on record as standing against modern-day slavery and other forms of human trafficking in Libya.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this measure.

I thank the ranking member of the Africa, Global Health, Global Human Rights, and International Organizations Subcommittee, Ms. KAREN BASS of California, for her hard work on this legislation.

For several years, Libya has been a hub for African migration to Europe, with an estimated 700,000 to 1 million refugees and migrants currently in the country.

Last year, I was shocked and horrified to see multiple news reports documenting the existence of slave auctions in Libya, where these migrants and refugees were put up for sale. It is unbelievable that, in the year 2018, we could still have slavery anywhere in the world, just absolutely unbelievable.

Since then, the U.N. High Commissioner for Human Rights found that many migrants who enter Libya are forced to work for no pay. This is also unacceptable. We cannot accept a world where human beings are auctioned off, treated like property. It is unbelievable. These are some of the most vulnerable people in the world, and we cannot stand by as they are mistreated.

This resolution strongly condemns slave auctions and the exploitation of migrants and refugees as forced laborers in Libya. It also calls upon all parties to the conflict in Libya to investigate and eradicate slave auctions and forced labor involving migrants and refugees, to hold those identified in the investigation accountable in courts of law, and to examine the extent to which profits earned through the exploitation of these migrants may be fueling conflict in Libya.

Importantly, the measure also calls upon the United Nations to investigate this slave trade and forced labor in Libya and expand U.N. Security Council sanctions against individuals and entities responsible for this atrocity. The international community must hold accountable those who are responsible for these heinous crimes.

It is also important that we have full information so that we can address this issue and understand what we are dealing with. That is why it is so important that this resolution also urges the Secretary of State to ensure that Libya is fully and accurately covered in the annual Trafficking in Persons Report. This measure sends a clear message. By passing it today, we say, unequivocally, that we will not stand for this inhumanity.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan measure, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, it is now my pleasure to yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BASS), the very distinguished ranking member of the Africa, Global Health, Global Human Rights, and International Organizations Subcommittee of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Ms. BASS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 644, strongly condemning the slave auctions of migrants and refugees in Libya, and for other purposes.

In November 2017, CNN broke a story about modern-day slavery in Libya with a grainy video that shows an auctioneer standing in front of a group of young men shouting: ''Big strong boys for farm work. 400, 700, 800.'' The video left people shocked and sparked protests outside of Libyan Embassies here in the U.S. and across Africa and Europe.

In April 2017, the U.N. Migration Agency, the International Organization for Migration, gathered evidence and issued a warning about slave markets in Libya. While there were warning signs from various organizations that migrants, refugees, and asylum seekers were suffering abuse, it took actual video evidence for the world to pay attention.

Libya has become a primary transit hub for migrants and refugees attempting to reach Southern Europe by sea, and various organizations estimate that there are between 400,000 and 1 million migrants and refugees in the country. Refugees and migrants are routinely subjected to grave human rights abuses committed by Libyan officials and security forces, as well as armed groups and criminal gangs who are often working in close cooperation and to mutual financial advantage.

How did we get here and what is the solution to this crisis?

Refugees and migrants in Libya are exposed to horrendous human rights violations in a country where institutions have been weakened by years of conflict and political division. The end of Qadhafi's regime in 2011 led to significant political turmoil and insecurity within Libya. Since then, there has been no effective government in place in the country. Today, three governments, divided along geographical and ideological lines, combine for power, each with limited control over parts of the country. The collapse of government and security institutions has made the trafficking in refugees a lucrative business.

This resolution condemns slave auctions and the exploitation of migrants and refugees as forced laborers in Libya. It also calls upon all parties to the conflict, including parties to the Libyan Political Agreement, to investigate and eradicate the slave auctions and to manage migration flows and migrant detention centers in a humane manner.

I want to also mention that the Congressional Black Caucus was at the head of this effort. We immediately called upon the Libyan Ambassador to come to the Hill to explain what was happening in the country and how the government intended to respond.

I have to say that she was very open in stating that the country needs the help of the international community to address this crisis. And she explained to us that she was aware that there were parts of her country that basically were not governed by any of the three governments and that they needed international assistance to manage this.

These auctions exposed the interconnected and complex nature of this crisis. Any solution to this problem will require a holistic and comprehensive strategy for Libya and the sending countries across Africa that promotes democratic governance, rule of law, respect for human rights, and creating economic opportunities.

The United States must remain focused and continue to promote U.S. values at home and around the world. This includes speaking out publicly when we see human rights abuses.

The bottom line is that slavery is a crime against humanity, and we cannot sit idly by while people around the world are exploited. I join my colleagues on both sides of the aisle in support of this bipartisan resolution strongly condemning the slave auctions of migrants and refugees in Libya.

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

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

In closing, the United States cannot stand by as human beings are auctioned off, forced to work for no pay, and treated without dignity or respect. Congress must speak out and condemn this horrific situation in Libya.

Mr. Speaker, I support this measure. I urge my colleagues to do the same, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

In closing, I thank the author of this measure. I thank Representative KAREN BASS for her work on this resolution. She is the ranking member of our Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, Global Human Rights, and International Organizations. I also thank Ranking Member ENGEL for his work on this resolution.

The world was shocked by the videos of the slave auctions in Libya. The videos are proof that slavery and human

trafficking exist, despite efforts to eradicate these evils. The resolution before us now shines a light on this human trafficking in Libya.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan resolution, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 644, which strongly condemns ongoing slave auctions in Libya of migrants and refugees.

Mr. Speaker, it is critical that we swiftly and unequivocally condemn these acts of unspeakable cruelty that have no place in the civilized world.

According to reports, an estimated 150,000 people—refugees fleeing conflict and economic migrants in search of better opportunities in Europe—cross Libya's borders each year.

But a clampdown by the Libyan Coast Guard meant fewer boats made it out to sea, leaving the smugglers with a backlog of would-be passengers on their hands.

With estimates of 400,000 to almost one million people now stranded in Libya, smugglers have become masters and the migrants and refugees have become slaves who are sold for as little as $400 each.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with this chamber the story of a young man named Victory, a 21-year-old Nigerian who fled his village and spent a year and four months—and his life savings—trying to reach Europe.

Victory made it as far as Libya, where he says he and other refugees were held in grim living conditions, deprived of food, abused, and mistreated by their captors.

When his funds ran out, Victory was sold as a day laborer by his smugglers; after weeks of being forced to work, Victory was told the money he had been bought for was not enough.

He was returned to his smugglers, only to be re-sold several more times—the smugglers also demanded ransom payments from Victory's family before eventually releasing him.

We know of at least 9 sites in which these horrors reportedly are commonplace.

The open sale of humans into slavery exposed in Libya in 2017 shocked the world.

United Nations Ambassador Nikki Haley denounced the practice, saying ''there are few greater violations of human rights and human dignity than this.''

However, without a capable government in the country, the practice has continued unabated while media interest ebbed.

Mr. Speaker, it is contrary to the values of this nation to stand by and watch these atrocities continue.

H. Res. 644 denounces the trafficking of—and violence against—innocent migrants in Libya, and proposes several concrete measures to a lasting infrastructure that upholds basic human rights for migrants in Libya.

First, the resolution calls on the Libyan government to investigate and end the slave auctions, as well as provide for humane management of migration flows.

Second, the resolution calls upon the United Nations to investigate the allegations of forced labor and demands that Libyan authorities to allow the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights to regularly monitor and publicly report on the situation of refugees and migrants in Libya, and impose sanctions against Libya if the nation fails to end forced labor.

Third, the resolution calls upon the African Union to conduct an independent investigation of forced labor in Libya, to assist migrants who wish to return to their homelands, and to impose sanctions against Libya should the forced labor continue.

Fourth, the resolution highlights the importance of adequately staffing, funding, and supporting the United States State Department and the Agency for International Development to provide humanitarian assistance for migrants and to develop a comprehensive strategy to address the political and security situation in Libya including issues related to migrants and refugees in detention centers.

I urge my colleagues to join me in voting for H. Res. 644 and standing true to our nation's commitment to advancing human rights in Libya, and around the world.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of New York). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 644), as amended.

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

The title of the resolution was amended so as to read: ''Resolution strongly condemning slave auctions and the exploitation of migrants and refugees as forced laborers in Libya, and for other purposes.''.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SAM FARR AND NICK CASTLE PEACE CORPS REFORM ACT OF 2018

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2259) to amend the Peace Corps Act to expand services and benefits for volunteers, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2259

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''Sam Farr and Nick Castle Peace Corps Reform Act of 2018''.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term ''appropriate congressional committees'' means—

(A) the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate;

(B) the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate;

(C) the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives; and

(D) the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

(2) DIRECTOR.—The term ''Director'' means the Director of the Peace Corps.

(3) PEACE CORPS VOLUNTEER.—The term ''Peace Corps volunteer'' means an individual described in section 5(a) of the Peace Corps Act (22 U.S.C. 2504(a)).

TITLE I—PEACE CORPS VOLUNTEER SUPPORT

SEC. 101. PEACE CORPS VOLUNTEER MEDICAL CARE REFORM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Peace Corps Act is amended—

(1) in section 5 (22 U.S.C. 2504)—

(A) in subsection (e), in the first sentence, by striking ''receive such immunization and dental care preparatory to their service'' and inserting ''receive, preparatory to their service, such immunization, dental care, and information on prescription options and potential interactions, as necessary and appropriate and in accordance with subsection (f)'';

(B) by re-designating subsections (f), (g), (h), (i), (j), (k), (l), (m), and (n) as subsections (g), (h), (i), (j), (k), (l), (m), (n), and (o);

(C) by inserting after subsection (e) the following new subsection—

''(f) The Director of the Peace Corps shall consult with health experts outside the Peace Corps, including experts licensed in the field of mental health, and follow guidance by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention regarding the prescription of medications to a volunteer.''; and

(D) in subsection (i), as so redesignated, by striking ''section, and'' and inserting ''section), and''; and

(2) by inserting after section 5 the following new section:

''SEC. 5A. HEALTH CARE FOR VOLUNTEERS AT PEACE CORPS POSTS.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The President shall ensure that each overseas post has the services of a medical office that is consistent in size and scope with the needs of the Peace Corps at such post, including, if necessary, by detailing to any such post the licensed medical staff of other United States departments, agencies, or establishments.

''(b) HIRING CRITERIA.—In selecting medical officers and support staff for overseas Peace Corps posts, the Director of the Peace Corps shall hire well-qualified and capable personnel to support the effectiveness of health care for Peace Corps volunteers by evaluating each candidate's—

''(1) medical training, experience, and accreditations or other qualifications;

''(2) record of performance;

''(3) administrative capabilities;

''(4) understanding of the local language and culture;

''(5) ability to work in the English language;

''(6) interpersonal skills; and

''(7) such other factors that the Director determines appropriate.

''(c) CERTAIN TRAINING.—The Director of the Peace Corps shall ensure that each Peace Corps medical officer serving in a malaria-endemic country receives training in the recognition of the side effects of such medications.

''(d) REVIEW AND EVALUATION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Director of the Peace Corps, acting through the Associate Director of the Office of Health Services and the country directors, shall review and evaluate the performance and health care delivery of all Peace Corps medical staff, including medical officers, to—

''(A) ensure compliance with all relevant Peace Corps policies, practices, and guidelines; and

''(B) ensure that medical staff complete the necessary continuing medical education to maintain their skills and satisfy licensing and credentialing standards, as designated by the Director.

''(2) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—The Director of the Peace Corps shall include, in the annual Peace Corps congressional budget justification, a confirmation that the review and evaluation of all Peace Corps medical staff required under paragraph (1) has been completed.

''(e) ANTIMALARIAL DRUGS.—The Director of the Peace Corps shall consult with experts at the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention regarding recommendations for prescribing malaria prophylaxis, in order to provide the best standard of care within the context of the Peace Corps environment.''.

(b) IMPLEMENTATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS BY THE INSPECTOR GENERAL OF THE PEACE CORPS.—

(1) INSPECTOR GENERAL REPORT.—As promptly as practicable, the Director shall implement the actions outlined in the agency response for all open recommendations of the Inspector General of the Peace Corps set forth in the report entitled ''Final Program Evaluation Report: OIG Follow-up Evaluation of Issues Identified in the 2010 Peace Corps/Morocco Assessment of Medical Care'' (Report No. IG–16–01–E).

(2) SEMIANNUAL REPORTS.—

(A) INITIAL REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director shall submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees that describes the Director's strategy for implementing the recommendations referred to in paragraph (1).

(B) SUBSEQUENT REPORTS.—Not later than 180 days after the submission of the report required under subparagraph (A), and semiannually thereafter, the Director shall submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees that describes the progress in implementing the recommendations referred to in paragraph (1) until all such recommendations have been implemented in accordance with the agency's response to the report referred to in such paragraph.

(3) NOTIFICATION.—After the submission of each report required under paragraph (2), the Inspector General of the Peace Corps may notify the appropriate congressional committees of any recommendations from the report referred to in paragraph (1) that the Inspector General determines remain unresolved.

SEC. 102. POST-SERVICE PEACE CORPS VOLUNTEER MEDICAL CARE REFORM.

Section 8142 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(d)(1) The Secretary shall authorize the Director of the Peace Corps to furnish medical benefits to a volunteer, who is injured during the volunteer's period of service, for a period of 120 days following the termination of such service if the Director certifies that the volunteer's injury probably meets the requirements under subsection (c)(3). The Secretary may then certify vouchers for these expenses for such volunteer out of the Employees' Compensation Fund.

''(2) The Secretary shall prescribe the form and content of the certification required under paragraph (1).

''(3) A certification under paragraph (1) will cease to be effective if the volunteer sustains compensable disability in connection with volunteer service.

''(4) Nothing in this subsection may be construed to authorize the furnishing of any medical benefit that the Secretary of Labor is not otherwise authorized to reimburse for former Peace Corps volunteers who receive treatment for injury or disease proximately caused by their service in the Peace Corps in accordance with this chapter.''.

SEC. 103. PEACE CORPS IMPACT SURVEY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Beginning not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act and once every two years thereafter for the following six years, the Director shall conduct a survey of former Peace Corps volunteers.

(b) SCOPE OF SURVEY.—The survey required under subsection (a) shall assess, with respect to each former Peace Corps volunteer completing the survey, the impact of the Peace Corps on the former volunteer, including the volunteer's—

(1) well-being;

(2) career;

(3) civic engagement; and

(4) commitment to public service.

(c) REPORT.—The Director shall submit a report containing the results of the survey conducted under subsection (a) to—

(1) the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate;

(2) the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives;

(3) the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

(4) the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 104. EXTENSION OF POSITIONS FOR PEACE CORPS EMPLOYEES.

Section 7(a) of the Peace Corps Act (22 U.S.C. 2506(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(8)(A) The Director of the Peace Corps may designate Peace Corps positions as critical management or management support positions that require specialized technical or professional skills and knowledge of Peace Corps operations. Such positions may include positions in the following fields:

''(i) Volunteer health services.

''(ii) Financial management.

''(iii) Information technology.

''(iv) Procurement.

''(v) Personnel.

''(vi) Legal services.

''(vii) Safety and security.

''(B) Subject to subparagraphs (C) and (D), with respect to positions designated pursuant to subparagraph (A), the Director may make or extend renewable appointments or assignments under paragraph (2) notwithstanding limitations under subparagraphs (A) and (B) of paragraph (2) and paragraph (5).

''(C) In exercising authority under subparagraph (B), the Director shall ensure that all decisions regarding the appointment, assignment, or extension of employees to any position designated pursuant to subparagraph (A)—

''(i) are consistent with Federal law and Peace Corps policy; and

''(ii) are based upon operational and programmatic factors.

''(D) The term of any appointment or assignment to any position designated pursuant to subparagraph (A) may not exceed five years.''.

TITLE II—PEACE CORPS OVERSIGHT AND ACCOUNTABILITY

SEC. 201. PEACE CORPS VOLUNTEER ACCESS TO INSPECTOR GENERAL.

Section 8 of the Peace Corps Act (22 U.S.C. 2507) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking ''he'' and inserting ''the President''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following new sentences: ''As part of the training provided to all volunteers under subsection (a), and in coordination with the Inspector General of the Peace Corps, the President shall provide all volunteers with information regarding the mandate of the Inspector General and the availability (including contact information) of the Inspector General and the Office of Victim Advocacy as a resource for volunteers. The President shall ensure that volunteers receive such information at least once during training that occurs prior to enrollment and at least once during each significant instance of training after enrollment.''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(c) The President shall implement procedures to maintain a record verifying each individual completing training provided to meet each requirement in this section and sections 8A, 8B, 8F, and 8G(b).''.

SEC. 202. PUBLICATION REQUIREMENT FOR VOLUNTEER SURVEYS.

Section 8E of the Peace Corps Act (22 U.S.C. 2507e) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b), in the first sentence—

(A) by inserting '', ensure that each such plan includes a consideration of the results, with respect to each such representative and the country of service of each such representative, of each survey conducted under subsection (c),'' after ''standards for Peace Corps representatives''; and

(B) by striking ''and shall review'' and inserting '', and review''; and

(2) in subsection (c)—

(A) in the first sentence, by striking ''2018'' and inserting ''2023''; and

(B) in the third sentence, by striking ''subsection (a)'' and inserting ''subsection (b)''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following new sentences: ''The President shall publish, on a publicly available website of the Peace Corps, a report summarizing the results of each survey related to volunteer satisfaction in each country in which volunteers serve, and the early termination rate of volunteers serving in each such country. The information published shall be posted in an easily accessible place near the description of the appropriate country and shall be written in an easily understood manner.''.

SEC. 203. CONSULTATION WITH CONGRESS REQUIRED BEFORE OPENING OR CLOSING OVERSEAS OFFICES AND COUNTRY PROGRAMS.

Section 10 of the Peace Corps Act (22 U.S.C. 2509) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(k)(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), the Director of the Peace Corps may not open, close, significantly reduce, or suspend a domestic or overseas office or country program unless the Director has notified and consulted with the appropriate congressional committees at least 15 days in advance.

''(2) The Director of the Peace Corps may waive the application of paragraph (1) for a

period of not more than five days after an action described in such paragraph if the Director determines such action is necessary to ameliorate a substantial security risk to Peace Corps volunteers or other Peace Corps personnel.

''(3) For the purposes of this subsection, the term 'appropriate congressional committees' means—

''(A) the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives; and

''(B) the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate.''.

TITLE III—CRIME RISK REDUCTION ENHANCEMENTS

SEC. 301. INDEPENDENT REVIEW OF VOLUNTEER DEATH.

Section 5 of the Peace Corps Act (22 U.S.C. 2504), as amended by section 101 of this Act, is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(p)(1) Not later than ten days after receiving notification of the death of a volunteer, the President shall provide a briefing to the Inspector General of the Peace Corps that includes—

''(A)(i) the available facts and circumstances surrounding the death of the volunteer, including a preliminary timeline of the events immediately preceding the death of the volunteer, subsequent actions taken by the Peace Corps, and any information available to the Peace Corps reflecting on the cause or root cause of the death of the volunteer; and

''(ii) a description of any steps the Peace Corps plans to take to inquire further into the cause or root cause of the death of the volunteer, including the anticipated date of the completion of such inquiry; or

''(B) an explanation of why the Peace Corps has determined that no further inquiry into the cause or root cause of the death of the volunteer is necessary, including—

''(i) a description of the steps the Peace Corps took to determine further inquiry was not necessary; and

''(ii) the basis for such determination.

''(2) If the Peace Corps has performed or engaged another entity to perform a root cause analysis or similar report that describes the cause or root cause of a volunteer death, the President shall provide the Inspector General of the Peace Corps with—

''(A) a copy of all information provided to such entity at the time such information is provided to such entity or used by the Peace Corps to perform the analysis;

''(B) a copy of any report or study received from the entity or used by the Peace Corps to perform the analysis; and

''(C) any supporting documentation upon which the Peace Corps or such entity relied to make its determination, including the volunteer's complete medical record, as soon as such information is available to the Peace Corps.

''(3) If a volunteer dies, the Peace Corps shall take reasonable measures, in accordance with local laws, to preserve any information or material, in any medium or format, that may be relevant to determining the cause or root cause of the death of the volunteer, including personal effects, medication, and other tangible items belonging to the volunteer, as long as such measures do not interfere with the legal procedures of the host country if the government of the host country is exercising jurisdiction over the investigation of such death. The Inspector General of the Peace Corps shall be provided an opportunity to inspect such items before their final disposition.

''(4) Consistent with the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.), the Inspector General of the Peace Corps may independently review the facts and circumstances surrounding the death of a volunteer and the actions taken by the Peace Corps in responding to such incident.

''(5) For the purposes of undertaking a review under this section, an officer or employee of the United States or a member of the Armed Forces may be detailed to the Inspector General of the Peace Corps from another department of the United States Government on a nonreimbursable basis, as jointly agreed to by the Inspector General and the detailing department, for a period not to exceed one year. This paragraph may not be construed to limit or modify any other source of authority for reimbursable or nonreimbursable details. A nonreimbursable detail made under this section may not be considered an augmentation of the appropriations of the Peace Corps.

''(6) Upon request, the Peace Corps may make available necessary funds to the Inspector General of the Peace Corps for reviews conducted by the Inspector General under this section. The request shall be limited to costs relating to hiring, procuring, or otherwise obtaining medical-related experts or expert services, and associated travel.

''(7) The undertaking of a review under this section may not be considered a transfer of program operating responsibilities to the Inspector General of the Peace Corps.''.

SEC. 302. ADDITIONAL DISCLOSURES TO APPLICANTS FOR ENROLLMENT AS VOLUNTEERS.

Section 8A of the Peace Corps Act (22 U.S.C. 2507a(d)) is amended—

(1) by amending subsection (d) to read as follows:

''(d) INFORMATION REGARDING CRIMES AND RISKS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Each applicant for enrollment as a volunteer shall be provided, with respect to each country in which the applicant may be invited to serve, with specific, aggregated, and easily accessible information regarding crimes against and risks to volunteers, including—

''(A) an overview of past crimes against volunteers in such country, including statistics regarding unreported crime collected through anonymous surveys;

''(B) the current early termination rate of volunteers serving in such country;

''(C) health risks prevalent in such country;

''(D) the nature and frequency of sexual harassment reported by volunteers serving in such country;

''(E) the extent and types of services provided by the Peace Corps to volunteers serving in such country, including access to medical care, counseling services, and assistance from the Office of Victim Advocacy; and

''(F) the level of satisfaction reported by volunteers serving in such country.

''(2) OPTION TO TIMELY DECLINE.—Upon receiving information described in paragraph (1), the applicant shall have the option to change the country of consideration and identify a substitute country.''; and

(2) in subsection (f)(2)(B)(iii), by striking ''victim advocates'' and inserting ''Victim's Advocates,''.

SEC. 303. ADDITIONAL PROTECTIONS AGAINST SEXUAL MISCONDUCT.

Section 8B(a) of the Peace Corps Act (22 U.S.C. 2507b(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (3)—

(A) by striking ''SARLs'' and inserting ''any employee of the Peace Corps'';

(B) by striking ''Victim Advocate'' and inserting ''Victim's Advocate''; and

(C) by inserting ''and require the Peace Corps to designate the staff at each post who shall be responsible for providing the services described in subsection (c)'' before the semicolon at the end;

(2) in paragraph (5), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(3) in paragraph (6), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(4) by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

''(7) maintains a record documenting the resignation of any employee or volunteer of the Peace Corps who resigns before a determination has been made regarding an alleged violation of the sexual misconduct policy or other serious policy violations;

''(8) takes into account the record maintained under paragraph (7) before such employee or volunteer is hired, enrolled, or otherwise invited to work with the Peace Corps;

''(9) provides orientation or information regarding the awareness and prevention of sexual assault and sexual harassment to—

''(A) Peace Corps-selected host families; and

''(B) a designated person of authority at the volunteer's initial workplace; and

''(10) ensures, to the extent practicable and appropriate, that any assault on, or any harm or injury to, a volunteer that is committed by any member of a host family or any national of a host country that was assigned by the Peace Corps to facilitate volunteer work is—

''(A) documented in an appropriate site history file and in the global tracking and recording system established pursuant to section 8H(c); and

''(B) taken into account with respect to determinations regarding placements of future volunteers at such post and the provision of any funds or other benefit by the Peace Corps.''.

SEC. 304. EXTENSION OF THE OFFICE OF VICTIM ADVOCACY.

Section 8C of the Peace Corps Act (22 U.S.C. 2507c) is amended—

(1) by striking ''victim advocate'' each place it appears and inserting ''Victim's Advocate'';

(2) by striking ''victim advocates'' each place it occurs and inserting ''Victim's Advocates''; and

(3) by amending subsection (e) to read as follows:

''(e) The Director of the Peace Corps shall include the head of the Office of Victim Advocacy in agency-wide policymaking processes in the same manner and to the same extent as the directors or associate directors of other offices within the Peace Corps.''.

SEC. 305. REFORM AND EXTENSION OF THE SEXUAL ASSAULT ADVISORY COUNCIL.

Section 8D of the Peace Corps Act (22 U.S.C. 2507d) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) by striking ''not less than 8 individuals selected by the President, not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this section,'' and inserting ''not fewer than 8 and not more than 14 individuals selected by the President''; and

(B) by inserting after the first sentence the following new sentence: ''At least one member should be licensed in the field of mental health and have prior experience working as a counselor or therapist providing mental health care to survivors of sexual assault in a victim services agency or organization.''; and

(2) in subsection (c)—

(A) by inserting ''and implemented'' after ''sexual assault policy developed''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following new sentence: ''To carry out this subsection, the Council may conduct case reviews and is authorized to have access, including through interviews, to current and former volunteers (to the extent that such volunteers provide the Peace Corps express consent to be interviewed by the Council), to volunteer surveys

under section 8E, to all data collected from restricted reporting, and to any other information necessary to conduct case reviews, except that the Council may not have access to any personally identifying information associated with such surveys, data, or information.''; and

(3) in subsection (g), by striking ''2018'' and inserting ''2023''.

SEC. 306. DEFINITIONS.

Section 26 of the Peace Corps Act (22 U.S.C. 2522) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), (f), and (g) as paragraphs (1), (6), (2), (3), (8), (7), and (5), respectively, by arranging such redesignated paragraphs in numerical order, and by moving such paragraphs 2 ems to the right;

(2) in paragraph (1), as redesignated, by striking ''(1)'' and inserting the following:

''In this Act:

''(1)''; and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (3), as redesignated, the following:

''(4) The term 'medical officer' means a physician, nurse practitioner, physician's assistant, or registered nurse with the professional qualifications, expertise, and abilities consistent with the needs of the Peace Corps and the post to which he or she is assigned, as determined by the Director of the Peace Corps.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on this measure.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Foreign Affairs Committee Chairman ROYCE and Ranking Member ENGEL for marking up the Sam Farr and Nick Castle Peace Corps Reform Act. This act is named after two former Peace Corps volunteers. Sam Farr served with us here in the United States Congress.

I also thank Representative KENNEDY from Massachusetts, who was also a Peace Corps volunteer several years ago, for his cosponsorship of this legislation to protect our Peace Corps volunteers. I call them our angels abroad.

Recently, I have heard too many stories of young, eager volunteers who selflessly give away years of their lives to help other people in foreign countries, countries that many Americans have never even heard of, but sometimes these Peace Corps volunteers are let down by the organization that they gave so much to.

Jennifer Mamola was hit by a drunk driver while serving in Uganda. She was at a bus stop with another volunteer, who was killed by the drunk driver. Jennifer had both of her legs broken.

When she returned home, still bedridden and loaded on pain medication, she faced an uphill battle to get medical treatment and endless bureaucracy from our own government. After months of fighting the system, she was finally approved for medical treatment, only to have her case continuously reopened.

Others tell of their struggle to receive quality medical care and protection while they are abroad in foreign countries.

Sara Thompson suffered for months from terrible nightmares and nausea. When she turned to the Peace Corps doctors, they attributed her symptoms to ''not adjusting well'' in the foreign country.

□ 1715

Not until Sara conducted her own research back in the United States did she realize that the malaria medicine the Peace Corps had prescribed for her was the thing that was making her sick. Her doctors never recognized the symptoms. Sara still suffers from these symptoms and this misdiagnosis and feels that the Peace Corps abandoned her.

Another brave volunteer told me about the sexual harassment she experienced while serving overseas in a foreign country. During broad daylight, men would grope and threaten her as she walked home from school. This harassment went on for months and months. When she reported this to the Peace Corps, the Peace Corps assured her that the men were just joking.

Are you kidding me, Mr. Speaker?

When she could no longer bear the harassment, she returned home, and the Peace Corps recorded her reason for leaving the Peace Corps as ''difficulty adapting to the culture.''

Sexual assault and harassment should never be excused as joking. It should never be brushed off as a cultural norm. And, Mr. Speaker, sexual assault is never the fault of a victim.

As a former judge, I can tell you that it is our duty to do everything within our power to protect these ambassadors, these angels abroad.

The Sam Farr and Nick Castle Peace Corps Enhancement Act of 2018 builds on and extends protections for our volunteers which became law as a result of the Kate Puzey Peace Corps Volunteer Protection Act of 2011, which I introduced, and it finally became law in 2011.

H.R. 2259 protects volunteers at every stage of their service with the Peace Corps: The onboarding process, their time in-country, and when they return home. During the onboarding process, this bill requires the Peace Corps to provide information on health risks and crimes to volunteers up front so that they can be informed and make a good decision on where to serve. Sometimes Peace Corps volunteers have no idea about the assaults that take place in these foreign countries. Those days will be over.

While they are deployed in the country, this bill requires the Peace Corps to make sure volunteers have access to qualified medical doctors. These doctors must consult with outside experts and the Center for Disease Control on best practices, particularly on mental health and malaria medications.

We also added important provisions on protection from sexual assault and harassment recommended by the Office of Special Counsel in a report that was released by them this year.

H.R. 2259 extends the Sexual Assault Advisory Council for an additional 5 years. It makes the Office of Victims Advocacy permanent. Both of these valuable resources for volunteers who have been assaulted or harassed would have expired this year.

And finally, when volunteers return home from their service with illnesses and injuries that they received overseas, they should not have to spend months dealing with bureaucratic red tape so that they can get medical care. This bill will ensure that they immediately receive the medical care and mental healthcare that they need and deserve.

Peace Corps volunteers, Mr. Speaker, are the face of our country in places where America's shining beacon of hope and liberty has not always shined so bright. They promote goodwill and a better understanding of the United States. This helps to ensure an enduring partnership with our Nation.

But most of all, they do good things. They do good because they are good. They change lives every day in the local communities that they serve; and we, at home, must ensure we are doing all we can to minimize unnecessary dangers for these volunteers. The Sam Farr and Nick Castle Peace Corps Enhancement Act of 2018 is a crucial step.

So I thank the Speaker for bringing this bill to the floor, and I urge my colleagues to support this critical bill, and the Senate to take it up as soon as possible.

I also would like to thank my staffers, Oren Adaki, Patrick Megahan, and Luke Murry in the Majority Leader's office.

Peace Corps volunteers, Mr. Speaker, are the best that we have in this country, and that is just the way it is.

I reserve the balance of my time.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM,

Washington, DC, June 12, 2018.

Hon. EDWARD R. ROYCE,

Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I write concerning H.R. 2259, the Sam Farr and Nick Castle Peace Corps Reform Act of 2018. This bill contains provisions within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. As a result of your having consulted with me concerning the provisions of the bill that fall within our Rule X jurisdiction, I agree to forgo consideration of the bill, so the bill may proceed expeditiously to the House floor.

The Committee takes this action with our mutual understanding that by foregoing consideration of H.R. 2259 we do not waive any

jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in this or similar legislation, and we will be appropriately consulted and involved as the bill or similar legislation moves forward so we may address any remaining issues within our Rule X jurisdiction. Further, I request your support for the appointment of conferees from the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform during any House-Senate conference on this or related legislation.

Finally, I would appreciate a response confirming this understanding and ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in the bill report filed by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, as well as in the Congressional Record during floor consideration thereof.

Sincerely,

TREY GOWDY.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC, June 12, 2018.

Hon. TREY GOWDY,
Chairman, Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN GOWDY: Thank you for consulting with the Foreign Affairs Committee and agreeing to be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 2259, the Sam Farr and Nick Castle Peace Corps Reform Act of 2018, so that the bill may proceed expeditiously to the House floor.

I agree that your forgoing further action on this measure does not in any way diminish or alter the jurisdiction of your committee, or prejudice its jurisdictional prerogatives on this resolution or similar legislation in the future. I would support your effort to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees from your committee to any House-Senate conference on this legislation.

I will seek to place our letters on H.R. 2259 into the Congressional Record during floor consideration of the bill. I appreciate your cooperation regarding this legislation and look forward to continuing to work together as this measure moves through the legislative process.

Sincerely,

EDWARD R. ROYCE,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE, WASHINGTON, DC,
JUNE 12, 2018.

Hon. EDWARD R. ROYCE,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I write to confirm our mutual understanding with respect to H.R. 2259, the Sam Farr and Nick Castle Peace Corps Reform Act of 2018. Thank you for consulting with the Committee on Education and the Workforce with regard to H.R. 2259 on those matters within my committee's jurisdiction and agreeing to make improvements to the legislation to address concerns.

The Committee on Education and the Workforce will not delay further consideration of this bill. However, I do so only with the understanding this procedural route will not be construed to prejudice my committee's jurisdictional interest and prerogatives on this bill or any other similar legislation and will not be considered as precedent for consideration of matters of jurisdictional interest to my committee in the future.

I respectfully request your support for the appointment of outside conferees from the Committee on Education and the Workforce should this bill or a similar bill be considered in a conference with the Senate. I also request you include our exchange of letters on this matter in the committee report and in the Congressional Record during consideration of this bill on the House Floor. Thank you for your attention to these matters.

Sincerely,

VIRGINIA FOXX,
Chairwoman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC, June 12, 2018.

Hon. VIRGINIA FOXX,
Chairwoman, House Committee on Education and the Workforce, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRWOMAN FOXX: Thank you for consulting with the Foreign Affairs Committee and agreeing to be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 2259, the Sam Farr and Nick Castle Peace Corps Reform Act of 2018, so that the bill may proceed expeditiously to the House floor.

I agree that your forgoing further action on this measure does not in any way diminish or alter the jurisdiction of your committee, or prejudice its jurisdictional prerogatives on this resolution or similar legislation in the future. I would support your effort to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees from your committee to any House-Senate conference on this legislation.

I will seek to place our letters on H.R. 2259 into the Congressional Record during floor consideration of the bill. I appreciate your cooperation regarding this legislation and look forward to continuing to work together as this measure moves through the legislative process.

Sincerely,

EDWARD R. ROYCE,
Chairman.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this measure. I would like to begin by thanking Representatives TED POE and JOE KENNEDY for their hard work on this legislation. This legislation seeks to enhance the health, safety, and security of Peace Corps volunteers.

Of course we, many of us, served with many of the people who went on to become Congressmen when they were first in the Peace Corps as well, and Sam Farr was one of those people, and I listened to many stories that Sam Farr told about the Peace Corps.

The bill is named in honor of two past Peace Corps volunteers, again, Congressman Sam Farr, who served in Colombia. I have traveled with Sam to Colombia, and his Spanish was impeccable. He was a tireless champion of the Peace Corps during his service in the House.

The bill is also named for Nick Castle, a young volunteer who was passionate about life and about helping other people. In 2013, while on assignment in rural China, Nick fell ill and didn't receive the medical care he needed and, tragically, died, a young man in his twenties.

This legislation before us today would strengthen existing health and safety standards for our Peace Corps volunteers. It would also reauthorize the Sexual Assault Advisory Council that reviews reports of sexual assault involving volunteers, and provides the Peace Corps additional flexibility in retaining certain employees.

Peace Corps volunteers represent the best of America. These selfless men and women live for 2 years, often in remote parts of the world, helping to advance critical priorities, like educating girls, preventing HIV and malaria, environmental conservation, improving agricultural methods, and community economic development.

Mr. Speaker, this is an important bill that will improve the lives of our Peace Corps volunteers currently serving in 65 countries across the globe. By passing this measure, we honor Sam Farr and Nick Castle and the 230,000 Americans who have served as Peace Corps volunteers over the past 57 years.

I remember when the Peace Corps first came together, when President Kennedy called for a Peace Corps. It has obviously gone on for a long, long time, and has been one of the most successful programs that the United States has had.

So I urge my colleagues to support this measure, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (M KENNEDY) who, as Mr. POE mentioned before, is a former Peace Corps volunteer who served in the Dominican Republic.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague, the ranking member of the Committee, Mr. ENGEL, for his advocacy for this legislation, for his leadership on the Foreign Affairs Committee, for the time that I spent on that committee as well, and for all of his support for this legislation.

I echo the gratitude toward the chairman of the committee, Mr. ROYCE, and all that he and his staff did to usher this bill through to this point; of course, my colleague, Mr. POE, and his team, for the leadership that they have shown on it and all that he has done in order to make sure that this bill has come with the broad bipartisan support that it has. And that, as he says, is just the way it is.

I also want to say I would be remiss not to reference our dear colleague, former colleague, Sam Farr, who, if you asked him what day it was, would respond with a Peace Corps story. This is an act that is close to his heart, an organization that is close to his heart that he spent an awful lot of time dedicating himself to, and I am grateful for the recognition that he deserves, and so many others today.

Mr. Speaker, about 15 years ago, I got off an airplane in Santo Domingo not knowing what to expect, and a couple of weeks later, was welcomed with open arms into a pretty rural community on the side of a highway in the Northern Dominican Republic.

Over the course of the next two-plus years, families that I didn't know, in a language that I barely spoke, accepted

me as one of their own. They cared for me when I was sick. They would literally take half of the food that they had on their plate and scrape it off so that I had a meal to eat. Folks that were making a couple of dollars a day, at best, intermittent electricity, intermittent running water, but whatever they had they were eager to share with me.

And my story and this is not unique. This is told over and over again by the hundreds of thousands of individuals who have had the opportunity to serve our country as Peace Corps volunteers around the globe. You listen to those stories, and they echo from East Timor and the Philippines, through Mongolia and the Far East, to sub-Saharan Africa, across the continent, Eastern Europe, Latin America, and Central America.

Over and over again, the stories that you hear, you ask any Peace Corps volunteer, and they believe that they serve, not just are serving the greatest Nation in the world, but they are also in service in one of the greatest nations in the world, and every volunteer says the same thing.

What you also see from those volunteers is this extraordinary generosity of spirit, this dedication to living out the ideals that we hold so dear, that we speak of in this Chamber, about reaching out to others and asking what we can do to help them in service, through our own actions, through the support of the Federal Government behind; what we can do, day by day, step by step to try to make our communities and their communities, our world, a little bit better.

That is what the Peace Corps stands for. That is what has been repeated day after day, volunteer after volunteer, in hundreds of countries around the world at various times and through all of those volunteers and their experiences.

That is why this bill today is so important, for Mr. Speaker, American might can be found on battlefields and military bases, but it is also found by that college graduate who is teaching in a small village in India, or a retiree who is teaching a stranger in Belize how to build a business.

By passing this bill, we can allow current and future Peace Corps volunteers to carry out their important duty while improving their access to care and ensuring their safety and security at home and abroad. Before they even set foot on a plane, volunteers will be made fully informed of the risks that they will face in their country where they have been invited to serve.

And once that jet lag has worn off and the nerves settle down, they have written their first letter home, we will guarantee that these volunteers have the access to well-qualified medical officers and support staff in Peace Corps offices overseas.

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

Mr. ENGEL. I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. In addition, this bill promises to take a number of steps to address and combat instances of sexual assault by reauthorizing the Sexual Assault Advisory Council through 2023, and requiring the Peace Corps to provide information to host families regarding sexual assault prevention awareness.

And because we recognize that tragedies can occur, and that service is not without risks, for any volunteer who returns home with a service-connected disability, this legislation will minimize bureaucratic delay and work to ensure that medical care is received without delay.

Through their selfless and tireless work, Mr. Speaker, Peace Corps volunteers leave a lasting, positive impression in countries all around the world that can endure for generations.

With the bipartisan passage of this bill, we are one step closer to protecting our volunteers serving around the world and ensuring the Peace Corps' influence continues to reach new heights.

I want to thank my colleagues, Mr. POE, Chairman ROYCE, and Ranking Member ENGEL for all their work on this important legislation, and I urge swift passage of H.R. 2259.

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

In closing, let me first again say that my colleague and friend, Mr. POE, is eloquent as usual. I want to single out Mr. KENNEDY, whose great uncle, President John F. Kennedy, first established the Peace Corps; and the Kennedy family has also, through the years, been very engaged in making the world a better place, so I appreciate my colleague from Massachusetts for speaking.

Congressman ROYCE and myself have run this committee in a bipartisan way and, again, I think this bill is typical of good bipartisanship. It is a good bill for the United States.

The Peace Corps shows people around the world America at its best. It shows our values. It shows our generosity. It shows our compassion. Since its inception in 1961, volunteers have engaged in people-to-people diplomacy and community-based development in 141 countries on six continents.

We, in Congress, must do what we can to keep our current volunteers healthy and safe.

So, again, I want to thank Congressman POE and Congressman KENNEDY. I want to also thank Senator CORKER and Senator FEINSTEIN for the companion bill in the Senate.

I would also like to especially recognize three staff members, Luke Murry, Oren Adaki, and Janice Kaguyutan—even though I am massacring her last name—for their years of work on Peace Corps issues. We couldn't do this without the good work that our staffs do.

One of the things that I am very proud of on the Foreign Affairs Committee is the bipartisan way in which we work, and the staffs are responsive to everyone on the committee, not just people on their side of the aisle, and I think that shows in the committee, and it shows America at its best and its finest.

□ 1730

The Peace Corps is really important. Peace Corps issues are really important. The agency is undoubtedly a better agency because of the efforts of the people that I just mentioned.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support this measure, I urge my colleagues to do the same, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, when I travel overseas in foreign countries, I, like many of the members of the Foreign Affairs Committee, try to meet with our Peace Corps volunteers. Most of those volunteers are in Third World countries, and I have had the honor to meet with them. They have come down from the mountains in Peru to meet with me and other Members.

One thing is universally true about all of them: They love being a Peace Corps volunteer. They love working in that country and doing things in that country most of us would never do, but they do it because they are good, and they do good.

And when the Peace Corps volunteers came to me first a few years ago about some of the things that were happening in the Peace Corps, they all made it clear to me that, even though these bad things happened to them while they served in the Peace Corps, whether it was being assaulted overseas, lack of medical attention by the Peace Corps, whatever, they all still supported the Peace Corps. They were not bitter about the Peace Corps. They weren't mad at the Peace Corps. Many of them said they would volunteer again if they could.

They are remarkable individuals. They are the best that we have in this country who represent us all over the world doing good things for people.

Of course it helps the United States politically, but, more importantly, it helps these people in these countries to have things that they would never be able to have without these Peace Corps volunteers working with them and helping to make a sanitary environment, helping them to market such things as guinea pigs, as I learned in Peru.

They are remarkable individuals, and I want to make that very clear that the Peace Corps volunteers support making the Peace Corps better, but they support the Peace Corps most of all.

Let me just mention this about Nick Castle. He died while he was in China. He died because he did not get adequate medical attention, medical attention that the United States was responsible for making sure that he got that he did not get, and because of that, he died in-country. So this bill is

named after Nick Castle, and it is named after Sam Farr.

I want to also say again how much I appreciate JOE KENNEDY from Massachusetts being the cosponsor of this, him being a Peace Corps volunteer, his family being supportive of the Peace Corps. One of the best things the United States ever did was when John F. Kennedy invented the Peace Corps.

We should continue to send our angels abroad, representing the United States, representing what is good, and we should support them when they are overseas, when they return home, and after they have even left the Peace Corps. Our government should work to help the Peace Corps, not work against the Peace Corps.

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

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2259, the Sam Farr and Nick Castle Peace Corps Reform Act.

To serve in the United States Peace Corps is a worthy mission. The Peace Corps promotes cultural understanding and creates strong ties between volunteers and the communities they serve. I've often heard foreign leaders, particularly in Africa, reflect upon their own interactions with volunteers who taught English or helped establish a fishery in their village. And I've seen many returned volunteers become leaders in industry and government at home—including serving here in Congress. This bill is named after one of them, former Representative and returned Peace Corps volunteer Sam Farr.

But serving in the Peace Corps also involves risk. Volunteers are expected to adapt to unfamiliar areas and customs. They may face political instability or crime. And they are exposed to countless infectious and tropical diseases, often without access to reliable care. Too often, we hear stories of Peace Corps volunteers suffering from debilitating illnesses that could have been prevented, falling victim to sexual assault without justice, or even dying. This is why the bill also is named for Nick Castle, a young Peace Corps volunteer who died while serving in China from a completely treatable illness.

The bill before us today strengthens the transparency, accountability and effectiveness of the Peace Corps by enacting a number of important reforms. It requires disclosures that will enable aspiring volunteers to better understand the risk they will face before they are deployed. The Peace Corps is not for everyone.

This legislation provides assurances to volunteers that qualified medical personnel will be accessible to them while serving overseas and here at home, should they experience a service-related injury or illness. And, importantly, it extends and expands upon a number of the provisions previously included in the Kate Puzey Act, which provides support to volunteers who have been victims of sexual assault.

Earlier this year, the Senate unanimously passed a similar version of the legislation: We have been working closely with the House sponsors, the administration, advocacy groups and our colleagues in the Senate to ensure that this important legislation can be enacted without further delay. I would like to thank the lead sponsor in the House, Judge POE, for his steadfast commitment throughout this process. I would also like to acknowledge the important work of the Committees on Education and the Workforce and Oversight and Government Reform, without whom we could not consider this bill today.

I urge Members to support this bill.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2259, the Sam Farr Peace Corps Enhancement Act. This bill will improve the health, security and safety of Peace Corps Volunteers. Our Peace Corps Volunteers uphold American values and character abroad. They are often the first impression given to foreign nationals of Americans and put themselves in the most remote areas of the world where managing risk is a daily practice. The Sam Farr Peace Corps Enhancement Act will strengthen a volunteer's ability to effectively serve our country abroad by establishing more institutional protections I am proud to be a cosponsor of this important legislation.

The Peace Corps was created to answer that powerful call from President Kennedy nearly sixty years ago when he stated, ''ask not what your country can do for you, but what you can do for your country''. Whether it is the Peace Corps, AmeriCorps or Conservation Corps, national service is a vital ingredient to a healthy and prosperous nation National service provides vital skills of teamwork, responsibility and the ability to cross cultural and economic lines in societies. No one understood this better than my dear friend and former colleague, Sam Farr who this bill is so aptly named after.

In his twenty-three distinguished years as a Former Congressman from California's 17th District, Sam Farr was often known as ''Mr. Peace Corps''. A former Peace Corps Volunteer himself, serving in Colombia during the early sixties; he was a tireless advocate for the Peace Corps Agency. He understood the importance of the work that the Agency and the volunteers were doing for America in the global arena, and the impact it has on not just the Peace Corps Volunteers, but the friendships and bonds they create in the countries they serve. I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation and I thank Congressmen JOE KENNEDY (D–MA) and TED POE (R–TX) for recognizing Congressman Farr, and introducing such an important and bipartisan bill that will truly benefit our volunteers.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2259, 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.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 34 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1829

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of New York) at 6 o'clock and 29 minutes p.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 50, UNFUNDED MANDATES INFORMATION AND TRANSPARENCY ACT OF 2017, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3281, RECLAMATION TITLE TRANSFER AND NON-FEDERAL INFRASTRUCTURE INCENTIVIZATION ACT

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 115–812) on the resolution (H. Res. 985) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 50) to provide for additional safeguards with respect to imposing Federal mandates, and for other purposes, and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3281) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to facilitate the transfer to non-Federal ownership of appropriate reclamation projects or facilities, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 5793, by the yeas and nays; and

H.R. 5749, by the yeas and nays.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. The second electronic vote will be conducted as a 5-minute vote.

HOUSING CHOICE VOUCHER MOBILITY DEMONSTRATION ACT OF 2018

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5793) to authorize the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to carry out a housing choice voucher mobility demonstration to encourage families receiving such voucher assistance to move to lower-poverty areas and expand access to opportunity areas, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 368, nays 19, not voting 40, as follows:

[Roll No. 314]

YEAS—368

Abraham
Adams
Aderholt
Amodei
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barletta
Barr
Barragán
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Bergman
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bost
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (TX)
Brat
Brooks (IN)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Capuano
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Comstock
Conaway
Connolly
Cook
Cooper
Correa
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crist
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Curtis
Davidson
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
Denham
DeSantis
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Donovan
Doyle, Michael F.
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Dunn
Emmer
Engel
Eshoo
Espaillat
Estes (KS)
Esty (CT)
Evans
Faso
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Goodlatte
Gottheimer
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Guthrie
Handel
Hartzler
Heck
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Higgins (LA)
Higgins (NY)
Hill
Himes
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huffman
Huizenga
Hultgren
Hurd
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Knight
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Kustoff (TN)
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamb
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee
Lesko
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (MN)
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lowenthal
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham, M.
Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Marshall
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McSally
Meadows
Meng
Messer
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Moore
Moulton
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Newhouse
Nolan
Norcross
Norman
Nunes
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Pallone
Palmer
Panetta
Pascrell
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pittenger
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Polis
Posey
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rokita
Rooney, Francis
Ros-Lehtinen
Rosen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Royce (CA)
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rutherford
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Smucker
Soto
Speier
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Suozzi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Trott
Tsongas
Turner
Valadao
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NAYS—19

Amash
Biggs
Blum
Brooks (AL)
Buck
Duncan (TN)
Gaetz
Garrett
Gohmert
Gosar
Grothman
Harris
Hice, Jody B.
Jones
Labrador
Massie
Perry
Sanford
Sensenbrenner

NOT VOTING—40

Aguilar
Allen
Bilirakis
Blackburn
Brady (PA)
Cheney
Costa
Costello (PA)
Cummings
Ellison
Frankel (FL)
Gallagher
Gowdy
Graves (LA)
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Harper
Hastings
Hoyer
Hunter
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Lowey
Mast
Meeks
Mooney (WV)
Napolitano
Neal
Noem
Perlmutter
Rohrabacher
Rooney, Thomas J.
Rush
Russell
Shea-Porter
Upton
Walz
Weber (TX)
Wilson (FL)

□ 1854

Messrs. BUCK, JODY B. HICE of Georgia, and GROTHMAN changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Messrs. CARTER of Georgia and DOGGETT changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, July 5, 2018.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,
The Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I have the honor to transmit herewith a facsimile copy of a letter received from Mr. Keith Ingram, Director of Elections, Office of the Secretary of State of Texas, indicating that, according to the preliminary results of the Special Election held June 30, 2018, the Honorable Michael Cloud was elected Representative to Congress for the 27th Congressional District, State of Texas.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

ROBERT REEVES.

Enclosure.

SECRETARY OF STATE,
THE STATE OF TEXAS,
Austin, TX, July 5, 2018.

Hon. KAREN L. HAAS,
Clerk, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MS. HAAS: This is to advise you that the unofficial results of the Special Election held on Saturday, June 30, 2018 for Representative in Congress from the 27th Congressional District of Texas, show that Michael Cloud received 19,856 votes or 54.74% of the total number of votes cast for that office.

It would appear from these unofficial results that Michael Cloud was elected as Representative in Congress from the 27th Congressional District of Texas.

To the best of our knowledge and belief at this time, there is no contest to this election.

As soon as the official results are certified to this office by all counties involved, an official Certificate of Election will be prepared for transmittal as required by law.

Sincerely,

KEITH INGRAM,
Director of Elections.

SWEARING IN OF THE HONORABLE MICHAEL CLOUD, OF TEXAS, AS A MEMBER OF THE HOUSE

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Speaker, as dean of the Texas delegation, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas, the Honorable MICHAEL CLOUD, be permitted to take the oath of office today.

His certificate of election has not arrived, but there is no contest and no question has been raised with regard to his election.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Will Representative-elect CLOUD and the members of the Texas delegation present themselves in the well.

All Members will rise and the Representative-elect will please raise his right hand.

Mr. CLOUD appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office, as follows:

Do you solemnly swear that you will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that you will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that you take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that you will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which you are about to enter, so help you God.

The SPEAKER. Congratulations, you are now a Member of the 115th Congress.

WELCOMING THE HONORABLE MICHAEL CLOUD TO THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to introduce to the House of Representatives the new Congressman for the 27th Congressional District of Texas, the Honorable MICHAEL CLOUD.

MICHAEL is a husband and a father. His wife and three children are either in the gallery or on the floor. He lives in Victoria, Texas. He is a graduate of Oral Roberts University, so the Oklahomans will enjoy that.

He has been a Republican county chairman in his home county for 7 years. He has been a member of the State executive committee of the Republican Party of Texas for a number of years.

He won a primary of six people. He got into a runoff and became the Republican nominee. He won the special election against nine people. He is the 10,949th Member of the House of Representatives. He is the 264th Member to represent the great State of Texas. He is the 23rd Member to represent Victoria, Texas, and he is the third Member to represent the 27th Congressional District of Texas.

I want to introduce to Mr. CLOUD the House of Representatives. This is the greatest legislative body in the world, whether you are DON YOUNG, who has been here for more than four decades, or DEBBIE LESKO, who has been here for less than 4 months.

You now have a voting card. You have an equal vote to all other Members here. You are part of a group that has to be elected.

Not one Member is on this floor because they were appointed. They were all elected by their constituents to represent the greatest Nation in the world.

Congratulations, and welcome to the House of Representatives.

EXPRESSING GRATITUDE FOR THE OPPORTUNITY TO SERVE AS REPRESENTATIVE FOR THE 27TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF TEXAS

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

Mr. CLOUD. Mr. Speaker, I do want to extend my sincerest appreciation and gratitude for the generosity and professionalism that you have shown to us as we have made this very quick transition. Thank you very much.

All right, there we go. This is Ean over there, my 12-year-old Zoe, and Kent. Kent's birthday is tomorrow. And my sister, Sara. I am also happy to be joined by my wife, Rosel. I have learned to keep this short.

You know, there are three words that set us apart from every other nation: ''We, the people.'' It is those three words that set us apart in history and the three words that allow someone like me and people like us to serve in an elected body like this.

So to the people of District 27 in Texas who elected me to serve, I take this responsibility seriously, and I ask for your continued prayers in serving well.

And to the people of this body, I look forward to working with you as we work toward this more perfect union and continue this experiment in self-government that has been handed to us from our Founders, and I pray that we have the courage and we have the strength to do what is right and to serve the people of this Nation well.

God bless you so much. Thank you for being here.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. Under clause 5(d) of rule XX, the Chair announces to the House that, in light of the administration of the oath of office to the gentleman from Texas, the whole number of the House is 429.

OPTIONS MARKETS STABILITY ACT

The SPEAKER. Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5749) to require the appropriate Federal banking agencies to increase the risk-sensitivity of the capital treatment of certain centrally cleared options, and for other purposes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 385, nays 0, not voting 43, as follows:

[Roll No. 315]

YEAS—385

Abraham
Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Amash
Amodei
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barletta
Barr
Barragán
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Bergman
Beyer
Biggs
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blum
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bost
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (TX)
Brat
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Capuano
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Cloud
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Comstock
Conaway
Connolly
Cook
Cooper
Correa
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crist
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Curtis
Davidson
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
Denham
DeSantis
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Donovan
Doyle, Michael F.
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Dunn
Emmer
Engel
Eshoo
Espaillat
Estes (KS)
Esty (CT)
Evans
Faso
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gaetz
Gallego
Garamendi
Garrett
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gottheimer
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grothman
Guthrie
Handel
Harris
Hartzler
Heck
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (LA)
Higgins (NY)
Hill
Himes
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huffman
Huizenga
Hultgren
Hurd
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Knight
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Kustoff (TN)
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamb
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee
Lesko
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (MN)
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham, M.
Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Marshall
Massie
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McSally
Meadows
Meng
Messer
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Moore
Moulton
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Newhouse
Noem
Nolan
Norcross
Nunes
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Pallone
Palmer
Panetta
Pascrell
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pittenger
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Polis
Posey
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rokita
Rooney, Francis
Ros-Lehtinen
Rosen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rutherford
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Smucker
Soto
Speier
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Trott
Tsongas
Turner
Valadao
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—43

Allen	Hanabusa	Norman
Bilirakis	Harper	Perlmutter
Blackburn	Hastings	Rohrabacher
Brady (PA)	Hoyer	Rooney, Thomas J.
Cheney	Hunter	Royce (CA)
Costa	Issa	Rush
Costello (PA)	Jenkins (KS)	Russell
Cummings	Jones	Shea-Porter
Ellison	Lowenthal	Suozzi
Frankel (FL)	Lowey	Upton
Gallagher	Mast	Walz
Gowdy	Meeks	Weber (TX)
Graves (LA)	Mooney (WV)	Wilson (FL)
Grijalva	Napolitano	
Gutiérrez	Neal	

□ 1911

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: ''A bill to require the appropriate Federal banking agencies to increase the risk-sensitivity of the capital treatment of certain centrally cleared exchange-listed options and derivatives, and for other purposes''.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRIVILEGED REPORT ON RESOLUTION OF INQUIRY TO THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

Mr. GOODLATTE, from the Committee on the Judiciary, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 115–813) on the resolution (H. Res. 938) of inquiry directing the Attorney General to provide certain documents in the Attorney General's possession to the House of Representatives relating to the ongoing congressional investigation related to certain prosecutorial and investigatory decisions made by the Department of Justice and Federal Bureau of Investigation surrounding the 2016 election, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

PERMISSION TO FILE SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT ON H. RES. 928, RESOLUTION OF INQUIRY TO THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to file a supplemental report on the resolution, H. Res. 928.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of New York). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

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 additional 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.

SCORE FOR SMALL BUSINESS ACT OF 2018

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1700) to amend the Small Business Act to reauthorize the SCORE program, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1700

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''SCORE for Small Business Act of 2018''.

SEC. 2. SCORE REAUTHORIZATION.

Section 20 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 631 note) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (j) as subsection (f); and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(g) SCORE PROGRAM.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Administrator to carry out the SCORE program authorized by section 8(b)(1) such sums as are necessary for the Administrator to make grants or enter into cooperative agreements in a total amount that does not exceed $10,500,000 in each of fiscal years 2019 and 2020.''.

SEC. 3. SCORE PROGRAM.

Section 8 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 637) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(1)(B)—

(A) by striking ''a Service Corps of Retired Executives (SCORE)'' and inserting ''the SCORE program described in subsection (c)''; and

(B) by striking ''SCORE may'' and inserting ''the SCORE program may''; and

(2) by striking subsection (c) and inserting the following:

''(c) SCORE PROGRAM.—

''(1) DEFINITION.—In this subsection:

''(A) SCORE ASSOCIATION.—The term 'SCORE Association' means the Service Corps of Retired Executives Association or any successor or other organization that receives a grant from the Administrator to operate the SCORE program under paragraph (2)(A).

''(B) SCORE PROGRAM.—The term 'SCORE program' means the SCORE program authorized by subsection (b)(1)(B).

''(2) MANAGEMENT AND VOLUNTEERS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator shall provide a grant to the SCORE Association to manage the SCORE program.

''(B) VOLUNTEERS.—A volunteer participating in the SCORE program shall—

''(i) based on the business experience and knowledge of the volunteer—

''(I) provide at no cost to individuals who own, or aspire to own, small business concerns personal counseling, mentoring, and coaching relating to the process of starting, expanding, managing, buying, and selling a business; and

''(II) facilitate low-cost education workshops for individuals who own, or aspire to own, small business concerns; and

''(ii) as appropriate, use tools, resources, and expertise of other organizations to carry out the SCORE program.

''(3) PLANS AND GOALS.—The Administrator, in consultation with the SCORE Association, shall ensure that the SCORE program and each chapter of the SCORE program develop and implement plans and goals to more effectively and efficiently provide services to individuals in rural areas, economically disadvantaged communities, and other traditionally underserved communities, including plans for electronic initiatives, web-based initiatives, chapter expansion, partnerships, and the development of new skills by volunteers participating in the SCORE program.

''(4) ANNUAL REPORT.—The SCORE Association shall submit to the Administrator an annual report that contains—

''(A) the number of individuals counseled or trained under the SCORE program;

''(B) the number of hours of counseling provided under the SCORE program; and

''(C) to the extent possible—

''(i) the number of small business concerns formed with assistance from the SCORE program;

''(ii) the number of small business concerns expanded with assistance from the SCORE program; and

''(iii) the number of jobs created with assistance from the SCORE program.

''(5) PRIVACY REQUIREMENTS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Neither the Administrator nor the SCORE Association may disclose the name, address, or telephone number of any individual or small business concern receiving assistance from the SCORE Association without the consent of such individual or small business concern, unless—

''(i) the Administrator is ordered to make such a disclosure by a court in any civil or criminal enforcement action initiated by a Federal or State agency; or

''(ii) the Administrator determines such a disclosure to be necessary for the purpose of conducting a financial audit of the SCORE program, in which case disclosure shall be limited to the information necessary for the audit.

''(B) ADMINISTRATOR USE OF INFORMATION.—This paragraph shall not—

''(i) restrict the access of the Administrator to program activity data; or

''(ii) prevent the Administrator from using client information to conduct client surveys.

''(C) STANDARDS.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator shall, after the opportunity for notice and comment, establish standards for—

''(I) disclosures with respect to financial audits under subparagraph (A)(ii); and

''(II) conducting client surveys, including standards for oversight of the surveys and for dissemination and use of client information.

''(ii) MAXIMUM PRIVACY PROTECTION.—The standards issued under this subparagraph shall, to the extent practicable, provide for the maximum amount of privacy protection.''.

SEC. 4. ONLINE COMPONENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 8(c) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 637(c)), as amended by section 3, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''(6) ONLINE COMPONENT.—In carrying out this subsection, the SCORE Association shall make use of online counseling, including by developing and implementing webinars and an electronic mentoring platform to expand access to services provided under this subsection and to further support entrepreneurs.''.

(b) ONLINE COMPONENT REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—At the end of fiscal year 2019, the SCORE Association shall issue a report to the Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship of the Senate on the effectiveness of the online counseling and webinars required as part of the SCORE program, including a description of—

(A) how the SCORE Association determines electronic mentoring and webinar needs, develops training for electronic mentoring, establishes webinar criteria curricula, and evaluates webinar and electronic mentoring results;

(B) the internal controls that are used and a summary of the topics covered by the webinars; and

(C) performance metrics, including the number of small business concerns counseled by, the number of small business concerns created by, the number of jobs created and retained by, and the funding amounts directed towards such online counseling and webinars.

(2) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this subsection, the terms ''SCORE Association'' and ''SCORE program'' have the meaning given those terms, respectively, under section 8(c)(1) of the Small Business Act, as added by section 3 of this Act.

SEC. 5. STUDY AND REPORT ON THE FUTURE ROLE OF THE SCORE PROGRAM.

(a) STUDY.—The SCORE Association shall carry out a study on the future role of the SCORE program and develop a strategic plan for how the SCORE program will meet the needs of small business concerns during the 5-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, with specific objectives for the first, third, and fifth years of the 5-year period.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than the end of the 6-month period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, the SCORE Association shall issue a report to the Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship of the Senate containing—

(1) all findings and determination made in carrying out the study required under subsection (a);

(2) the strategic plan developed under subsection (a);

(3) an explanation of how the SCORE Association plans to achieve the strategic plan, assuming both stagnant and increased funding levels.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section, the terms ''SCORE Association'' and ''SCORE program'' have the meaning given those terms, respectively, under section 8(c)(1) of the Small Business Act, as added by section 3 of this Act.

SEC. 6. TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.

(a) SMALL BUSINESS ACT.—The Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 631 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 7 (15 U.S.C. 636)—

(A) in subsection (b)(12)—

(i) in the paragraph heading, by inserting ''PROGRAM'' after ''SCORE''; and

(ii) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''Service Corps of Retired Executives'' and inserting ''SCORE program''; and

(B) in subsection (m)(3)(A)(i)(VIII), by striking ''Service Corps of Retired Executives'' and inserting ''SCORE program''; and

(2) in section 22 (15 U.S.C. 649)—

(A) in subsection (b)—

(i) in paragraph (1), by striking ''Service Corps of Retired Executives'' and inserting ''SCORE program''; and

(ii) in paragraph (3), by striking ''Service Corps of Retired Executives'' and inserting ''SCORE program''; and

(B) in subsection (c)(12), by striking ''Service Corps of Retired Executives'' and inserting ''SCORE program''.

(b) OTHER LAWS.—

(1) SMALL BUSINESS REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 1997.—Section 707 of the Small Business Reauthorization Act of 1997 (15 U.S.C. 631 note) is amended by striking ''Service Corps of Retired Executives (SCORE) program'' and inserting ''SCORE program (as defined in section 8(c)(1) of the Small Business Act)''.

(2) VETERANS ENTREPRENEURSHIP AND SMALL BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1999.—Section 301 of the Veterans Entrepreneurship and Small Business Development Act of 1999 (15 U.S.C. 657b note) is amended by striking ''Service Core of Retired Executives'' and inserting ''SCORE program''.

(3) MILITARY RESERVIST AND VETERAN SMALL BUSINESS REAUTHORIZATION AND OPPORTUNITY ACT OF 2008.—Section 3(5) of the Military Reservist and Veteran Small Business Reauthorization and Opportunity Act of 2008 (15 U.S.C. 636 note) is amended by striking ''means the SCORE program''.

(4) CHILDREN'S HEALTH INSURANCE PROGRAM REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2009.—Section 621 of the Children's Health Insurance Program Reauthorization Act of 2009 (15 U.S.C. 657p) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a), by striking paragraph (4) and inserting the following:

''(4) the term 'SCORE program' means the SCORE program authorized by section 8(b)(1)(B) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 637(b)(1)(B));''; and

(B) in subsection (b)(4)(A)(iv), by striking ''Service Corps of Retired Executives'' and inserting ''SCORE program''.

(5) ENERGY POLICY AND CONSERVATION ACT.—Section 337(d)(2)(A) of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6307(d)(2)(A)) is amended by striking ''Service Corps of Retired Executives (SCORE)'' and inserting ''SCORE program''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) and the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. ADAMS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

□ 1915

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today, this evening, in support of H.R. 1700, the SCORE for Small Business Act of 2018, which was introduced by the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. ADAMS), and I want to commend her for her leadership on this legislation. This legislation will allow the SCORE program to continue to offer business mentoring and training to thousands of entrepreneurs and small business owners each year.

The SCORE program currently includes over 11,000 volunteer mentors, with expertise across 62 industries, who collectively provide more than a million hours of business counseling each year.

When an entrepreneur seeks a SCORE mentor, they are purposely paired with a business professional with knowledge in a specific field or experience facing specific challenges. This process ensures that the concerns of the entrepreneur are met by the volunteer mentor.

In addition to SCORE's mentorship services, the program also offers in-person business training classes at its 350 chapter locations nationwide. Entrepreneurs can also utilize the extensive online training opportunities and free business tools available on SCORE's national website.

Last fiscal year, SCORE trained over a half million clients, empowering them to start, run, and scale their business. This legislation will allow SCORE to continue to provide these important services.

H.R. 1700 reauthorizes the SCORE program at $10.5 million for fiscal years 2019 and 2020, providing for enhanced services to SCORE clients. This legislation also formally changes the program's name from the Service Core of Retired Executives to the more commonly used name of SCORE.

Additionally, H.R. 1700 requires the SCORE Association to further utilize webinars and electronic mentoring as a way of increasing SCORE's presence nationwide.

H.R. 1700 will require the SCORE Association to develop a strategic plan for how the program will adapt to meet the needs of America's entrepreneurs over the coming years. This requirement will not only allow for better congressional oversight of the SCORE program, but will also guarantee that taxpayer dollars contributing to the program are effectively used to serve the needs of the small business community.

Considering the important role that small businesses play throughout our Nation and our communities, it is our responsibility to ensure that our entrepreneurs and small businesses have the resources that they need to be successful. H.R. 1700 is the way of doing just that, and I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1700, the SCORE for Small Business Act of 2018.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of my bill, H.R. 1700, the SCORE for Small Business Act of 2018.

There are nearly 30 million small businesses in the United States, representing more than 99 percent of all businesses. These small firms employ nearly 50 percent of all private sector employees in the United States.

These trailblazers play a critical role in the American economy. They take great risks by launching new ventures, developing new products, and establishing new industries; and, ultimately, these brave efforts help spur growth in our economy.

The Small Business Administration, SBA, is a vital part of their support system. The SBA administers a portfolio of Entrepreneurial Development programs, which includes the Service Corps of Retired Executives, better known as SCORE.

Through this program, the SBA has undertaken efforts to connect new entrepreneurs and small-business owners with more experienced businessmen

and -women. This expansive network consists of entrepreneurs, business leaders, and executives who volunteer as mentors to small firms both in-person and online.

SCORE has grown to become one of the Federal Government's largest volunteer business adviser and mentoring programs. In 2017, 59 percent of SCORE's clients were women, 39 percent minorities, and 11 percent veterans.

My legislation reauthorizes this essential program so that it will continue to have the ability to meet the needs of entrepreneurs. With technology enhancements and streamlined service processes, SCORE mentoring will now be accessible to business owners, no matter their location.

I urge Members to support this legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I would ask the gentlewoman from North Carolina if she has any further speakers this evening, and, if not, I believe I have the right to close. So if she has any concluding remarks, I would be happy to yield if the gentlewoman has any other speakers to speak on this issue because I would be closing then.

Ms. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I do have the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. EVANS), who will speak on this issue.

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

Ms. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. EVANS).

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, I want to lend my voice to this very important essential legislation. Nothing is more important than mentoring, particularly in small businesses. I know in the particular case of the city of Philadelphia and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, SCORE is an important asset.

I thank the gentlewoman from North Carolina for her leadership on something that is extremely essential, something that transcends parties. It is about economic growth and economic opportunity, and I thank her for her leadership that she has shown in understanding the importance of mentoring.

Ms. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I do want to thank Chairman CHABOT for his support.

There is no question that we need to support our small businesses across the country, no matter their location, industry, or expertise level. My bill, H.R. 1700, provides that critical support by reauthorizing a major component of SBA's entrepreneurial programs and clarifying the utilization of the volunteer base.

This bill is supported by the SCORE Association and is reflective of the growth of this program that actively engages business owners, as well as retired executives, to mentor the next generation of job makers.

I want to again thank Chairman CHABOT for working in a bipartisan manner to help our Nation's small businesses and for his support to reauthorize SCORE.

I would urge all of the Members to support this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, the commonsense improvements in this bill will allow the SCORE program to continue its mission: helping entrepreneurs to start and grow their businesses.

With over 99 percent of all businesses in the United States being classified as small, it is vital that these business owners have access to effective entrepreneurial resources.

H.R. 1700 would ensure that, regardless of location, a small-business owner can access SCORE mentoring and training.

Mr. Speaker, I would, again, like to commend the gentlewoman from North Carolina for her leadership on this important matter. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1700, the SCORE for Small Business Act of 2017.

H.R. 1700 amends the Small Business Act to reauthorize the SCORE program (Service Corps of Retired Executives) for FY2018–FY2019.

The program is renamed as simply the SCORE program.

The Small Business Administration (SBA) shall award a grant to the SCORE Association (or any successor group) in order to strengthen resources for entrepreneurs.

By passing this bill, we are ensuring that the program and each of its chapters develop and implement plans and goals to provide services more effectively and efficiently to individuals in rural areas, economically disadvantaged communities, and other traditionally underserved communities.

Such requirements includes plans for electronic initiatives, web-based initiatives, chapter expansion, partnerships, and the development of new skills by participating volunteers.

The SBA's SCORE program embodies the power of public-private partnerships and is dedicated to educating and assisting entrepreneurs and small business owners in the formation, growth and expansion of their small businesses.

I want to thank all the trained volunteers that serve as counselor's advisors and mentors to aspiring entrepreneurs and business owners.

Further, there are approximately 13,000 volunteer business counselors with 348 chapters across the country.

Established in 1965, the Houston chapter has more than 130+ volunteers covering the 9-county Greater Houston Area.

These services are offered at no fee, as a community service.

According to the SCORE Association, in FY13, SCORE estimates that it served over 400,000 clients, and helped to create more than 40,500 new businesses and more than 67,098 new jobs.

I urge my colleagues to join me in voting for H.R. 1700 as it is vital that we support.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LEWIS of Minnesota). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1700, 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.

SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATION PROTECTION ACT OF 2017

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2655) to amend the Small Business Act to expand intellectual property education and training for small businesses, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2655

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 ''Small Business Innovation Protection Act of 2017''.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act—

(1) the term ''Administrator'' means the Administrator of the SBA;

(2) the term ''Director'' means the Under Secretary of Commerce for Intellectual Property and Director of the USPTO;

(3) the term ''SBA'' means the Small Business Administration;

(4) the term ''small business concern'' has the meaning given the term in section 3(a) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632(a));

(5) the term ''small business development center'' means a center described in section 21 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 648); and

(6) the term ''USPTO'' means the United States Patent and Trademark Office.

SEC. 3. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) the USPTO and the SBA are positioned to—

(A) build upon several successful intellectual property and training programs aimed at small business concerns; and

(B) increase the availability of and the participation in those programs across the United States; and

(2) any education and training program administered by the USPTO and the SBA should be scalable so that the program is able to reach more small business concerns.

SEC. 4. SBA AND USPTO PARTNERSHIPS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator and the Director shall enter into a partnership agreement under which the Administrator and Director shall—

(1) develop high-quality training, including in-person or modular training sessions, for small business concerns relating to—

(A) domestic and international protection of intellectual property; and

(B) how such protections should be considered in the business plans and growth strategies of the small business concerns; and

(2) leverage existing training materials already developed to educate inventors and small business concerns.

(b) TRAINING.—The training developed under subsection (a) may be provided by the Administrator, the Director, or small business development centers established under section 21 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 648)—

(1) through electronic resources, including Internet-based webinars; and

(2) at physical locations, including at—

(A) a small business development center; or

(B) the headquarters or a regional office of the USPTO.

SEC. 5. SMALL BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT CENTERS.

Section 21(c)(3) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 648(c)(3)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (S), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(2) in subparagraph (T), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(U) training developed by the Administrator and the Director of the United States Patent and Trademark Office, which may be delivered in person or through a website to small business concerns relating to—

''(i) domestic and international intellectual property protections; and

''(ii) how such protections should be considered in the business plans and growth strategies of the small business concerns.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) and the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. ADAMS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the House Small Business Committee, I rise this evening in support of another bill, H.R. 2655, the Small Business Innovation Protection Act of 2017, and I want to commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. EVANS) for his leadership on this bill.

As small entrepreneurs continue to expand their businesses both here and abroad, they must have the tools they need to protect their intellectual property. Entrepreneurs and small-business owners have generated more than 63 percent of new jobs over the last two decades, and small businesses represent about 96 percent of employer firms in high-patenting manufacturing industries.

However, the process for obtaining copyright, trademark, and patent protections both in the United States and abroad can be daunting, even for the most experienced small-business owners. We need to ensure that small-business owners have the tools they need to protect their innovative ideas and products, as intellectual property protections are essential to promoting entrepreneurship and innovation.

Small-business owners often do not have the knowledge or resources to protect their ideas and products, especially when they are competing in the international marketplace. Most simply cannot afford to retain attorneys to guide them through the difficult process of obtaining intellectual property protections, which leaves them vulnerable to their innovative ideas and products being stolen both here in the United States and internationally.

This bipartisan legislation, introduced by my friend and colleague from Pennsylvania (Mr. EVANS) addresses this issue by forming a partnership between the SBA, the Small Business Administration, and the United States Patent and Trademark Office, or USPTO, giving entrepreneurs the full breadth of knowledge of the Small Business Development Center system and the USPTO. The partnership will provide training for small-business owners, which can be provided by the USPTO, the SBA, or a Small Business Development Center either electronically or at a physical location.

This legislation utilizes existing resources at both agencies to better assist small-business owners and expand their outreach efforts to provide small businesses with the resources they need to address intellectual property issues.

Considering the important role that small entrepreneurs play in our global marketplace, it is our responsibility to ensure that they have the resources they need to better protect their intellectual property. H.R. 2655 addresses this important small business issue and, therefore, I would urge my colleagues to support this commonsense, bipartisan legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I again want to thank Mr. EVANS for his leadership on this, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I rise to support H.R. 2655, the Small Business Innovation Protection Act of 2017.

Innovation is an indispensable driver of economic growth and it ensures America's competitive edge in the global marketplace, but many small innovators who should have IP rights are disadvantaged by a complex system which allows their property to be pirated. Much of the time, all they needed was access to the resources, the expertise, and the knowledge to obtain, monitor, and enforce their rights.

H.R. 2655 corrects this by creating a partnership between the two agencies best suited to help these innovators: the Small Business Administration and the United States Patent and Trademark Office.

By leveraging existing IP education and training programs and utilizing the immense network of Small Business Development Centers, innovators will have all the necessary resources to better protect their interests both domestically and internationally.

□ 1930

I applaud Representative EVANS for recognizing the problem and working to advance the interests of our Nation's small businesses.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. EVANS).

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2655, the Small Business Innovation Protection Act of 2017.

I want to thank my colleague Congressman FITZPATRICK of Pennsylvania for working with me to help American small businesses via this critical piece of legislation.

H.R. 2655 directs the Small Business Administration and the Under Secretary of Commerce for Intellectual Property and the Director of the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office to enter into a partnership agreement; one, to develop high quality training for small business concerns related to domestic and international protection of intellectual property and how such protections should be considered in small business concerns' business plans and growth strategies.

Number two, to leverage existing training material already developed to educate inventors as well as small business concerns.

In addition, section 4 of this bill provides that the agencies must use the training material that they already have at their disposal.

I think that Members of the Congress have a special duty to try and ensure that our small businesses have all the tools in the toolbox they need to succeed.

We know that small businesses are critical to the economic strength of our country, especially new and growing tech-based economies.

That is why we should create programs like this to assist entrepreneurs in starting their own businesses, providing structure, and helping them with their progress.

In the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, where there are already 1 million small businesses, which, according to the Pennsylvania SBDC, employ 2.4 million workers that make up 47 percent of the private sector labor force, it is critical that these businesses be able to protect their intellectual properties so that they will feel free to continue growth and innovation and prosper.

This bill is a step in the right direction by expanding intellectual property education and training for small businesses. And frankly, Mr. Speaker, this bill is an example of how we can use the power of government to create narrowly tailored solutions to problems in the current public/private partnerships in Pennsylvania and around the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to the support of my colleagues.

In addition to that, Mr. Speaker, there is a letter from the Biotechnology Industry Organization written in support of this particular bill I ask that my colleagues support.

Ms. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, intellectual property protections offer small innovative firms and entrepreneurs much needed

protection at home and in other countries.

In fact, small business firms with IP rights earned 32 percent more in revenue on average per employee when compared to their counterparts without IP rights.

Without those protections, our economy may not be what it is today.

H.R. 2655 offers necessary education and training to sustain America's competitive edge and drive continued economic growth.

As such, I once again urge my colleagues to support this measure, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, this legislation strengthens the partnership between two important Federal agencies that help small businesses protect what they have created: the SBA and the USPTO.

It is important that small firms across the Nation have access to all the tools that they need to protect their creations from intellectual property theft.

Therefore, I would urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2655.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOE'S BARBEQUE OF ALVIN, TEXAS, IS A GIFT

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

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, Alvin, Texas, is known nationally for two things: 42 inches of rain in 24 hours, our gift from Tropical Storm Claudette; and baseball strikeout king Nolan Ryan, our gift from the gods of baseball.

But those gifts are in our past. Our now greatest gift has been going strong since 1976: Joe's Barbeque.

Owner Joe Saladino is a walking, Texan-talking American dream.

Joe opened with four tables, one barbecue pit, and three employees. He served eight potatoes per day; four at lunch and four at dinner.

I was at Joe's a few weeks ago, and man, oh, man, has that world changed. 1,200 Texans eat at Joe's every single day. They enjoy 100 pounds of sausage, 80 briskets, and endless potatoes.

THE SUPREME COURT IS SUPPOSED TO BE ABOVE POLITICS

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

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, the Supreme Court is supposed to be above politics. Justice is supposed to be blind.

But rather than nominate a fair and balanced jurist to the Supreme Court, the man in the White House has nominated a right-wing operative to replace Justice Kennedy.

Not only that, the nominee is someone who apparently believes that the President is above the law.

Make no mistake. Judge Brett Kavanaugh is no Justice Kennedy.

Whether we are talking about the disgraceful Starr Commission or Bush vs. Gore or the scandalous George W. Bush administration, Judge Kavanaugh has been there. His hands are covered in right-wing muck.

This nomination threatens the rights and liberties the people of this Nation have died for. Confirming Judge Kavanaugh would destroy Roe vs. Wade. It would put ObamaCare at risk, and it would threaten the rights of same-sex couples to marry.

The American people demand justice, and justice is fair, not a justice who is full of hot air.

CONCERNS ABOUT JUDGE KAVANAUGH

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

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to convey my strong concerns about President Trump's nominee for the Supreme Court, Judge Brett Kavanaugh.

If confirmed, Judge Kavanaugh will be in a crucial position to reshape the laws around a woman's right to make her own medical decisions, but also he will be in a position to affect the right to access quality and affordable healthcare for millions of Americans, and legal protections for LGBTQ citizens.

I am disturbed by Judge Kavanaugh's record on these issues and many others.

Millions of Americans rely on the Supreme Court to uphold these hard-won rights, and they are increasingly imperiled.

My colleagues in the Senate must be sure that Judge Kavanaugh continues to do what the Supreme Court has done for years: preserve, protect, and uphold these constitutional rights for all Americans.

If they cannot be sure that Judge Kavanaugh will do so, they must reject his nomination.

NO COURT SHOULD BE TO THE RIGHT OR THE LEFT

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, headlines of the New York Times: ''Conservatives Close in on Three-Decade Dream: Tipping Court to the Right.''

Mr. Speaker, no court should be to the right or to the left. It should be for the American people.

I ask the Senate, and I commit to my constituents, to fight for a thorough and long review of the nominee's record, and to determine whether we are now appointing to the court a political biased aficionado; a person who has worked in politics and as well has shown his bias by way of his extensive and detailed and over-the-top report in the Starr report.

It will be interesting to find whether Mr. Kavanaugh has concern about all of America, because the Supreme Court holds in his hands that responsibility.

The USA Today says, ''Family Separation Combines Cruelty and Incompetence.''

I ask for the Secretary of Homeland Security to immediately come to the House of Representatives, and I ask the Speaker to provide that opportunity for him to be able to speak to us about why he has lost children and why they are separated from their families.

We need to stop the shooting of babies by those who leave guns for 2-year-olds to shoot themselves.

THE 2018 NATO SUMMIT

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, this week, America's closest allies have come together to discuss issues critical to our common security at the 2018 NATO Summit.

In these challenging times, with serious global threats, we must affirm our commitment to NATO. Liberty's defense requires strong bonds with proven allies.

Sadly and needlessly, our President's wishy-washy statements regarding the transatlantic alliance have already led to uncertainty and discomfort among our allies. How counterproductive.

Instead of strengthening bridges among freedom-loving nations, our President has derided our closest allies. He has cozied up to Vladimir Putin and North Korea's dictator, even inviting Russia back into the G7 Group.

Putin's murderous regime is waging an illegal war in Ukraine, killing over 10,000 Ukrainians already, displacing millions, and actively seeks to undermine our democratic institutions and alliances.

This President's dangerous behavior is weakening U.S. leadership and global security. NATO has brought peace and security to liberty-loving nations. We must be clearly resolute in our defense of liberty, and to that end, NATO.

HONORING THE LIFE OF LAURA SHIPP

(Mr. KIHUEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KIHUEN. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to remember the life of Laura Shipp.

Laura attended the Route 91 festival in Las Vegas on October 1.

Laura was a single mother to her son, Corey, who is a Marine Corps reservist.

Laura and her son had a strong relationship, and she had even moved from California to Las Vegas so she could be closer to him.

Laura loved the Los Angeles Dodgers and country music. She was protective of those that she loved and had a big heart.

Laura is remembered as being a smart woman who would always make sure to buy her son and nephew a toy or a snack, even when she didn't have a lot of money.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to extend my condolences to Laura Shipp's family and friends. Please know that the city of Las Vegas, the State of Nevada, and the whole country grieve with you.

□ 1945

PULLING OUT OF IRAN NUCLEAR DEAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ZELDIN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Speaker, throughout the next hour, we will discuss the President's correct decision to pull out of the Iran nuclear agreement, otherwise known as the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, as well as the urgent need to eliminate Iran's problematic nuclear and nonnuclear activities.

Joining me tonight are Members of Congress from across our great country who are deeply passionate about America's best interests and supportive of the President's decision to withdraw from the Iran deal.

Mr. Speaker, this first speaker who we will hear from tonight is someone who I was elected with in 2014, who I have had many conversations with about the importance of ensuring that America's foreign policy is strong, consistent, and effective. He has been a strong, consistent, and effective voice for the need to pursue a better path forward with regard to the United States' relationship with Iran and the need to combat their nuclear and nonnuclear activities.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HILL).

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from New York (Mr. ZELDIN) for his leadership in this House on this important topic and for his voice that carries across all freedom-loving people about the relationship that we are trying to have with Iran; on the failures of the Iranian nuclear deal and why it is a bad deal for America and for our allies; why it has put the American people at risk and our security at risk, particularly for not only our country, but our allies, and, particularly, our ally Israel.

This deal has major flaws that have been noted over the past couple of years, including the sunset provisions, which never should have been included, and zero monitoring of the Iranian military or the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps sites.

It allowed continued research and development on advanced centrifuges for the Iranian nuclear program, and it didn't prohibit, Mr. Speaker, any ballistic missile technology. In fact, when Secretary Kerry was negotiating this deal, Iranian representatives traveled to Moscow, no doubt to attempt to acquire ballistic missile technology.

My concerns are shared, Mr. Speaker, by a large bipartisan group in the House, and I recall the votes in the Senate to disapprove this deal. These procedural votes in the Senate demonstrated that the nuclear deal negotiated by Mr. Kerry and Mr. Obama was well short of the treaty approval level—that is, two-thirds of the Senate—which would have been necessary had the Obama administration actually attempted to submit the JCPOA as a treaty.

Without decertification, this deal allowed Iran to head in the same direction as North Korea, and I support the President in his decision to decertify the Iran nuclear deal.

Mr. Speaker, I pledge to work with my colleagues in the House like Mr. BARR from Kentucky, who chairs our Subcommittee on Monetary Policy and Trade on sanctions; my colleague Mr. ZELDIN on the Financial Services Committee; as well as our colleagues on the Foreign Affairs Committee who will support policies that will target Iran's terror financing, its missile technology, its violations of human rights, and, certainly, the topic of the night, its nuclear program.

It is well documented by the U.S. Department of State in multiple administrations that Iran is the world's number one state sponsor of terrorism. They have a history of arresting American citizens and citizens of other Western countries with no chance of a fair trial.

We must not forget the people of Iran who are living under the oppression of this extremist Islamic regime that is a persistent violator of human rights and religious freedom. Recently, just in May, the regime arrested a 19-year-old Iranian girl for posting on Instagram a video of herself dancing in her own room. Dancing.

I stand here tonight with the people of Iran and support their peaceful protests against the oppressive and corrupt mullahs in Tehran. The House took an important step earlier this year by passing a resolution in support of the Iranian people.

Today, Iran's economy is on the brink of collapse.

What happened to the $150 billion in freed financial assets that was unfrozen on day one in the Iranian deal? There was no quid pro quo on that. Those funds were freed, Mr. Speaker, on day one, whether Iran complied with the long-term aspects of the agreement or not.

What happened to the $1.7 billion, pallets of currency that were delivered to the mullahs by the Obama administration in the middle of the night at the Geneva airport? Where is that money for the Iranian people? It is not hard to guess where it went or who has it, which is why we passed Congressman BRUCE POLIQUIN's bill, the Iranian Leadership Asset Transparency Act, a commonsense measure that will let the people of Iran see what the regime is doing with those billions, and what has happened to them since Iran got the money back.

I call on the Senate to pass this bill so that we can show the world how corrupt the regime is. Today, Mr. Speaker, the Iranian currency compared to the U.S. dollar is over 40,000 to 1. On the eve of the Islam Republic, it was 70 to 1.

The Iranian people have borne the brunt of 35 years of corruption and terror, and I stand with them tonight, and I stand against the failures of the deal that we are talking about.

At this critical moment in Iran's history, I stand on the floor of the American people's House, and the Iranian people are in the streets, not chanting ''death to America,'' Mr. Speaker, but marching for the same endowed freedoms that we enjoy here every day: life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. ZELDIN for hosting this Special Order and for giving Members the opportunity to participate and highlight the flaws of this failed nuclear deal, the importance of why decertification works, and the corruption and the brutality of the Iranian mullahs.

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Arkansas for his comments. The people of Arkansas who listened to his remarks this evening, people back in my district who are listening to Congressman HILL, and people from all around America, can tell that he gets it.

Unfortunately, as we were negotiating the Iran nuclear deal, we had people who were negotiating from weaker and weaker positions, and, unfortunately, ended up accepting a deal that crossed many of their own red lines that were set. I think we would have been in much better shape if we had more people like the gentleman

from Arkansas in the administration at that time. Fortunately, he is here in Congress with us, and I thank the gentleman for participating this evening.

Speaking of getting it, we have another leader from the House Financial Services Committee, chairman of the Subcommittee on Monetary Policy and Trade, ANDY BARR from the great State of Kentucky, an exceptional Member of Congress who understands the financial system of our great country, the leverage that we have with regard to the sanctions, the way that leverage disappeared, and the way that we negotiated away that leverage with the sanctions relief.

He understands that we are dealing with an adversary that doesn't respect weakness. They only respect strength. I appreciate the gentleman being here and everything he does in the Financial Services Committee here in Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BARR).

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ZELDIN), for his important leadership and his voice on this very critical issue and for being a stalwart defender of the rock-solid alliance between the American people and the State of Israel, and the important relationship that represents; Israel, of course, being an island of moderation in a very dark and dangerous part of the world.

When the United States is asked to make foreign policy decisions, it is my view and it is Congressman ZELDIN's view that we should stand with our allies. We should stand with Israel. We should not stand with our enemies. We should not stand with the mullahs in Tehran. But, instead, we should stand with our ally who always opposed this dangerous Iran nuclear deal.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of President Trump's decision to withdraw from the Iran nuclear deal, also known as the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, and I agree with the President's assessment that the Iran deal gave too many benefits to Iran for too little in return.

I also want to thank my colleague and friend FRENCH HILL, who also serves with Congressman ZELDIN and myself on the House Financial Services Committee, where the three of us have an important responsibility to the American people, our constituents, and our allies, and that is oversight of the Department of the Treasury's implementation and enforcement of sanctions.

More than 4 years ago, the Obama administration reached this flawed nuclear deal with Iran. Since then, the destabilizing role that this rogue regime has played in the Middle East has not waned, but, instead, it has grown. Despite all the concessions to Iran, the Iranian leadership continues to lead mobs of supporters chanting ''death to America'' and ''death to Israel,'' and promises to wipe Israel off the face of the planet.

The leadership in Tehran continues to pose a range of threats to the national security of the United States and the security of our allies in the region and beyond. As many observers have noted, the regime in Tehran does not see itself as leading a country focused on security and prosperity within its borders, but, instead, leading a revolution that it seeks to expand at the expense of its neighbors and the United States and it is allies.

Iran continues to represent the number one state sponsor of terrorism in the world. Iran has received significant sanctions relief under the Obama administration's flawed nuclear deal. The regime is selling oil on the international market. It has received access to tens of billions of dollars in funds held abroad, and it has signed deals worth more than $100 billion in foreign investments.

This includes, as the gentleman from Arkansas pointed out, $1.8 billion in cash that the Obama administration gave to Iran up front under the previous administration's false narrative that this agreement would help make the Middle East more stable and a safer place.

Yet, Iran continues to destabilize the Middle East and undermine U.S. foreign policy. The regime's Revolutionary Guard Corps and its terrorist proxy, Hezbollah, continue to prop up the murderous Assad regime in Syria and fuel tension across the region. Hezbollah has stockpiled tens of thousands of advanced rockets in Lebanon, allowing it to strike targets throughout Israel, and this is after the consummation of the Iran nuclear deal.

At home, the regime continues to deny the Iranian people basic human rights, while detaining several Americans. Iran's so-called moderate president, Hassan Rouhani, gave the order to ''expedite'' the production of intercontinental ballistic missiles capable of striking the United States while presiding over the most executions in 25 years.

There is, according to the defenders of the JCPOA, a false narrative that they perpetuate, and the media is complicit. The false narrative being that Iran is in compliance with the deal, and this is despite reports that Iran continues trying to illicitly procure nuclear equipment from Germany after the deal was reached. The Obama administration subsidized Iran's nuclear program by purchasing heavy water, a chemical used to make weapons-grade plutonium.

Furthermore, we know that this deal, by its own architecture, was not designed to ensure compliance, because there is no effective verification procedure embedded in the deal.

Under the current JCPOA, the United Nations International Atomic Energy Agency inspectors are not even allowed to check Iranian military sites, the sites that are most likely to be the places where Iran houses and conducts its nuclear testing. A comprehensive, no-notice inspection regime must be put into place in any future agreement, which President Trump has ensured would be part of his better alternative.

Ballistic missiles: In addition, Iran continues to develop and test ballistic missiles that threaten Israel and the United States. According to joint intelligence reports, Iran has launched well over 23 ballistic missiles since the signing of the JCPOA. Far from lessening the threat, the Iran nuclear deal emboldened Iran to continue to violate U.N. Security Council resolutions, specifically, a blatant disregard of U.N. Security Council Resolution 2231 that formally approved the Iran nuclear deal.

□ 2000

Specifically, that resolution called on Iran to not undertake any activity related to ballistic missiles designed to be capable of delivering nuclear weapons, including launches using such ballistic missile technology.

Ballistic missiles, Mr. Speaker, are the most reliable way to deliver nuclear warheads, and no country has maintained an expensive missile program without also aspiring to possess nuclear weapons.

The leadership in Iran in negotiating this agreement professed a commitment to civilian nuclear power.

Why then continue to develop ballistic missiles, Mr. Speaker, if you are committed to only peaceful nuclear power?

As former Secretary of Defense Ash Carter testified to Congress in 2016, President Obama's own Defense Secretary: The I in ICBM stands for intercontinental, which means having the capability to fly from Iran to the United States.

Intercontinental ballistic missiles, as our friend, Prime Minister Netanyahu, pointed out, are not designed for Tel Aviv. Those missiles are designed for Los Angeles, New York, Atlanta, and Chicago.

Support for Hezbollah hasn't waned since the Iran nuclear deal was consummated, since it was signed. Iran is and continues to be the largest state sponsor of terrorism, and current estimates indicate that Iran provides Hezbollah approximately $800 million annually. According to the State Department, Iran provides the majority of financial support for Hezbollah and Lebanon and has trained thousands of terrorist group fighters at camps in Iran.

Regrettably, this deal that provided billions of dollars in sanctions relief and billions of dollars in hard currency to the rogue regime in Tehran is fueling Iranian support for Hezbollah.

In addition to fighters, Hezbollah is believed to possess over 100,000 missiles. It has been reported that Iran has built weapons factories for Hezbollah in southern Lebanon, providing the ability to produce destructive munitions on its own near Israel. It has sent fighters to Syria on behalf of the Assad regime and helped train and develop Shiite militias furthering Iranian interests in Iraq and Yemen.

This combat experience in Syria and Iraq is particularly alarming as Hezbollah now has thousands of experienced fighters at its disposal who can be redeployed to other conflicts in the future. The Iran nuclear deal has fueled this export of terrorism.

Finally, reports indicate that Iran civilian airlines also participate in the conflict by flying arms and fighters to Syria from Iran and other locations in the Middle East. We have heard directly testimony in our committee as the House Financial Services Committee has conducted searching oversight over the implementation of the Iran nuclear deal that, in fact, this agreement has facilitated and fueled civilian airlines being used to send arms and fighters to support the murderous Assad regime.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I joined my colleagues here tonight not opposed to diplomacy and not opposed to any Iran nuclear deal. In fact, all of us would like to see a peaceful denuclearization of Iran. We would like democracy and freedom for the people of Iran. We stand with the people in Iran. We are not against any agreement.

We simply stand against a bad nuclear deal that is not verifiable, that doesn't prevent Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon, but instead paves the way for Iran to have a nuclear arsenal. We stand opposed to a bad nuclear deal that threatens our allies, that threatens Israel, and that threatens the American people.

We believe that the President can and will negotiate a better deal for America, and it is incumbent upon Congress to help this administration access the leverage it needs to achieve that objective and to support his vision to help hold Iran accountable to the United States and our allies.

What would this agreement entail?

Why would a new agreement be better than the current JCPOA?

It would remove all of the flawed sunset provisions; it would require Iran to suspend any support of terrorist proxies; it would require Iran to permanently and irreversibly end its ballistic missile program; and it would include much better verification that would allow international inspectors access to all sites, including sites that are most likely to contain illicit nuclear activity.

Mr. Speaker, once again, I am proud to stand with the ally of the United States, Israel, and stand against our enemy, the mullahs in Tehran.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. ZELDIN) again for his outstanding leadership and his passionate voice in defense of American national security and in defense of Israel and our other allies.

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Kentucky for speaking. That was outstanding.

For anyone who is trying to get caught up with the 101, 201, or 301 of what has been going on over the course of the last few years and hasn't been paying attention, they can just listen to the gentleman's remarks two or three times over and understand, study, ask questions, and get brought completely up to speed as far as what went wrong and how we go forward from here.

So I thank the gentleman for participating, for his leadership, and for his great remarks tonight.

When I was first elected, I would be at events, and I would let people know about how I have two titles being both the highest ranking Jewish Republican in Congress and the lowest ranking Jewish Republican in Congress. But then the numbers doubled. We went from one to two in 115th. If you are keeping score at home, that means we are on pace so that in January of 2023 there will be a minyan here in the House of Representatives of Jewish Republicans. So we have a little ways to go, but we are blessed to have a freshman who is joining us here tonight from the great State of Tennessee, DAVID KUSTOFF, whom I guess I will call the cochair of the Jewish Republican caucus of the House of Representatives. He is my friend from Tennessee, a great Member, a great freshman Member, and a great leader and voice on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. KUSTOFF).

Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee. My friend from New York is my leader. I recognize that and will yield to him in that respect.

I also appreciate his taking the time to organize this evening this very important issue. I think we all realize that the defense of our Nation and our allies is one of the most important reasons that we function as a government.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of President Trump's recent decision to withdraw from the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action also known as the Iran deal.

In November of 2017, I spoke here on the House floor lauding President Trump's decision to decertify the Iran deal. Today I am glad to stand here with the news that the United States is finally withdrawing from this deeply flawed deal and reimposing tough sanctions on Tehran.

Just a few months ago, April 30 of this year, the Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu unveiled a massive supply of documents revealing Iran's developments of a secret nuclear weapons program while claiming otherwise. In reality, Iran kept these documents in a secured vault ensuring that the International Atomic Energy Agency would never find them during their inspection. With the Prime Minister's revelations, the Iranian regime is believed to have been falsifying reports to the agency for years, and the deal failed in its basic objective to prevent the regime from obtaining nuclear weapons.

This hard evidence by Israeli intelligence only further illustrates that Iran cannot be trusted by the international community and only continues to harbor hostility that threatens our national security interests.

As we have seen over the years, the Iran deal has also failed to prevent the further testing of ballistic missiles. According to the Foundation for Defense of Democracies, Iran has launched 23 illicit ballistic missiles since the beginning of the signing of the Iran deal in July of 2015.

Now, one of these was a new long-range missile with capabilities to carry multiple warheads. This was the country's third test of a missile with a range of approximately 1,200 miles and fully capable of reaching Israel.

Against multiple United Nations Security Council resolutions, Iran continues to invest time, invest energy, and invest resources into its ballistic missile program. These illicit tests are dangerous, they are unacceptable, and they cannot continue to occur.

Additionally, Iran continues to be one of the world's largest state sponsors of terrorism with the IRGC operatives in Lebanon, in Syria, and in Gaza, all of which surrounds our friend and our ally, Israel.

Just today, Iran's Revolutionary Guard Corps Deputy Commander Major General Hossein Salami stated that Iran's regional allies were ''awaiting orders to eradicate the evil regime.'' This is in reference to Israel. It is clear that Iran's aggression in the region is dramatically increasing, leaving Israel and other surrounding countries vulnerable to a nuclear weapons attack.

This past February, just a few months ago, Israel shot down an Iranian drone that had been dispatched from a Syrian airbase 30 seconds after it crossed into Israeli airspace. It was not until April 13 of this year when Israel revealed that the Iranian drone was carrying explosives with plans to attack and destroy an unspecified target in Israel. Think about it. Had this situation been escalated to nuclear warfare, one can only imagine the devastation that would have ensued.

We have got to say enough is enough. We cannot enable Iran to enrich tons of uranium; we cannot enable Iran to test ballistic missiles against the United Nations Security Council resolutions; we cannot enable Iran to funnel $150 billion of frozen assets to terrorist proxies such as Hamas and Hezbollah; and we cannot enable Iran's belligerence to escalate.

While the previous administration failed in their intent to inhibit Iran from its perilous activities, quite frankly, President Trump did not. He did the right thing for the United States; he did the right thing for Israel; and he did the right thing for our allies throughout the world.

I am pleased that the President saw the dangers of the Iran deal as it did not stop Iran's ambition to become nuclear, but rather paves it.

As we work in Congress to implement further sanctions against the Iranian

regime, we must protect our allies in the Middle East and effectively prevent Iran from progressing with their nuclear weapons program.

I, again, want to thank my friend and my colleague from New York, Congressman ZELDIN, for leading this discussion so that all the issues and, frankly, all the facts can be out on the table.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the great leadership Congressman ZELDIN has shown on this issue.

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Tennessee. It is so great to have him here not just for tonight's remarks and his leadership on this issue, it is just so great to have him in Congress. I thank the gentleman so much for his friendship and for his important leadership.

Mr. Speaker, last month, President Trump correctly withdrew the United States from the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, JCPOA, otherwise known as the Iran nuclear deal. Tonight, during this hour, several Members of Congress were speaking here on the House floor regarding the administration's strategy to curb Iran's malign interests in the region and ensure Iran is no longer rewarded for its bad behavior.

The Iran deal was fatally flawed for what was in it and fatally flawed for what was not in it. First, it is important to reflect on key lessons that should be learned from the manner in which the United States made several bad errors negotiating this so-called deal.

□ 2015

We must learn these lessons to make sure that history never repeats itself.

First, the United States signed a preliminary agreement in 2013 that preemptively traded a large portion of our leverage even before formal negotiations began. The Iranians came to the table desperate for sanctions relief. They were not there as freedom-loving, good citizens of the world, nor were they aspiring to be. The leverage was sanctions relief, which was proof that the sanctions were working.

Nonnuclear activities weren't also on the table but should have been. Once you negotiate away all the leverage that will bring the Iranians to the table in the first place, you don't have the leverage left to deal with all of Iran's bad activities that you need to deal with.

Second, the United States underestimated just how desperate the Iranian leadership was in order to stay in power. There is no reason for the United States to assume the position of weakness that it did in the negotiation. We should have been, by far, the stronger party in the talks. For some very odd reason, the United States continued to negotiate from a weaker and weaker position for no good or acceptable reason.

Next, one red line after another was crossed, set by the United States. When they were crossed, there were no consequences, further weakening our negotiating hand.

The United States also very much cared about hitting target dates that the Iranians didn't care whether or not were hit. That, too, further weakened our negotiating hand.

When the President and his administration gets rolled by a foreign adversary, we all, as Americans, are getting rolled. It is a huge problem. This was made worse by paying a $1.7 billion cash ransom to get our hostages released. Pallets of unmarked cash had to be airlifted and delivered at the same exact time as the releasing of our hostages.

Now, there are a lot of people who say it wasn't a ransom. When you have to pay $1.7 billion on pallets of cash delivered at the exact same moment as releasing the hostages, it is kind of hard to cut it any other way. Paying this cash ransom to the world's largest state sponsor of terrorism showed the ridiculous lengths the Obama administration was willing to go, at any and all costs, to appease Iran and show weakness to other American adversaries who were witnessing this all play out.

Recent reports revealed that the Obama administration misled the American people and granted a license letting Iran access the United States' financial system when U.S. Government officials pledged that they would never allow Iran to access U.S. investments or markets.

This Iran nuclear ''deal'' provided Iran with a jackpot of up $150 billion in sanctions relief without even asking for a signature. Secretary Kerry called it ''an unsigned political commitment.''

Ben Rhodes, the White House's taxpayer-funded fiction writer, created an echo chamber to promote a false narrative and sell a devil's bargain of a deal to the American people.

Even Democratic Members of this Chamber were feeling the heat from the White House, forced to support what they were privately admitting was an unsigned, unchecked bad deal.

Secretary Kerry admitted this deal was never intended to receive congressional approval. He said this wasn't a treaty, because a treaty would have been ''impossible to pass.''

I don't know how anyone out there would define what a legal definition of ''treaty'' is, but I am pretty confident that that wouldn't be it. The U.S. should have never entered this historically bad deal to begin with and really could have done a much better job negotiating it.

As I mentioned earlier, the Iran nuclear deal was fatally flawed for what was in it and fatally flawed for what was not put in it. Next, I will discuss some of the reasons why it was fatally flawed for what was in it.

The JCPOA isn't a pathway for how to prevent Iran from acquiring a nuclear weapon. It is a blueprint for exactly how Iran attains a nuclear weapon. Two of the biggest issues with what was in it, inside the JCPOA you have a very flawed verification regime and highly problematic sunset provisions.

President Obama said this deal wasn't built on trust; it was built on verification. I don't know how you support a deal that is built on verification when you have no idea what the verification regime is. I, as a Member of Congress, still have not received the secret side deals between the IAEA and Iran that outline the verification regime.

When Secretary Kerry was before the House Foreign Affairs Committee last Congress, I asked him if he had read it, and he said no. The Secretary of State did not read the verification regime. But the American public was told this was a deal not built on trust, built on verification.

We have learned since some of what is in the side deals, like Iran collects some of their own soil samples and is the inspector of some of their own nuclear sites.

It is crazy; right?

The United States made a slew of permanent concessions in exchange for temporary concessions on the part of the Iranians, a point which comes into much greater focus as the sunset provisions are analyzed. The sunset clause undermines any reasonable justification for the deal, providing Iran the capability to obtain a nuclear weapon within a few years even if it didn't cheat on the deal at all. That, of course, is in addition to the $150 billion of sanctions relief.

Under the JCPOA, Iran was still allowed to assemble a limited amount of advanced centrifuges that could enrich uranium for a nuclear weapon within 1 year. However, Iran has even violated those minimal restrictions multiple times.

Iran has spun more IR–6 centrifuges than permitted under the JCPOA. It has assembled more IR–8 rotor assemblies than it is permitted to. It has attempted to acquire carbon fiber that it had agreed not to. It has stockpiled more heavy water than what was allowed under the JCPOA.

Just think, the people who have said that Iran has not violated the letter of the deal are all examples of the letter of the deal being violated.

With regards to verification, the Iranians have said before, during, and after this deal that they would allow no access to their military sites whatsoever. We said that we were going to have access to their military sites.

The Iranians said the entire time, before, during, and after: You will never have access to our military sites.

On top of it all, the United States agreed that we wouldn't have any of our weapons inspectors participate in any of the inspections.

The IAEA, on its own, has failed to conduct a thorough review of Iran's nuclear capabilities. Just one example, in September 2015, when the Iranian officials then granted limited access to

IAEA inspectors at the Parchin facility, although environmental samples revealed chemically man-modified particles of natural uranium, the IAEA did not pursue an explanation or even an inquiry. This Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action is a house of cards.

So, what are we doing? Not only was a better deal absolutely attainable, but no deal would have been better than this agreement.

Next, I want to discuss in further detail why the JCPOA was fatally flawed for what was not in it.

When Secretary Kerry chose to ignore Iran's bad, nonnuclear activities in the region, he negotiated away all of the leverage that brought the Iranians to the table in the first place. You cannot separate Iran's ballistic missile development designed to deliver a nuclear warhead from its nuclear weapons program.

Iran has continued to pursue its ICBM development in violation of U.N. Security Council resolutions.

Iran has continued to finance terrorism. It is the world's largest state sponsor of terrorism and has continued to work to overthrow foreign governments.

Iran supports Assad in Syria, Hezbollah, and the Houthis in Yemen. They have consolidated massive territorial control, building a land bridge between Tehran and Beirut, a direct threat to the security and stability of regional partners such as Israel and Jordan.

By failing to address Iran's nonnuclear activities, the JCPOA has given Iran more resources to pursue its terrorist ambitions in the region.

These are, unfortunately, just a few of the examples of Iran's bad activities.

Since the JCPOA was entered into, Iranian aggression in the Middle East, including Syria, Iraq, and elsewhere, has only increased.

Iran has launched as many as 23 ballistic missiles since the conclusion of the July 2015 nuclear deal.

They have illegally financed terrorist activities, wreaking havoc in the Middle East.

Iran has recommitted to wiping Israel off of the map, calling them the Little Satan.

They chant death to America, and they call United States the Great Satan in their parliament, in their streets on their holidays, all while unjustly imprisoning American citizens.

In the past 2 years, Iran has blown up mock U.S. warships and seized one of our Navy vessels and subsequently held hostage and publicly embarrassed 10 American sailors.

Do you remember Secretary Kerry's reaction to Iran holding hostage and embarrassing those sailors? His response was: Thank you.

He was thanking the Iranians. He defended the whole situation as evidence of an improved relationship with Iran. That is living in an alternate version of reality.

One fundamental question is often misunderstood, and in many cases it is not even asked: What leverage could we have, moving forward, to tackle all of Iran's threatening actions if we eliminate the sanctions that bring the Iranians to the table in the first place?

President Trump is absolutely correct to reimpose the toughest sanctions against Iran's oil and financial sector and IRGC officials, agents, and affiliates. In order to regain the leverage that brought the Iranians to the table, we must increase financial pressure so that Iran does not have the ability to back terrorist groups across the world and keep their economy afloat.

With Secretary of State Mike Pompeo and National Security Advisor John Bolton working so closely with our President to counter Iran's aggression, I feel confident when they say: ''No path to a nuclear weapon, not now, not ever.''

The onus is on Iran. If they like the sanctions relief and they want to keep the sanctions relief, then the United States has just a few reasonable requirements: the verification regime needs to be fixed; the sunset provisions need to be lifted; and the other bad and nefarious legal activities must end.

If there are any other nations around the world that want to keep the sanctions relief in place, then convince Iran to change its behavior and agree to the United States' very reasonable demands.

It is very telling that so many nations in the Middle East are supportive of President Trump's determinations to push back against Iranian aggression. They are the ones that are most impacted, and they support the decision.

In 2009, millions of Iranians poured into the streets to protest a fraudulent election of then-President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad. The United States and the rest of the world then offered zero support following that undemocratic election. President Obama said it was none of our business, which proved to not only be wrong, but also a huge error in judgment.

We must learn from our lesson of 2009 and not repeat that same mistake. The United States must support the millions of Iranians who continue to march in the streets desperate for support to help them turn the tide in Tehran and all throughout Iran. There are millions of people in Iran who want a free, stable, democratic Iran.

Now, in 2018, Iranians have once again courageously poured into the streets to protest the brutality of President Hassan Rouhani's regime. Over the last few months, we are witnessing the largest protests in Tehran since 2012.

Keep in mind that whenever we hear about how the most moderate candidates get elected in Iran—this is a point I have heard a lot. Iran elects the most moderate candidates, but so often they leave out the important point that the 12,000 most moderate candidates are denied access to the ballot altogether. The only choice has been to pick a pro-regime hardliner. We should be under no illusions otherwise.

By withdrawing from the JCPOA, President Trump is sending an important message to the Iranians that America will not accept a regime that tortures its own people, funds terrorist activities, and vows for the destruction of the United States and our great ally, Israel.

The United States is a nation that is not even close to equals with Iran. We are the greatest Nation in the world, and when we engage in these negotiations, we must do so from a position of strength and not relinquish that. That is all that this adversary respects. We can't be silent not because we want war, but because we want to prevent it.

The good news is, now, in July of 2018, again we are treating Israel like Israel and Iran like Iran. One of my complaints and many other Americans is, for a while, we were treating Israel like Iran and Iran like Israel. It made no sense.

□ 2030

I mentioned earlier in this hour how important it is for the United States to be strong, consistent, and effective in our foreign policy; to strengthen our relationships with our friends; to treat our adversaries as our adversaries, understanding that our enemies, our adversaries, do not respect weakness; they only respect strength.

I wish that the start of the negotiation had gone down very differently in the first place, but fast forward to today. With President Trump, Secretary Pompeo, Ambassador Bolton, their team, and with other countries aligned with us, especially in the Middle East, we can pursue a better path forward.

For all of those who are interested, whether you like the JCPOA or not, if you like the sanctions relief or not; but hopefully all concerned with Iran's bad activities, especially their nuclear and their non-nuclear activities as well, you can help us, putting the onus on Iran and encouraging them to accept our very reasonable demands.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank, again, everyone who participated in tonight's hour. I would like to thank Sara Matar from my team, who has worked very hard on this issue throughout her time in my office. This is an issue that isn't going away anytime soon. It is one that will be passed on from one generation to the next. As our great republic continues to thrive, exist, grow, to be strong, and to protect our freedoms and liberties, we must be strong as a people.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today on account of attending a funeral.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and July 11.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. MCHENRY, on Friday, July 6, 2018:

H.R. 1496. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 3585 South Vermont Avenue in Los Angeles, California, as the ''Marvin Gaye Post Office''.

H.R. 2673. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 514 Broadway Street in Pekin, Illinois, as the ''Lance Corporal Jordan S. Bastean Post Office''.

H.R. 3183. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 13683 James Madison Highway in Palmyra, Virginia, as the ''U.S. Navy Seaman Dakota Kyle Rigsby Post Office''.

H.R. 4301. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 201 Tom Hall Street in Fort Mill, South Carolina, as the ''J. Elliott Williams Post Office Building''.

H.R. 4406. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 99 Macombs Place in New York, New York, as the ''Tuskegee Airmen Post Office Building''.

H.R. 4463. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 6 Doyers Street in New York, New York, as the ''Mabel Lee Memorial Post Office''.

H.R. 4574. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 108 West Schick Road in Bloomingdale, Illinois, as the ''Bloomingdale Veterans Memorial Post Office Building''.

H.R. 4646. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1900 Corporate Drive in Birmingham, Alabama, as the ''Lance Corporal Thomas E. Rivers, Jr. Post Office Building''.

H.R. 4685. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 414 Hope Street in Bristol, Rhode Island, as the ''First Sergeant P. Andrew McKenna Jr. Post Office''.

H.R. 4722. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 111 Market Street in Saugerties, New York, as the ''Maurice D. Hinchey Post Office Building''.

H.R. 4840. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 567 East Franklin Street in Oviedo, Florida, as the ''Sergeant First Class Alwyn Crendall Cashe Post Office Building''.

Robert F. Reeves, Deputy Clerk of the House, further reported and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. MITCHELL, on Tuesday, July 10, 2018:

H.R. 219. An act to correct the Swan Lake Hydroelectric project survey boundary and to provide for the conveyance of the remaining tract of land within the corrected survey boundary to the State of Alaska.

H.R. 220. An act to authorize the expansion of an existing hydroelectric project, and for other purposes.

H.R. 446. An act to extend the deadline for commencement of construction of a hydroelectric project.

H.R. 447. An act to extend the deadline for commencement of construction of a hydroelectric project.

H.R. 951. An act to extend the deadline for commencement of construction of a hydroelectric project.

H.R. 2122. An act to reinstate and extend the deadline for commencement of construction of a hydroelectric project involving Jennings Randolph Dam.

H.R. 2292. An act to extend a project of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission involving the Cannonsville Dam.

H.R. 5956. An act to incentivize the hiring of United States workers in the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, July 11, 2018, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

OATH OF OFFICE MEMBERS, RESIDENT COMMISSIONER, AND DELEGATES

The oath of office required by the sixth article of the Constitution of the United States, and as provided by section 2 of the act of May 13, 1884 (23 Stat. 22), to be administered to Members, Resident Commissioner, and Delegates of the House of Representatives, the text of which is carried in 5 U.S.C. 3331:

> ''I, AB, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear truth faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God.''

has been subscribed to in person and filed in duplicate with the Clerk of the House of Representatives by the following Member of the 115th Congress, pursuant to the provisions of 2 U.S.C. 25:

MICHAEL CLOUD,
27th District of Texas.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

5453. A letter from the Under Secretary, Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Mark A. Ediger, United States Air Force, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 1370(c)(1); Public Law 96-513, Sec. 112 (as amended by Public Law 104-106, Sec. 502(b)); (110 Stat. 293); to the Committee on Armed Services.

5454. A letter from the Under Secretary, Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's Reserve Component Equipment Procurement and Military Construction Report for FY 2019, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 10543(c); Public Law 104-201, Sec. 1257(a)(1) (as amended by Public Law 112-81, Sec. 1064(11)); (125 Stat. 1587); to the Committee on Armed Services.

5455. A letter from the Under Secretary, Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Jeffrey G. Lofgren, United States Air Force, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 1370(c)(1); Public Law 96-513, Sec. 112 (as amended by Public Law 104-106, Sec. 502(b)); (110 Stat. 293); to the Committee on Armed Services.

5456. A letter from the Under Secretary, Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of General Lori J. Robinson, United States Air Force, and her advancement to the grade of general on the retired list, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 1370(c)(1); Public Law 96-513, Sec. 112 (as amended by Public Law 104-106, Sec. 502(b)); (110 Stat. 293); to the Committee on Armed Services.

5457. A letter from the Under Secretary, Acquisition and Sustainment, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's report to Congress titled, ''Distribution of Department of Defense Depot Maintenance Workloads for Fiscal Years 2017, through 2019'', pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2466(d)(1); Public Law 100-456, Sec. 326(a) (as amended by Public Law 106-65, Sec. 333); (113 Stat. 567); to the Committee on Armed Services.

5458. A letter from the Under Secretary, Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter authorizing four (4) officers to wear the insignia of the grade of rear admiral or rear admiral (lower half), pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 777(b)(3)(B); Public Law 104-106, Sec. 503(a)(1) (as added by Public Law 108-136, Sec. 509(a)(3)); (117 Stat. 1458); to the Committee on Armed Services.

5459. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter authorizing two officers to wear the insignia of the grade of major general or brigadier general, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 777(b)(3)(B); Public Law 104-106, Sec. 503(a)(1) (as added by Public Law 108-136, Sec. 509(a)(3)); (117 Stat. 1458); to the Committee on Armed Services.

5460. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Business Management, Analysis and Optimization, Office of the Chief Management Officer, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's report to Congress titled, ''Streamlining the Department of Defense Management Headquarters''; to the Committee on Armed Services.

5461. A letter from the Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's Major final rules — Amendments to Smaller Reporting Company Definition [Release Nos.: 33-10513; 34-83550; File No.: S7-12-16] (RIN: 3235-AL90) received July 2, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

5462. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report to Congress on the Medicaid Health Home State Plan Option, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 1396w-4 note; Public Law 111-148, Sec. 2703(b)(2)(A); (124 Stat. 322); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5463. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's FY 2017 Generic Drug User Fee Amendments Financial Report, pursuant to the Generic Drug User Fee Amendments of 2012; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5464. A letter from the Regulations Coordinator, Health Resources and Services Administration, Department of Health and Human

Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Removing Outmoded Regulations Regarding the Rural Physician Training Grant Program, Definition of ''Underserved Rural Community'' (RIN: 0906-AB17) received June 26, 2018, 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.

5465. A letter from the Regulations Coordinator, Health Resources and Services Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Removing Outmoded Regulations Regarding the National Health Service Corps Program (RIN: 0906-AB15) received June 26, 2018, 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.

5466. A letter from the Regulations Coordinator, Health Resources and Services Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Removing Outmoded Regulations Regarding the Ricky Ray Hemophilia Relief Fund Program (RIN: 0906-AB13) received June 26, 2018, 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.

5467. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's report to Congress entitled, ''Fiscal Year 2017 Annual Report on the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) Advisory Committee Vacancies and Public Disclosures'', pursuant to Sec. 712(e) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5468. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Food and Drug Administration's FY 2017 Performance Report to Congress for the Generic Drug User Fee Amendments; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5469. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Reclassification of Major Sources as Area Sources Under Section 112 of the Clean Air Act received June 27, 2018, 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.

5470. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Michigan; Revisions to Volatile Organic Compound Rules [EPA-R05-OAR-2017-0100; EPA-R05-OAR-2017-0501; FRL-9980-08-Region 5] received June 27, 2018, 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.

5471. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Pennsylvania; Base Year Emissions Inventories for the Lebanon and Delaware County Nonattainment Areas for the 2012 Annual Fine Particulate Matter National Ambient Air Quality Standard [EPA-R03-OAR-2017-0423; FRL-9980-30-Region 3] received June 27, 2018, 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.

5472. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Arkansas; Revisions to Minor New Source Review Program [EPA-R06-OAR-2017-0435; FRL-9979-15-Region 6] received June 27, 2018, 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.

5473. A letter from the Director, Regulator Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; California; Yolo-Solano Air Quality Management District; Negative Declarations [EPA-R09-OAR-2018-0160; FRL-9980-17-Region 9] received June 27, 2018, 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.

5474. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Oklahoma; Interstate Transport Requirements for the 2012 PM2.5 NAAQS [EPA-R06-OAR-2017-0052; FRL-9979-96-Region 6] received July 2, 2018, 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.

5475. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality State Implementation Plans; California; Chico Redesignation Request and Maintenance Plan for the 2006 24-hour PM2.5 Standard [EPA-R09-OAR-2018-0181; FRL-9980-49-Region 9] received July 2, 2018, 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.

5476. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Colorado; Regional Haze State Implementation Plan [EPA-R08-OAR-2018-0015; FRL-9980-13-Region 8] received July 2, 2018, 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.

5477. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Interstate Transport Prongs 1 and 2 for the 2012 Fine Particulate Matter (PM2.5) Standard for Colorado, Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wyoming [EPA-R08-OAR-2018-0055; FRL-9980-12-Region 8] received July 2, 2018, 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.

5478. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; California; Eastern Kern Air Pollution Control District; Reclassification [EPA-R09-OAR-2018-0223; FRL-9980-48-Region 9] received July 2, 2018, 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.

5479. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Remaining Requirements for Mercury and Air Toxics Standards (MATS) Electronic Reporting Requirements [EPA-HQ-OAR-2009-0234; FRL-9980-41-OAR] (RIN: 2060-AT42) received July 2, 2018, 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.

5480. A letter from the Deputy Chief, Disability Rights Office, Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Misuse of Internet Protocol (IP) Captioned Telephone Service [CG Docket No.: 13-24]; Telecommunications Relay Services and Speech-to-Speech Services for Individuals with Hearing and Speech Disabilities [CG Docket No.: 03-123] received July 2, 2018, 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.

5481. A letter from the Associate Bureau Chief, Wireline Competition Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Accelerating Wireline Broadband Deployment by Removing Barriers to Infrastructure Investment [WC Docket No.: 17-84] received July 2, 2018, 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.

5482. A letter from the Associated Bureau Chief, Wireline Competition Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Promoting Telehealth in Rural America [WC Docket No.: 17-310] received July 2, 2018, 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.

5483. A letter from the Deputy Chief, Broadband Division, Wireless Telecommunications Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Use of Spectrum Bands Above 24 GHz For Mobile Radio Services [GN Docket No.: 14-177]; Amendment to Parts 1, 22, 24, 27, 74, 80, 90, 95, and 101 To Establish Uniform License Renewal, Discontinuance of Operation, and Geographic Partitioning and Spectrum Disaggregation Rules and Policies for Certain Wireless Radio Services [WT Docket No.: 10-112] received June 21, 2018, 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.

5484. A letter from the Deputy Chief, Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Protecting Consumers from Unauthorized Carrier Changes and Related Unauthorized Charges [CG Docket No.: 17-169] received June 21, 2018, 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.

5485. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Burundi that was declared in Executive Order 13712 of November 22, 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.

5486. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Belarus that was declared in Executive Order 13405 of June 16, 2006, 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.

5487. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser, Office of Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting reports concerning international agreements other than treaties entered into by the United States to be transmitted to the Congress within the sixty-day period specified in the Case-Zablocki Act, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b(a); Public Law 92-403, Sec. 1(a) (as amended by Public Law 108-458, Sec. 7121(b)); (118 Stat. 3807); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5488. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report pursuant to Sec.

40(g)(2) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5489. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 17-147, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5490. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 17-070, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) and 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5491. A letter from the Sanctions Regulations Advisor, Office of Foreign Assets Control, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Iranian Transactions and Sanctions Regulations received June 28, 2018, 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.

5492. A letter from the Inspector General, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the System Review Report of the audit organization of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services Office of Inspector General conducted by the United States Postal Service Office of Inspector General, pursuant to the Inspector General Act of 1978; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5493. A letter from the Charmian, Federal Reserve System, transmitting the Board's Semiannual Report to Congress prepared by the Office of the Inspector General for the Board and the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, pursuant to the Inspector General Act of 1978; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5494. A letter from the Chairman, National Credit Union Administration, transmitting the Administration's Inspector General's semi-annual report for October 1, 2017, through March 31, 2018, pursuant to Sec. 5(b) of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5495. A letter from the Executive Director, National Council on Radiation Protection and Measurements, transmitting the 2017 Annual Audit Report of the Council, pursuant to 36 U.S.C. 10101(b)(1) and 150909; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5496. A letter from the Executive Director, National Mining Hall of Fame and Museum, transmitting the 2017 annual report and financial audit of the National Mining Hall of Fame and Museum, pursuant to Secs. 152112 and 10101, of Title 36 of the U.S. Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5497. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0362; Product Identifier 2018-NM-020-AD; Amendment 39-19269; AD 2018-09-12] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 26, 2018, 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.

5498. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2016-9523; Product Identifier 2016-NM-134-AD; Amendment 39-19270; AD 2018-09-13] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 26, 2018, 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.

5499. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0398; Product Identifier 2017-NM-113-AD; Amendment 39-19277; AD 2018-10-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 26, 2018, 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.

5500. A letter from the Regulatory Development Coordinator, Office of Regulation Policy and Management, Office of the Secretary (00REG), Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule — Medical Care in Foreign Countries and Filing for Reimbursement for Community Care Not Previously Authorized by VA (RIN: 2900-AP55) received July 2, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

5501. A letter from the United States Trade Ambassador, United States Trade Representative, Executive Office of the President, transmitting the 2018 Biennial Report on the Implementation of the African Growth and Opportunity Act, pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 3705 note; Public Law 114-27, Sec. 110(a); (129 Stat. 370); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5502. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's Cybersecurity Strategy, pursuant to 6 U.S.C. 149a(e); Public Law 107-296, Sec. 228A(e) (as amended by Public Law 114-328, Sec. 1912(a)); (130 Stat. 2684); to the Committee on Homeland Security.

5503. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Foreign Assets Control, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a letter notifying Congress of the Treasury Department's intent to terminate the sanctions imposed on Coop Pank AS; jointly to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Financial Services.

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. HENSARLING: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 5953. A bill to provide regulatory relief to charitable organizations that provide housing assistance, and for other purposes (Rept. 115–806). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HENSARLING: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 5877. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to allow for the registration of venture exchanges, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 115–807). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HENSARLING: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 6139. A bill to require the Securities and Exchange Commission to carry out a study to evaluate the issues affecting the provision of and reliance upon investment research into small issuers (Rept. 115–808). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HENSARLING: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 5793. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to carry out a housing choice voucher mobility demonstration to encourage families receiving such voucher assistance to move to lower-poverty areas and expand access to opportunity areas (Rept. 115–809). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HENSARLING: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 5749. A bill to require the appropriate Federal banking agencies to increase the risk-sensitivity of the capital treatment of certain centrally cleared options, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 115–810). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HENSARLING: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 5970. A bill to require the Securities and Exchange Commission to implement rules simplifying the quarterly financial reporting regime; with amendments (Rept. 115–811). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 985. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 50) to provide for additional safeguards with respect to imposing Federal mandates, and for other purposes, and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3281) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to facilitate the transfer to non-Federal ownership of appropriate reclamation projects or facilities, and for other purposes (Rept. 115–812). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. GOODLATTE: Committee on Judiciary. House Resolution 938. Resolution of inquiry directing the Attorney General to provide certain documents in the Attorney General's possession to the House of Representatives relating to the ongoing congressional investigation related to certain prosecutorial and investigatory decisions made by the Department of Justice and Federal Bureau of Investigation surrounding the 2016 election; with an amendment (Rept. 115–813). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. PAULSEN (for himself and Mr. BLUMENAUER):

H.R. 6317. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that direct primary care service arrangements do not disqualify deductible health savings account contributions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. BLACK:

H.R. 6318. A bill to amend section 275(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act to change the first commission of one of the criminal offenses described in that section from a misdemeanor to a felony, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Education and the Workforce, Ways and Means, and Appropriations, 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. HULTGREN:

H.R. 6319. A bill to require the Securities and Exchange Commission to carry out a study of the 10 per centum threshold limitation applicable to the definition of a diversified company under the Investment Company Act of 1940, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California:

H.R. 6320. A bill to require the Securities and Exchange Commission to carry out a study of Rule 10b5-1 trading plans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. MOORE (for herself and Mr. HUIZENGA):

H.R. 6321. A bill to require the Securities and Exchange Commission to revise the definitions of a ''small business'' and ''small organization'' for purposes of assessing the impact of the Commission's rulemakings under the Investment Advisers Act of 1940; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. MEEKS:

H.R. 6322. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to require issuers with a multi-class stock structure to make certain disclosures in any proxy or consent solicitation material, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. GOTTHEIMER (for himself, Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH, and Ms. SINEMA):

H.R. 6323. A bill to create an interdivisional taskforce at the Securities and Exchange Commission for senior investors; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. HIMES:

H.R. 6324. A bill to require the Securities and Exchange Commission to carry out a study of the direct and indirect underwriting fees, including gross spreads, for mid-sized initial public offerings; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE (for herself, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, and Mr. CROWLEY):

H.R. 6325. A bill to extend the period of designation for certain countries for purposes of providing temporary protected status to nationals of those countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAPUANO (for himself, Mr. CORREA, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. KEATING, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Ms. MENG):

H.R. 6326. A bill to temporarily restrict the removal of alien parents separated from their children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRAWFORD (for himself, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. WOMACK, and Mr. HILL):

H.R. 6327. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to modify the composition of the Eastern judicial district of Arkansas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ESPAILLAT:

H.R. 6328. A bill to require the Secretary of Defense to recognize associations of procurement technical assistance centers under certain circumstances, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. NOEM (for herself and Mr. SMITH of Missouri):

H.R. 6329. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from the value of taxable estates bequests to certain exempt organizations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. SÁNCHEZ (for herself, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. WELCH, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. POCAN, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. AGUILAR, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. JONES, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. GOMEZ, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. JACKSON LEE, and Ms. HANABUSA):

H. Res. 986. A resolution expressing support for the designation of Journeyman Lineman Recognition Day; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. PAULSEN:

H.R. 6317.

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

Article I, Section 8

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mrs. BLACK:

H.R. 6318.

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

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution which grants Congress the authority 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. HULTGREN:

H.R. 6319.

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

Section 8, Clause 3, To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and within the Indian Tribes

Section 8, Clause 18, To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California:

H.R. 6320.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution

By Ms. MOORE:

H.R. 6321.

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

Articte 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. MEEKS:

H.R. 6322.

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

Commerce Clause, Article 1, Section 8, and Clause 3 of the US Constitution

By Mr. GOTTHEIMER:

H.R. 6323.

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

Article. 1. Section. 8.

By Mr. HIMES:

H.R. 6324.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes

By Ms. JACKSON LEE:

H.R. 6325.

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

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clauses 4 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CAPUANO:

H.R. 6326.

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

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. CRAWFORD:

H.R. 6327.

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

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the enumerated powers listed in Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. ESPAILLAT:

H.R. 6328.

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

Article One of the United States Constitution, section 8, clause 18:

The Congress shall have Power—To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof

or

Article One of the United States Constitution, Section 8, Clause 3:

The Congress shall have Power—To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian tribes;

By Mrs. NOEM:

H.R. 6329.

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

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

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

H.R. 20: Mr. LAMB.

H.R. 103: Mr. PEARCE.

H.R. 140: Mr. GRAVES of Missouri.

H.R. 173: Mrs. BLACKBURN.

H.R. 184: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 662: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 681: Mrs. LESKO.

H.R. 750: Mr. FASO.

H.R. 936: Mr. ROE of Tennessee.

H.R. 959: Mr. LYNCH, Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico, and Mr. REICHERT.

H.R. 1017: Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.

H.R. 1038: Mr. ABRAHAM.

H.R. 1098: Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 1171: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN and Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana.

H.R. 1178: Mr. GRAVES of Missouri.

H.R. 1187: Mr. PERLMUTTER.

H.R. 1201: Mr. COFFMAN and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.

H.R. 1212: Mr. MARSHALL.

H.R. 1264: Ms. GRANGER.

H.R. 1291: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 1300: Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 1318: Mr. GALLEGO and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.

H.R. 1339: Mr. COFFMAN.

H.R. 1384: Mr. FASO.

H.R. 1419: Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.

H.R. 1439: Mr. LAMB.

H.R. 1476: Mr. RUIZ.

H.R. 1617: Miss RICE of New York.

H.R. 1683: Mr. HUNTER, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, and Mr. KATKO.

H.R. 1697: Mr. MEEKS.

H.R. 1748: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.

H.R. 1818: Ms. SÁNCHEZ and Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 1838: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.

H.R. 1876: Mr. COFFMAN and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.

H.R. 1881: Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. BRAT, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. CARTER of Texas, and Mr. COMER.

H.R. 1953: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.

H.R. 1957: Mr. HASTINGS and Mr. CRIST.

H.R. 1985: Mr. CICILLINE and Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 2049: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 2106: Mrs. COMSTOCK.
H.R. 2150: Mr. BROOKS of Alabama and Mr. GRAVES of Missouri.
H.R. 2158: Ms. CLARKE of New York.
H.R. 2259: Mr. GARAMENDI.
H.R. 2267: Mr. COURTNEY.
H.R. 2285: Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 2431: Mr. GRAVES of Missouri.
H.R. 2584: Mr. POE of Texas and Ms. DEGETTE.
H.R. 2633: Mr. MEEKS and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.
H.R. 2885: Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas.
H.R. 2902: Mr. GRIJALVA and Mr. MEEKS.
H.R. 2944: Mr. CORREA.
H.R. 2976: Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Mr. CUMMINGS.
H.R. 3006: Ms. TITUS.
H.R. 3148: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania and Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 3207: Mr. TED LIEU of California, Ms. MENG, and Mr. SERRANO.
H.R. 3395: Mr. WITTMAN.
H.R. 3409: Mr. BACON.
H.R. 3464: Ms. MENG, Mrs. LOWEY, and Mr. HIGGINS of New York.
H.R. 3635: Mr. BIGGS, Mr. HUIZENGA, and Mr. HURD.
H.R. 3645: Mrs. LOVE.
H.R. 3682: Mr. DESAULNIER.
H.R. 3738: Mr. PANETTA.
H.R. 3775: Mr. GRAVES of Missouri.
H.R. 3828: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.
H.R. 3976: Mrs. LESKO.
H.R. 3984: Ms. MENG.
H.R. 4137: Mr. COOK.
H.R. 4256: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania and Mr. RASKIN.
H.R. 4271: Ms. CLARKE of New York.
H.R. 4384: Mr. JEFFRIES.
H.R. 4518: Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KILMER, and Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI.
H.R. 4549: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 4556: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
H.R. 4575: Mr. PERLMUTTER and Mr. AGUILAR.
H.R. 4626: Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. ESPAILLAT, and Ms. CLARKE of New York.
H.R. 4691: Mr. CONNOLLY and Mr. CARBAJAL.
H.R. 4693: Mr. CONNOLLY.
H.R. 4704: Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 4732: Mr. UPTON, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. CARBAJAL, and Mr. SMUCKER.
H.R. 4846: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 4897: Mr. FLEISCHMANN and Ms. MATSUI.
H.R. 4915: Mr. BERGMAN.
H.R. 4952: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 4953: Mr. ENGEL and Mr. GAETZ.
H.R. 4957: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
H.R. 5004: Mr. SERRANO and Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 5008: Ms. NORTON and Mr. SCHNEIDER.
H.R. 5031: Mr. DONOVAN and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 5085: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.
H.R. 5107: Mr. PEARCE.
H.R. 5129: Mr. HUFFMAN and Mr. BROWN of Maryland.
H.R. 5141: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. CARTER of Texas, and Mrs. BEATTY.
H.R. 5145: Mr. SERRANO, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Mr. ELLISON, and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
H.R. 5160: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 5191: Mr. HUNTER and Mrs. BEATTY.
H.R. 5241: Ms. JUDY CHU of California and Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.
H.R. 5281: Mr. BARTON, Mr. BANKS of Indiana, Mr. HUIZENGA, and Mr. COFFMAN.
H.R. 5291: Mr. BROWN of Maryland.
H.R. 5333: Mr. SCHRADER.
H.R. 5358: Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. FASO, and Mr. BERGMAN.
H.R. 5385: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. BARTON, and Mr. HURD.
H.R. 5427: Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico.
H.R. 5433: Mr. GALLEGO.
H.R. 5453: Miss RICE of New York.
H.R. 5460: Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida, Mr. BUCSHON, and Mr. HASTINGS.
H.R. 5474: Ms. CLARKE of New York.
H.R. 5507: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
H.R. 5516: Mr. SCHIFF.
H.R. 5595: Mrs. HARTZLER and Mr. VALADAO.
H.R. 5658: Mr. LOBIONDO.
H.R. 5671: Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. CLARKE of New York, and Ms. STEFANIK.
H.R. 5678: Mr. COFFMAN and Mr. MARSHALL.
H.R. 5690: Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 5697: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 5717: Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 5732: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 5862: Ms. CLARKE of New York.
H.R. 5900: Mr. FITZPATRICK and Mr. SIRES.
H.R. 5924: Mr. PERRY.
H.R. 5948: Mrs. BLACK.
H.R. 5963: Mrs. BLACK.
H.R. 5985: Mr. CURBELO of Florida and Mr. KATKO.
H.R. 5986: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
H.R. 6014: Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. LEE, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Ms. MENG, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. GUTHRIE, and Ms. PINGREE.
H.R. 6016: Ms. FUDGE, Ms. MOORE, and Mr. RASKIN.
H.R. 6022: Mr. CRAMER.
H.R. 6031: Ms. MCSALLY and Ms. STEFANIK.
H.R. 6037: Mr. CAPUANO.
H.R. 6043: Mr. MASSIE and Mr. PERLMUTTER.
H.R. 6048: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.
H.R. 6060: Mr. CAPUANO.
H.R. 6071: Mr. SCHIFF and Ms. JUDY CHU of California.
H.R. 6074: Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico.
H.R. 6077: Mr. HIGGINS of New York.
H.R. 6080: Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Ms. PINGREE.
H.R. 6086: Mr. SOTO, Mr. PALLONE, and Mr. LANCE.
H.R. 6103: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.
H.R. 6105: Ms. STEFANIK.
H.R. 6108: Mr. ABRAHAM.
H.R. 6137: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI, and Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 6174: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY and Mr. MCEACHIN.
H.R. 6178: Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. DESJARLAIS, and Mr. AMODEI.
H.R. 6180: Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. LEE, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, and Mr. HASTINGS.
H.R. 6183: Mrs. DINGELL, Mrs. COMSTOCK, and Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico.
H.R. 6184: Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, and Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
H.R. 6193: Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. MCEACHIN, Mr. RUSH, Mr. HASTINGS, Mrs. LAWRENCE, and Mr. EVANS.
H.R. 6195: Mr. BYRNE.
H.R. 6201: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.
H.R. 6207: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina and Mr. CHABOT.
H.R. 6213: Mr. GAETZ, Mr. POSEY, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, and Mr. FLORES.
H.R. 6232: Mr. SOTO and Mr. MOULTON.
H.R. 6236: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. ELLISON, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. CORREA, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. EVANS, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. LEE, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. COHEN, and Ms. BARRAGÁN.
H.R. 6238: Mr. ELLISON, Mr. KILMER, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, and Mr. SIRES.
H.R. 6239: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. VISCLOSKY, and Mr. CROWLEY.
H.R. 6251: Ms. MOORE and Mr. CAPUANO.
H.R. 6256: Mr. MCGOVERN and Mr. CURBELO of Florida.
H.R. 6277: Mr. NUNES.
H.R. 6278: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 6282: Mr. DESAULNIER.
H.R. 6288: Ms. BONAMICI.
H.R. 6301: Mrs. BLACK.
H.R. 6313: Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, and Mrs. WALORSKI.
H.R. 6315: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. CARBAJAL, and Ms. NORTON.
H.J. Res. 33: Mr. HIMES and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H. Res. 15: Mr. POLIS.
H. Res. 211: Ms. ESHOO.
H. Res. 318: Mr. KILMER.
H. Res. 319: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H. Res. 673: Mr. WEBER of Texas and Mr. BOST.
H. Res. 763: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.
H. Res. 825: Mr. HUFFMAN.
H. Res. 826: Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, and Ms. KAPTUR.
H. Res. 864: Mr. HIMES, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mr. PETERS, Mr. PANETTA, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, and Mr. DEUTCH.
H. Res. 910: Mrs. WAGNER, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. CLARKE of New York, and Ms. NORTON.
H. Res. 977: Ms. BORDALLO.
H. Res. 981: Mr. CHABOT.
H. Res. 982: Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. KENNEDY, and Ms. MATSUI.
H. Res. 984: Mr. GALLAGHER.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

The amendment to be offered by Representative WATSON COLEMAN (NJ) or a designee, to H.R. 50, the Unfunded Mandates Information and Transparency Act of 2017, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 115th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 164 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JULY 10, 2018 *No. 115*

Senate

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable CINDY HYDE-SMITH, a Senator from the State of Mississippi.

PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

Holy Father, thank You for the showers of blessings You bestow upon us each day. Help us to open our hands to Your generosity, expressing our gratitude in loving obedience.

Lord, inspire our lawmakers to live for You, striving to please You in their every endeavor. May they not forget that they belong to You, the Great Shepherd of their destinies. Go before them, that they may follow in Your steps. Go behind them to steer them when they stray. And go beside them so that they will experience the strength and joy that come from Your abiding presence.

We pray in Your marvelous Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Presiding Officer led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

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

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, July 10, 2018.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable CINDY HYDE-SMITH, a Senator from the State of Mississippi, to perform the duties of the Chair.

ORRIN G. HATCH,
President pro tempore.

Mrs. HYDE-SMITH thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

NOMINATION OF BRETT KAVANAUGH

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, President Trump has made a superb selection to serve as Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States: Judge Brett Kavanaugh of the DC Circuit. Judge Kavanaugh possesses an impressive resume, an outstanding legal mind, and an exemplary judicial temperament. He has served 12 years on the Nation's most consequential circuit court. During that tenure, he has proven to be one of the most thorough and thoughtful jurists in our country. Importantly, that record demonstrates an understanding of a judge's proper role in our constitutional Republic.

Judge Kavanaugh understands that in the United States of America judges are not—not—unelected superlegislators whom we select for their personal views or policy preferences. A judge's duty is to interpret the plain meaning of our laws and our Constitution according to how they are written.

Judges need to be unbiased. They need to treat all parties fairly. They need to approach every case with open ears and an open mind. Judges' decisions must turn on the facts of each case and be based on the texts that it is their job to interpret.

By all accounts, Judge Kavanaugh is precisely that kind of judge. His resume, to put it simply, is topnotch: a bachelor's degree from Yale, with honors; a law degree, also from Yale, where he was a member of the law review; a lecturing position at Harvard Law School, to which he was appointed, by the way, by then-Dean and now-Justice Elena Kagan.

After graduating, he quickly built a reputation as a star law clerk, including on the Supreme Court, for Justice Kennedy; as an energetic and talented public servant; and as one of the preeminent legal minds of his generation.

In 2006, the Senate confirmed him to the DC Circuit. He has compiled an extensive record on the Federal bench. He has published more than 300 opinions and has earned considerable praise for his clear writing and reasoning.

Judge Kavanaugh has built a long and distinguished record. It paints a clear picture of how he would conduct himself as a member of the Nation's highest Court. It reflects a firm understanding that judges must interpret laws as they are written. We do not choose them to make policy, to pick favorites, or to craft novel legislation from the bench.

Some of our colleagues—and others on the left—seem to see the role of judges very differently. President Obama summed up this alternate view well when he was running for President. He explained that he sought to appoint judges who harbored particular empathy for certain parties in certain cases. That is great if you happen to be the party in the case whom the judge likes. It is not so great if you are the other guy. It doesn't align with our Nation's historical understanding of the rule of law or the role that Federal courts play in our democracy.

I respectfully submit that, then and now, some of our Democratic colleagues seem to be a little confused. They seem to be confusing the nature of a political office with the nature of a judicial office. This would explain why some of our colleagues sound

Printed on recycled paper.

eager to try and turn judicial confirmations into something like political elections—to grill Judge Kavanaugh on policy outcomes, like voters rightly grill all of us when we run for our seats in the Senate.

Some Democratic Senators have telegraphed that they will heed the demands of the far-left special interest groups and try to force Judge Kavanaugh to commit under oath to decisions he might make on particular issues in hypothetical cases. Forget that the cases don't even exist yet. Forget the total absence of any facts, legal arguments, or research. Forget how inappropriate and undesirable it would be for a judge to predetermine a ruling before either side's lawyers uttered a single word.

That is simply not how this process has ever worked or ever could work. I am not the one saying this. Here is what a prior Supreme Court nominee said on this very subject: ''A judge sworn to decide impartially can offer no forecasts, no hints, for that would show not only disregard for the specifics of the particular case, it would display disdain for the entire judicial process.''

Those are the words of another then-DC Circuit Court judge and current Supreme Court Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg during her Senate confirmation to the Supreme Court in 1993.

I think we all should remember that standard. We will do well to remember that we are evaluating a judge, not debating a candidate for political office.

Even more regrettably, a number of our Democratic colleagues could not even wait until the President's announcement last night before launching attacks on his nominee. This was, in some cases, quite literally a fill-in-the-blank opposition. They wrote statements of opposition only to fill in the name later.

Sadly, this is not a new approach for the far-left special interest groups. Just last year, Justice Gorsuch met with partisan opposition before the ink was even dry on his nomination. I am sorry to say that Judge Kavanaugh seems to have already broken that record, because Senate Democrats were on record opposing him before he had even been named—just fill in the name, whomever it is we are against—before the ink was even dry on Justice Kennedy's resignation.

This is a telltale sign that some of our colleagues are throwing thoughtful independent judgment out the window and are outsourcing their thinking on this matter to far-left special interest groups.

There has been a lot of talk about outsourcing here. If anybody is outsourcing, it is the Democrats outsourcing what they say to these outside groups that are demanding opposition to anyone at all costs, no matter who it is.

As I discussed on the floor yesterday, we know exactly what this partisan playbook looks like. It has been hauled out for most everyone who a Republican President has nominated to the Supreme Court for the last 40 years. It is like clockwork.

I fully anticipate that we will hear all kinds of fantastic stories about the pain and suffering that this perfectly qualified, widely respected judge will somehow unleash on America if we confirm him to the Court. That kind of cheap, political fearmongering insults the intelligence of the American people because Americans understand the difference between a political office and a judicial office. They understand the difference between the policymakers who throw pitches and the judges who call balls and strikes.

I look forward to the Senate's fair consideration of this most impressive nomination. I look forward to meeting with Judge Kavanaugh later this morning, to hearing his testimony in committee, and to voting on his confirmation right here on the Senate floor.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session and resume consideration of the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Mark Jeremy Bennett, of Hawaii, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. 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 ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The Democratic leader is recognized.

NOMINATION OF BRETT KAVANAUGH

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, last night President Trump selected Brett Kavanaugh as his nominee for the upcoming vacancy on the Supreme Court. In selecting Judge Kavanaugh, President Trump did exactly what he said he would do on the campaign trail—nominate someone who will overturn women's reproductive rights and strike down healthcare protections for millions of Americans, including those with preexisting conditions. He has put at risk civil rights, labor rights, environmental rights, and LGBTQ rights. How do we know? Because President Trump repeatedly promised to nominate Justices who will overturn Roe v. Wade and who will undermine our healthcare laws.

This didn't come out of the clear blue; President Trump promised it. He said he would only pick ''pro-life judges'' who would ''automatically'' reverse Roe v. Wade. President Trump actually went so far as to say that women should be ''punished'' for their healthcare choices. President Trump also said that his judicial appointments would ''do the right thing,'' unlike Justice Roberts on healthcare. That is President Trump's litmus test, and it couldn't be clearer.

During the campaign, President Trump commissioned a list of 25 people who would meet the litmus test, who were vetted and approved by two organizations that represent the hard right—the Federalist Society, led by a man named Leonard Leo whose goal in life has been to overturn Roe v. Wade, and the Heritage Foundation, whose goal is to strike down healthcare law because they don't want the government to help people out when they have preexisting conditions or other healthcare needs.

Edward Whelan, a prominent conservative activist, said this about Leonard Leo, the man who put together the list that Trump promised to choose from: ''No one has been more dedicated to the enterprise of building a Supreme Court that will overturn Roe v. Wade than the Federalist Society's Leonard Leo.''

If anyone believes that Judge Kavanaugh or anyone else on the list would uphold Roe v. Wade, then I have a bridge to sell them.

Leonard Leo's goal in life is to repeal Roe. He came up with the list. Do you think he put any slackers, in his opinion, on that list? No.

Judge Kavanaugh got the nomination not because he will be an impartial judge on behalf of all Americans but because he passed President Trump's litmus test—repeal women's freedom for their reproductive rights and repeal America's healthcare, including protection for preexisting conditions. If Judge Kavanaugh were to be confirmed, women's reproductive rights would be in the hands of five men on the Supreme Court. That is not what the women or the men of America want.

Judge Kavanaugh in his own writings made clear he would rule against reproductive rights and freedoms and that he welcomes challenges to the constitutionality of the Affordable Care Act, of our healthcare act. Judge Kavanaugh has argued that the Supreme Court should question the constitutionality of the Affordable Care Act. He openly criticized the Supreme

Court when they upheld the law. He is no neutral arbiter. He has already made up his mind. He wouldn't have been approved by the Heritage Foundation if they weren't certain that he would repeal the ACA. He wouldn't have been approved by the Federalist Society if Leonard Leo wasn't certain that he would repeal Roe v. Wade.

Judge Kavanaugh has argued that the Trump administration could keep a young girl in Federal custody to prevent her from obtaining constitutionally protected healthcare. He has argued that employers should be able to deny their employees access to affordable contraceptive coverage. If Judge Kavanaugh feels that way about contraceptive rights, imagine what he feels about a woman's right to choose.

I will make one other point about Judge Kavanaugh. He is a deeply, deeply conservative justice, way out of the mainstream. He has written troubling decisions rejecting something 90 percent of Americans want—commonsense gun laws. He has undone environmental protections. He has challenged them. Our Clean Air and Clean Water Acts would be at risk. He would make it far more difficult for regulations to exist to enforce those laws.

Here is what is most amazing: He has gone so far as to say that a President doesn't need to follow the law if he ''deems'' it unconstitutional.

Folks, here we have a President, President Trump, who cares less about the rule of law, less about the restraints that every other President has felt were put in place by the Constitution and the norms that have blessed this great country for 200 years, and we are going to put on the Bench someone who says: If this President, President Trump, deems some law is unconstitutional, he doesn't have to follow it. How many Americans think the President would be judicious and limited in doing that? That is not the President I have seen over the last year and a half—oh, no.

An analysis by Professor Epstein of Washington University of St. Louis found that Judge Kavanaugh would be the second most conservative Justice on the Court, to the right of Judge Gorsuch, second only to Justice Thomas. This is the most conservative Court we have had in 80, 90 years—since the 1930s, at the very minimum. To those who say that President Trump has made a moderate selection from the judicial mainstream in the form of Judge Kavanaugh, think again and look at his record. He is a deeply conservative justice.

His judicial philosophy appears to spring from his history. Judge Kavanaugh was embedded in the partisan fights of the past few decades involving the notorious Starr report, the Florida recount, President Bush's secrecy and privilege claims once in office, and ideological judicial nomination fights throughout the Bush era.

The hard right has had a goal. They can't achieve their hard-right philosophy through the two elected branches of government, try as they might—the Congress and President—but if they get control of the one nonelected branch, the judiciary, they can turn the clock back in America for decades, maybe centuries. That has been their goal. When Judge Kavanaugh worked in the White House, he helped them achieve that goal. Judge Kavanaugh's background as a partisan political operative seems exactly like the kind of man President Trump would want on the Supreme Court if legal issues from the Mueller probe arise—deferential to a fault to Executive authority.

Judge Kavanaugh's long track record of partisan politics comes with a long paper trail. The Senate must now be able to access and have the time to adequately review all documents, emails, and other paperwork associated with Judge Kavanaugh before the process moves forward. Judge Kavanaugh's papers may be critical to helping the American people understand the kind of jurist that Judge Kavanaugh would be on the Supreme Court, and if that makes us take a little more time, so be it.

As the President himself has said, this is one of the most consequential nominations we have had in a generation. To get the full record before any of us vote is absolutely necessary, important, essential, and fair. Judge Kavanaugh's papers may give the Senate the best and only chance of understanding Judge Kavanaugh's personal views.

No doubt, Judge Kavanaugh will be schooled, as were his most recent predecessors, to reveal as little as possible about his philosophy and personal views in his confirmation hearing. No doubt he will employ practiced evasions that have become a farcical tradition of the nomination process: I will respect precedent. I will follow settled law and strive to uphold stare decisis. Gee, Senator, I can't comment lest I bias myself on a future case.

We have seen what happened when Justice Roberts, Justice Gorsuch, and Justice Alito said that. Once they got on the Bench, they overturned precedent with alacrity to achieve their political goals. Probably the worst was Citizens United, where Chief Justice Roberts undid close to a century of tradition and allowed wealthy people to send millions of dollars undisclosed into our politics, making the swamp so much worse. Most recently, Justice Gorsuch, Justice Roberts, and the rest dramatically overturned precedent in the Janus case on a whim, as the dissent noted. They just pulled a theory out of a hat—a First Amendment ruling that the First Amendment prohibited unions from organizing. My, oh my, how can anyone believe that Judge Kavanaugh will stick to precedent when Justice Roberts, Justice Gorsuch, and Justice Alito ignore precedent and make their own political rulings regularly?

We need to review the record—Judge Kavanaugh's written history, where the best clues of his jurisprudence may lie. It is no less than the standard my Republican colleagues demanded of then-Judge Kagan during her confirmation process. They asked for her entire record; 170,000 documents were sent here.

We need those documents now more than ever because this new Justice will be so pivotal in determining the future of our Nation for so long. The nomination could alter the balance of the Court in favor of powerful special interests against working families for a generation. The pro-hard-right business Heritage Foundation wants only nominees who will side with the big boys against the average person, and in Judge Kavanaugh, they have someone who would do just that.

We cannot let it happen. If the Senate blocks this nomination, it will lead to a more independent, moderate selection that both parties could support.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. Madam President, I enjoyed listening to the minority leader and disagree with almost everything he said. I do believe he is one of the great Senators here, and I care for him. He has a job to do, I suppose.

It seems strange that every time a Supreme Court nominee comes from the Republicans, there is every reason in the world not to confirm that nominee in the eyes of the current Democrats. Even without the first day of hearings, we are getting that type of situation. It is hard to believe. It is really hard to believe.

I rise today in strong support of the nomination of Brett Kavanaugh to be an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court. I have known Brett for quite a while. He is a terrific human being. He is honest, decent, and a good family man. He is everything you would want on the Bench. He is fair. He is considerate. He is knowledgeable. He is intelligent. He understands the law, and when he doesn't understand the law, he will search it until he does.

President Trump has made an outstanding choice. He has kept his commitment to the American people. He has selected a nominee with deep experience in the law and an understanding of the proper role of a judge under our Constitution.

I first met Brett Kavanaugh 14 years ago when he came before the Judiciary Committee for his first confirmation hearing to the DC Circuit. I was the chair of the Judiciary Committee at that time. I was impressed at that time by Brett's sterling credentials, his broad knowledge of the law, and his demeanor. At only 39 years of age, he knew more about the law than most lawyers who have practiced a lifetime. I think anybody who is fair would acknowledge that.

Brett was confirmed to the DC Circuit in 2006 following years of obstruction by Senate Democrats. I was pleased and proud to support Brett's

nomination to the DC Circuit. I have followed his work on that court the last dozen years with great interest. He spent a dozen years on that court, the second greatest court in our country, without criticism, by the way—or at least, I should say, without fair criticism. He has been a true intellectual leader, authoring landmark opinions on the separation of powers, administrative law, and national security.

It is no overstatement to say that Judge Kavanaugh is among the most distinguished and most influential judges in the entire country. The Supreme Court has adopted his positions and his opinions no less than 11 times. He has authored multiple dissents that ultimately prevailed in the Supreme Court. That ought to be complimented, not condemned.

He has taught courses at Harvard, Yale, and Georgetown. I would have preferred if he had taught some courses at Brigham Young University and the University of Utah, but that was too far west, I guess. But you can't knock Harvard, Yale, and Georgetown.

It bears mention that liberal and conservative Justices alike have hired his former clerks, which shows the respect he has across the ideological spectrum.

Truly, there is no one more qualified and more prepared to serve on the Supreme Court than Brett Kavanaugh. The funny thing is most people know that, including my friends on the other side. That is one reason they are afraid to have him on the Court. I speak from experience on this. I am the former chairman of the Judiciary Committee. I have participated in the confirmation of more Federal judges than any Senator in our Nation's history—more than half of all Federal judges ever confirmed. I have participated in the last 14 Supreme Court confirmation battles, including the confirmations of all current members of the Court.

I know a good nominee when I see one. Brett Kavanaugh is not just a good nominee; Brett Kavanaugh is an exceptional nominee, and any fair person has to admit it.

It has been a little over a year since we last considered a nominee to the Supreme Court. That nominee was Neil Gorsuch.

I have to say, President Trump hit a home run with Justice Gorsuch. I came to this floor nearly a dozen times in support of Justice Gorsuch's nomination because I knew Neil Gorsuch, and I knew what kind of a Justice he would be. I knew he would interpret the Constitution according to its original meaning, not according to the pet theories of liberal law professors or progressive activists. I knew he would give effect to the plain text of statutes rather than roaming around to find bits and pieces of legislative history to support his preferred view. I knew he would hold the administrative state to task and help check the unrestrained growth of the unelected, unaccountable fourth branch of government.

Justice Gorsuch has done all of that and more. He has shown himself to be an independent thinker who faithfully applies the text of the Constitution and the text of statutes. He has shown that he is perfectly comfortable disagreeing with the administration when the administration advances what he believes is a wrongheaded argument. Most of all, he has shown that he understands deeply that under our Constitution, political power lies with the people and their elected representatives, not nine Justices in Washington, DC.

In all the ways Neil Gorsuch has been a home run, Brett Kavanaugh will be one too. In his dozen years on the DC Circuit, Judge Kavanaugh has been an independent, fair-minded jurist who is deeply committed to the Constitution and the rule of law. He has made his mark especially in cases involving the separation of powers and agency decision making. He is serious about ensuring that the branches of government stay within their proper spheres and that agency officials have sufficient political accountability. He has also shown a commitment to our First and Second Amendment freedoms. In all this, he has been a true intellectual leader. And like Justice Gorsuch, Judge Kavanaugh has demonstrated that he understands that in our system of government, judges interpret the law. They don't make the laws; they interpret them. Policymaking is for the other branches of government.

In a rational world, Judge Kavanaugh's nomination would be confirmed by the Senate overwhelmingly. I don't think there is any question about that. His qualifications are unquestionable. His integrity is beyond reproach. He is respected throughout the country as one of our Nation's leading jurists.

Sadly, however, sometimes we don't live in a rational world, at least not when it comes to the Supreme Court. We saw this last year. My Democratic colleagues attacked Justice Gorsuch as unfit and unqualified. They said he had not sided often enough with the right sort of causes and that he would not do enough to protect the ''little guy'' when deciding cases. Democrats' objection, at root, was that they did not think Neil Gorsuch would rule the way they wanted. They did not think he would reach liberal enough outcomes. Of course they couldn't say that directly, as that would have given the whole game away and shown that their opposition was really just about politics, which is exactly what it was. So they latched on to a couple of cases, blew them entirely out of proportion, and misrepresented what then-Judge Gorsuch had actually said.

They asked him questions about cases likely to come before the Supreme Court that neither he nor any other nominee could answer without violating the canons of judicial ethics. He could not answer without violating the canons of judicial ethics. Yet they asked these questions anyway. I guess they expected an answer, but no self-respecting nominee would have given an answer.

They claimed he would be some sort of rubberstamp for the administration, when there was nothing in his record at all to suggest he had ever been a rubberstamp for anything.

My Democratic colleagues could not with a straight face oppose Neil Gorsuch or Neil Gorsuch's nomination on the merits, so they kicked up a cloud of half-truths and misrepresentations and used those to justify their opposition. Fortunately, the majority of my colleagues saw these desperate tactics for what they were—complete baloney, and that is putting it mildly.

Now we are about to replay the same game. In the coming weeks, my Democratic colleagues are going to throw everything they have at Judge Kavanaugh. We are going to see Judge Kavanaugh's opponents twist his words, misrepresent his opinions, and do everything they can to make him into some sort of a monster, a judicial monster. They will call him a rubberstamp for the rich and powerful and warn that his confirmation will mean the end of liberty and civil rights. That is trash talk, but that is what we are used to around here when they are afraid of the nominations that come from the Republican side. There is no reason to be afraid; these are people who are going to abide by the law, live in accordance with the law, and decide cases the way the law demands and dictates.

This is the same playbook we have seen before. It is the same playbook we saw last year with Neil Gorsuch. It is the same playbook we would have seen no matter whom the President nominated because the opposition will not be about Judge Kavanaugh's credentials or his qualifications; it will be about politics, straight and simple. My Democratic colleagues want a Justice who will reach the outcomes they want, who will use the Constitution to make policy, but Judge Kavanaugh is not that kind of a judge. He interprets the Constitution as written. He interprets our laws as written. He follows the separation of powers and leaves policymaking to the political branches.

Brett Kavanaugh is one of the most respected judges in our country for good reason—because he is a real judge. He has been an intellectual leader on one of our Nation's most important courts for over a decade. He has heard thousands of cases and issued hundreds of opinions. He is a great thinker, a powerful writer, and, I might add as somebody who knows him well, a kind and humble man. I cannot think of a better person to fill Justice Kennedy's seat on the Supreme Court than his former clerk because Justice Kennedy is a kind and humble man, and he is excited about having this nominee take his place.

After all the kicking and screaming last year, after all the obfuscations and misrepresentations, we confirmed Neil

Gorsuch to the Supreme Court. We did so because he was unquestionably qualified and because he had demonstrated a firm understanding of the judge's proper role under the Constitution.

Like Neil Gorsuch, Brett Kavanaugh is unquestionably qualified. Like Neil Gorsuch, Brett Kavanaugh has shown a commitment to the Constitution and to the principle that judges are to interpret the law, not make it up. Like Neil Gorsuch, Brett Kavanaugh will be confirmed. I have confidence in my colleagues that he will be confirmed. He is a good man. I know him personally. I have known him for a long time. He is a good man. He is a brilliant man and a man whose nomination I am honored to support.

I intend to do everything in my power to see Judge Kavanaugh confirmed to the Supreme Court. I could not be more pleased that one of my final acts here in the U.S. Senate will be to help shepherd through one last nominee to our Nation's highest Court. I could not be more pleased that this nominee is Judge Brett Kavanaugh.

I know Judge Kavanaugh. I know what a great Justice he will make. I know that he will be fair. I know that he will live in accordance with the law. I also know that he has courage and conviction and that he will do what Justices have to do; that is, interpret the Constitution and our statutes in this country in ways that will please the vast majority of all Americans. That is about all we can ask for. I know he will do that because I know the man. I know his family. I know his parents. All I can say is that I am very pleased that our President has decided to nominate him as a Justice on the United States Supreme Court.

I would caution my colleagues to pay attention to his record because you can't keep voting against people just because politically they are not on your team. I think you can if they are not qualified, but he is qualified. I think you can if they are not willing to abide by the law as written, but he is and has proven that.

I could go on and on. All I can say is that he is a good nominee. I hope all of my colleagues will support him. I hope my friends on the Democratic side will do the right thing. The right thing will help propel the confirmation process along. Who knows who the next President is going to be. It could be a Democrat, and I would hope that Brett Kavanaugh would be an example to Republicans, if they are in the minority, to do what is right—make your case, but don't slander people or libel them, and certainly don't stop decent, honorable candidates from holding these positions on the Federal bench.

I wish Judge Kavanaugh well because I think he will make a great Justice on the Court. I think he will be the type of Justice who will make everybody proud, even those with whom he disagrees. He is a decent man. He is an honorable man. He is a family man. He is brilliant. He is exactly like the person our Founding Fathers would like to have on the Supreme Court Bench. I believe that if we give him a chance, he will do a very good job. He is not going to always please me. He is not going to always please the Republicans. He will do what is right. I hope my colleagues on the other side will understand that and will not make this another cause celebre.

Be that as it may, we are going to push as hard as we can, and hopefully he will become our next Justice on the United States Supreme Court.

With that, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, last night the President of the United States announced that Brett Kavanaugh is his choice to fill the vacancy on the U.S. Supreme Court left by the impending retirement of Justice Anthony Kennedy. I was glad to have the occasion to join the President and others at the White House last night, and I could not be more pleased with the President's choice.

Now that the President has performed his duty under the Constitution, it now falls to us to do our duty. The appointments clause to the U.S. Constitution says that subject to the advice and consent of the Senate, the President shall appoint members of the Supreme Court, among other officials. The President has done his job, and now it falls to the U.S. Senate to do our job under the Constitution of the United States.

We have all learned a little bit more about the nominee in just the few hours since his nomination. Of course, we know he is a judge on the U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals for the DC Circuit—what some have called the second highest court in the land. By that, they mean that because it sits in the District of Columbia, many important cases involving the U.S. Government go up through that court as opposed to courts in Texas or Indiana or other places around the country. For more than 10 years, he has served in that capacity.

We know he has had a distinguished academic and legal career. He graduated from an elite law school—Yale—and clerked for Justice Kennedy himself, the man he will succeed when confirmed. Most importantly and as evidence of Judge Kavanaugh's good judgment, he made the wise decision to marry a Texan. His wife grew up in Abilene and graduated from the University of Texas.

Now that the nomination has been made, the Senate will follow what we refer to here as regular order. That means the Judiciary Committee, led by Chairman GRASSLEY, will thoroughly vet the nominee, and then the committee will debate and vote on the nomination, and then the nomination will come to the floor of the Senate, where we will debate and vote on the nomination.

We have already heard some say that there is not enough time to carry out this process before the midterm elections, which should raise all of our antennae. Both Justice Gorsuch and Justice Sotomayor were confirmed 66 days after they were nominated, so the truth is that we have plenty of time to do our job under the Constitution. We do want to be thorough, and we will, but we also owe it to the Court and to the American people to move expeditiously to fill this post so as not to leave it vacant. Justice Kennedy said that he intends to leave at the end of the month.

As the senior Democratic Senator from Kentucky said recently, ''The Senate should do nothing to artificially delay consideration of the next Justice.'' I agree with him, and that is consistent with the standard here in the Senate.

Some have said: Well, we have a midterm election coming up, and maybe we ought to defer filling the vacancy. But I would note that in 2010, leading up to a midterm election, just like this year, Senate Democrats confirmed President Obama's nominee to the Court, Elena Kagan. So there is plenty of precedent for moving expeditiously, thoroughly, not recklessly but in a focused fashion to confirm this nomination once it has been vetted and voted on.

It is no secret that Judge Kavanaugh will help decide cases that will be important in the life of our Nation. That is the role of the Supreme Court, and it is already clear from his previous experience that he has had plenty of preparation—academically and work experience and life experience—that has prepared him to do exactly that.

Judge Kavanaugh has demonstrated the intellectual capacity that we would expect of a Supreme Court Justice, and over the years, he has demonstrated a rigorous understanding of the law. He has demonstrated his sharp mind and analytical skills in a variety of jobs—working in the White House as a lawyer and as Staff Secretary to the President.

By the way, for those who don't know what a Staff Secretary does in the White House, that is the person who has the final eyes on a document before the President is presented something for his signature. It is a very, very important job. Brett Kavanaugh was Staff Secretary to the President of the United States during the term of office of President George W. Bush.

He has also taught at law schools, such as Harvard, where he was actually hired by now-Justice Elena Kagan, whom he would serve alongside, as well

as Georgetown and Yale. We know that during the years he has been on the appellate bench, he has handed down hundreds of decisions. Let's not forget that in order to attain that important position, the Senate already confirmed him once in 2006 by a vote of 57 to 36.

We all know that this is President Trump's second nomination to the Supreme Court, after that of Justice Neil Gorsuch just last year. In his first term on the Court, Justice Gorsuch has already demonstrated the power of his pen, the clarity of his thought, and the force of his legal reasoning, and I am sure that Justice Scalia would be proud of his successor's impartiality, his rigor, and his self-discipline. Based on his distinguished record, I think Judge Kavanaugh will display many of the attributes Justice Gorsuch has displayed on the Supreme Court.

In the coming weeks, we will hear a lot about Judge Kavanaugh's interesting life story, his long career as a dedicated public servant, his service to his community, and, yes, his strong Catholic faith, but at the end of the day, the decisions of the Supreme Court should not be affected by personal agendas, political or otherwise. That is because the interpretation of the law is a discipline unto itself, and it should always be separated from the personalities, the preferences, or the ideological or political agenda of the judge. That is what judges do. If they can't do it, then they shouldn't serve as judges.

Justices, by their work, must be insulated from the day-to-day politics that are all too common here in the Congress. The Court, of course, should not be a partisan or political institution. It was created by the Founders to be something apart from the political branches of government, the executive and legislative branches. That is because the political branches of the government run for election and are held accountable by the voters—not so with judges who serve for a life term.

I know President Obama once argued in favor of what he called an empathy standard in judicial decision-making, but that is not my standard, and I know it is not Judge Kavanaugh's standard either. It is another way to call for results-oriented judging, which is the opposite of what a good judge should do.

As a former judge and justice of the Texas Supreme Court, I believe those who serve in the judicial branch must put their personal beliefs aside and apply the law as written and faithfully interpret those laws passed by Congress, signed into law by the President, as well as interpreting the text of the Constitution. If they want to be policymakers, they ought to run for Congress. They ought to be subject to the vote of the electorate. They ought to run for school board. They ought to run for city council. If you want to be a judge, you have to take an oath to do something different from serving in those sorts of political offices.

It is crucial that as this process begins to unfold, we remember that. It is important that the President's nominee not be subjected to personal attacks from the angry and unhinged element we have seen already reflected on our TV screens and that at times seems to forget that judges in our political system are not charged with making the law or making policy but rather interpreting the law and the Constitution and the laws written by the Congress and signed by the President.

Based on what we have seen so far, the confirmation process will no doubt be contentious. We have seen activists already encourage Members of the Senate to abandon civility and decorum, and I hope we resist. We have seen some of our colleagues already engage in various publicity activities and talk about battle lines being drawn, as if this is some sort of war to be fought. They indicated their unwavering opposition to the President's nominee before we even knew who the nominee might be. One of our colleagues came to the floor of the Senate before the nomination was announced and said he would oppose whomever President Trump were to nominate. Well, that should tell us a lot—that it is not about the individual, it is about the office, and it is about kowtowing to a political base that demands opposition at all costs and at all turns to anything this President might do, no matter how qualified the nominee might be.

In the days ahead, I think we can predict from experience that these attacks will continue. Some of our colleagues will demand that Judge Kavanaugh reveal how he will rule in a particular case in exchange for their vote. How corrupt would that be, to insist that the judge tell you ahead of time how he would rule in a particular case in exchange for a vote for confirmation? That would clearly be wrong. It would be wrong for any judge, without hearing the case—the arguments of the lawyers, the facts of the case—to prejudge an outcome. That, again, is not what judges do. They don't run for office based on a political platform as do the political branches of government. Those of us who run for office for the Senate or the House are happy to talk about what we believe in and what we would do if elected to office, but that is not what judges are supposed to do.

What is more, there is clear precedent for resisting those sorts of guarantees ahead of time. Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg said during her own confirmation process that sort of assurance is completely inappropriate. Justice Ginsburg gave what I think is the correct response to such requests, saying she would offer no hints, no forecasts, no previews of her rulings.

Trying to predict how ethical Justices will decide particular cases is a futile endeavor because, for good judges, it depends on learning the facts as well as entertaining the legal arguments by the lawyers involved, not coming into it with a preconceived notion of how you would rule in any case under any facts involving a particular topic. Sure, hypotheticals can be dreamed up, but no judge knows the right decision until he or she studies the case before them.

I can tell my colleagues, we relish the opportunity to support and defend the President's nominee against any and all baseless attacks. We will not back down. We will not surrender the field to those who make unjustified criticisms of the nominee or attribute to him some characteristic or some experience which is entirely false. We will defend the record of Judge Kavanaugh, who I believe is a thoughtful and willing public servant, against deliberate attacks to denigrate him. We will not allow others to distort the nature of his previous judicial decisions or use him as a sacrificial lamb in some sort of vengeance campaign against this President. We pledged that same level of support for Justice Gorsuch, and we showed we were able to do just that—defend the President's nominee against unjustified attacks—and will do so again, joined by Judge Kavanaugh's many other supporters, including those who do not share his political or judicial philosophy.

I noted today a liberal law professor, Akhil Amar, who wrote an opinion piece saying that, yes, even liberals should support this nominee, and he gives his reasons why. You can read it for yourself in the New York Times, but the stakes are simply too important to let unfair and inaccurate accusations be made about the nominee without correcting them. The American people deserve better. This nominee deserves better.

The American people demand judges like Brett Kavanaugh, who are fair and independent arbiters of the law. The basic problem is, in recent years, some have viewed the court as a way to circumvent and evade the political process and achieve their preferred policy outcomes when judges pronounce some radical change in the law or public policy from the bench without the chance for voters to vote on that individual or on those policies. Many have come to see this as an end-run around the normal political process. Those who can't win at the ballot box, well, let's win on the court, but that is not the right philosophy. That is not the one preferred by most Americans, nor shared by the Founding Fathers of this country or evidenced in the Constitution.

During the first 18 months of this administration, President Trump has nominated, and we have confirmed, 42 members of the Federal judiciary, including Justice Gorsuch. Next on our list is Judge Kavanaugh. So we look forward to doing our duty under the Constitution to vet the nominee, to ask the tough questions, to have the debate and then the vote in the Judiciary Committee, and then bring that nominee to the floor of the Senate and have that debate and that vote here.

Vote we will this fall on this nominee, and I trust we will keep the same sort of timeframe we have seen applied impartially in cases like Justice Sotomayor, Justice Kagan, and Justice Gorsuch. There is no reason to drag this out other than for partisan, political purposes.

So let's do our job. Let's be dignified about it. Let's not engage in unnecessary name-calling or falsely attribute to the nominee beliefs he does not have or make wild, unhinged predictions about what may happen to the Supreme Court were he to be confirmed.

I look forward to confirming this new equally outstanding nominee this fall.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I come to the floor to talk for just a few, quick moments about what the stakes are as we begin this debate over a new swing vote on the U.S. Supreme Court.

This is a fairly simple chart listing off a number of preexisting conditions that tens of millions of Americans have. What it says is, the Supreme Court could take away your healthcare if you have a history of cancer, diabetes, heart disease, strokes, cerebral palsy, mental illness, ALS, lupus, epilepsy, Parkinson's—the list goes on.

The reason for this is, the new priority for those who oppose the Affordable Care Act and the protections that are built in it for Americans who are sick or have ever been sick—their new strategy is to use the court system as a means to try to invalidate the protections in the law for people with preexisting conditions—protections, by the way, Republicans said they supported during the debate over the Affordable Care Act.

The case currently before the district court level, Texas v. United States, has drawn interest because of an exceptional decision by the Trump administration. The Trump administration has decided to weigh in on behalf of the petitioners, abandoning the traditional role of the executive to defend a statute. Traditionally, an executive will defend a statute regardless of whether they politically support it because who else will defend a statute if not the Department of Justice and the U.S. Government?

In this case, the Trump administration is going to court to argue the U.S. Congress cannot, under the Constitution, provide protection to people with preexisting condition against discrimination and rate increases from insurance companies. Now, this should freak out the tens of millions of Americans who have preexisting conditions because without the protection in the law today, healthcare will be unaffordable and unavailable to the over 100 million Americans who have any history of disease.

Given the importance the Trump administration has placed on this case by weighing in, in this exceptional, unprecedented way on behalf of those who are trying to pull apart protections for people with preexisting conditions, we have to expect, we have to prepare for the fact that this case may move from the district court to the appellate court and eventually to the Supreme Court. If it does, this seat we are about to debate will likely, potentially, be the deciding vote as to whether Americans in this country who have preexisting conditions will continue to be able to get healthcare. So I just wanted to come to the floor, as we start, to set the table for this conversation to make very clear what the stakes are.

The Trump administration has taken the exceptional position of arguing against people with preexisting conditions, saying Congress cannot, by law, protect people with preexisting conditions. President Trump, as a candidate, made it very clear that his priority was to put Justices on the Court who would correct for the fatal flaw of John Roberts. He identified that fatal flaw as John Roberts' defense of the Affordable Care Act. He made a promise he wouldn't make that mistake again; that he would not put somebody on the Court who would vote to uphold parts of the Affordable Care Act.

You have to take the President at his word. Most of the things he said he would do as President of the United States, when he was a candidate, he has done. A lot of folks here didn't take him seriously—didn't think he would really try to unwind NATO, didn't think he would really try to ban Muslims from the United States, didn't think he would pursue this crazy idea of a wall. He did all those things.

So let's take him at his word when he says he is not going to appoint a Supreme Court Justice who will uphold the Affordable Care Act, and the case that is moving up to the Supreme Court today is a case that would take away protections for people with preexisting conditions.

Second, he essentially outsourced the decision over who would be his nominee to these two political groups: the Federalist Society and the Heritage Foundation. We know where the Heritage Foundation is on the Affordable Care Act. They have basically made it their mission, over the course of the last 7 years, to try to destroy the Affordable Care Act. They have essentially written the legislation that has been put before this Congress, on a variety of occasions, to try to replace the Affordable Care Act with something that provides no protections for people with these illnesses, but the Federalist Society is in this game, too, of trying to attack the Affordable Care Act.

In one of the main judicial attacks on the Affordable Care Act, NFIB v. Sebelius, one of the lead counsels of record was a Federalist Society member, and 24 other Federalist Society members signed and filed amicus briefs in support of this judicial attack against the Affordable Care Act and the protections for preexisting conditions.

The Heritage Foundation and Federalist Society have been in the business of trying to take away protections for people with preexisting conditions from the beginning of this fight. So when you outsource the selection of the Supreme Court Justice to those groups, you know whom you are going to get. You are going to get a Justice who is going to vote to unwind these protections. You don't have to do that kind of supersleuthing because the President effectively already told you he was going to appoint someone who would remedy the fatal sin of John Roberts, which was to uphold at least a central tenet of the Affordable Care Act.

I understand what Senator CORNYN is saying; that we should just accept that the nominee, when he comes before the Judiciary Committee, isn't going to answer any questions and that we shouldn't assume anything we don't know, but we have some pretty good evidence thus far. In addition, we have Judge Kavanaugh's writings, Judge Kavanaugh's attacks in his judicial opinions on the Affordable Care Act.

Seven-Sky is a really interesting case that came before the DC Circuit Court. It essentially, in the end, upheld the constitutionality of the individual mandate. Judge Kavanaugh dissented. I will admit, it was an interesting dissent, and people should read it, but in that dissent, he goes out of his way to suggest that Congress has gone far afield from its constitutional limitations in adopting the Affordable Care Act.

He wrote in his dissent that the individual mandate is ''unprecedented on the federal level in American history'' and predicted that upholding the mandate would ''usher in a significant expansion of congressional authority with no obvious principled limit.'' Those are extraordinary words.

It is interesting because if you read the dissent, it, in fact, hints that ultimately the individual mandate can be upheld as a tax. So I acknowledge the subtleties in that dissent, but that is an extraordinary phrase, that upholding the individual mandate would ''usher in a significant expansion of congressional authority with no obvious principled limit.'' The obvious limit is the Constitution, and the idea that judges would decide what the principled limit is, other than the Constitution, I think is something that should be part of our debate. The fact that Judge Kavanaugh went out of his way to talk about his fears as to how broad the Affordable Care Act may be, in addition to his inclusion on the Federalist Society and Heritage Foundation list and in addition to Trump's very clear signaling that he is only going to appoint a judge who is willing to overturn the Affordable Care Act, tells you that if you have any of these conditions, you are in the crossfire right now.

One hundred thirty million people in America have preexisting conditions.

Let's take a few of these just to give a sense of the scope of the threat. There are more than 15.5 million cancer survivors in the United States today; 23 million Americans have been diagnosed with diabetes; there are about 100 million adults who have high blood pressure, about 100 million more who have high cholesterol; 26 million Americans diagnosed with asthma; 44 million Americans have mental illness; 400,000 diagnosed with multiple sclerosis; and 28 million diagnosed with heart disease.

Without the protections in the Affordable Care Act, if you have these diagnoses, you likely will not be offered healthcare. That is what happened prior to the protections for people with preexisting conditions; you just weren't even offered a plan if you had some of these conditions. But if you were offered coverage, you were offered them at rates that were unaffordable.

Here is some data based on CMS's calculations around operated risk adjustment methodology. They say that for folks who have diabetes without complication, the increase in rates without protections for people with preexisting conditions could be about $5,600 a year. If you have a drug dependence, if you have an addiction, the increase could be $20,000 a year. If you have had a heart attack or a history of serious heart disease, your increase could be $60,000 a year. If you have metastatic cancer, you could be paying a 3,500-percent premium; that is, $140,000 in additional surcharge a year. Obviously nobody can afford that. That is why, if you have a history of metastatic cancer, you are not getting offered insurance unless you have that protection. Those are the stakes.

I want to make people understand that we are going to have a big debate over what Judge Kavanaugh will mean for the future of reproductive choice in this country, women's access to contraception. Those are really, really important debates. But I want everyone to understand that this case is coming; Texas v. United States is moving through the court system. It is moving through the court system, in part, because the Trump administration is trying to get the judicial branch to invalidate protections for people with preexisting conditions. Despite the fact that the President told us he liked that part of the law, he has now instructed his judicial department, instructed the Office of the Attorney General to try to strip away protections for people who have high cholesterol, mental illness, cerebral palsy, multiple sclerosis, and it may mean this seat on the Supreme Court is going to decide that case. I think we can be pretty sure of how Judge Kavanaugh is going to rule. His hostility to the Affordable Care Act in his writings, his inclusion on lists by groups that have worked for years to undo these protections, and the clear signal from the President that he was only going to pick individuals for the Court who would unwind the Affordable Care Act tell you how big the stakes are.

The Supreme Court could take away your healthcare if you have any of these diseases, and the likelihood that they will take away your healthcare if you have any of these preexisting conditions is radically increased if Brett Kavanaugh is confirmed. I announced last night that I will oppose his nomination, and I will be on the floor talking at length about many of the reasons this body should reject his nomination. At the outset, I wanted to make clear that this debate over the future of preexisting condition protections for people in this country—130 million people who have preexisting conditions—needs to be at the center of this conversation regarding Brett Kavanaugh's nomination.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Connecticut. Certainly I am happy he is bringing to the attention of the Senate this critical issue of the future of the Supreme Court and the impact it will have on families across America. Certainly, when it comes to something as basic as our health insurance, we understand this.

There are forces at work in Washington in the Trump administration that are trying to put an end to the Affordable Care Act, and in Congress, many Members of Congress—the House and the Senate—have voted 60 times to repeal the Affordable Care Act. We barely saw it survive just a few months ago when Senator JOHN MCCAIN, in the middle of the night, came and stood in that well and voted no, along with two other Republican Senators. They saved the Affordable Care Act.

Most Americans had their own questions about the Affordable Care Act and how important it was, but they couldn't understand how the Republicans would come to us and say ''Get rid of it'' and have no replacement.

We realize, as the Senator from Connecticut just explained, that under the old rules with insurance companies, under the old rules, many of us were victims. If you had someone with a preexisting condition in your family—perhaps you had diabetes, perhaps your child was a cancer survivor, had asthma, or so many different things—health insurance was very expensive, if you could get it. We changed the law. We said: You can't discriminate against an American because someone in their family has had a preexisting condition. Everybody is in the same pool in America. We are going to join together.

Well, now the Trump administration has said they are going to fight that in court. They are going to try to declare it unconstitutional to protect people with preexisting conditions, so they filed a brief in a lawsuit—a lawsuit that is wending its way to the Supreme Court. When the Senator from Connecticut, Mr. MURPHY, came before us and talked about the new nominee to fill the vacancy on the Supreme Court, it is important that he focused on the impact it could have on ordinary people.

Most Americans, put to the test, couldn't name the Justices on the U.S. Supreme Court. Well, they know it is a big Court, an important Court, the highest Court in the land, but they don't know who is there until we get into this kind of debate. As we do, people tend to learn a lot more about the Justices and what their core beliefs are.

When it comes to Judge Brett Kavanaugh, who now sits on the DC Circuit Court of Appeals, he has a lengthy record—12 years of opinions as a judge, not to mention all the years before that when he was active politically in Washington, DC. Senator MURPHY of Connecticut is correct to note that his approach to the law and his approach to the Constitution do not give us great hope in preserving the protections on health insurance that are part of the Affordable Care Act. One decision by that Supreme Court could undo years of legislative work and literally remove protections from families. We are talking about that today. We should be talking about that today. But it isn't what we are voting on today, and that is why I have come to the floor.

NOMINATION OF BRIAN BENCZKOWSKI

Mr. President, back on page 8 of the Executive Calendar of the United States Senate, there is a long list of nominations that are pending before the Senate, and one of these, Calendar No. 639 on the Message No. 1402, is the name Brian Allen Benczkowski, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Attorney General. You would have to search the Executive Calendar to find it, but it is going to be voted on this afternoon in the Senate.

Is it another routine nomination? Not at all. This position in the Department of Justice is the Assistant Attorney General for the Criminal Division, who is the leader and is responsible for over 600 Federal prosecutors who are prosecuting cases across the criminal spectrum from treason against the United States to the opioid crisis and everything in between—600 men and women, career prosecutors, prosecuting the laws, the cases on behalf of the U.S. Government. President Trump has suggested that he wants this man, Brian Allen Benczkowski, of Virginia, to be in charge of those 600 prosecutors.

Is this a big assignment? In the Department of Justice, it is one of the biggest assignments. This person will be directing the cases that are filed on behalf of the United States of America, critical cases for protecting our national security, critical cases relative to crimes that are being committed, critical cases when it comes to our rights as citizens. He will be leading 600 Federal prosecutors.

Is it not reasonable for us to ask a basic question about Brian Allen Benczkowski, of Virginia? We did so in the Judiciary Committee, and here is the question we asked: Mr. Benczkowski, you are seeking the position of Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Criminal Division with 600 prosecutors that you will direct. Please tell the committee how many cases you have prosecuted. As a lawyer—first, how many civil cases have you tried.

The answer? None.

Oh, well, how about criminal cases? How many criminal cases have you prosecuted in your lifetime as a lawyer? None.

How many motions have you argued before a Federal court? None.

Wait a minute. You are being chosen to head up the Criminal Division of the Department of Justice, and you have no experience? You have never prosecuted a case ever—never once been in a Federal courtroom, not one time?

So far, President Trump has sent us a record number of nominees for the Federal courts, and I will tell you, as a member of the Senate Judiciary Committee, all but a few have been approved. I think some of them are awful choices, and some are good. But the awful choices are men and women who have said and done things in their legal practice and private lives that really raise serious questions about whether they have the temperament to be a Federal judge.

With few exceptions, all of the Republicans on the Senate Judiciary Committee have voted every time for Trump nominees. Two exceptions were a district court nominee for Washington DC and a district court nominee for Alabama, and in both of those cases, the people who were being appointed by the Trump administration to a lifetime appointment in a Federal district court had no experience in a Federal courtroom.

I can tell you that one of the hearings on one of the Trump nominees—and I will not bring his name up for the record, but you can find it if you wish—cross-examination by a Republican Senator on our committee, Senator KENNEDY of Louisiana, was devastating. This Trump nominee couldn't find his way to a Federal courthouse with GPS. He had no experience whatsoever in trying a case, so the decision was made to withdraw his nomination. Only rarely in a year and a half have Trump nominees been so unqualified that they have withdrawn their nominations.

Now, this afternoon, we consider Brian Allen Benczkowski, of Virginia, to head up the Criminal Division of the U.S. Department of Justice, a man with no trial experience—none—in a Federal courtroom, not in a civil case, not in a criminal case.

There is more to the story. Why is he here? He is here because at one point in his career he was staff director to then-Senator Jeff Sessions of Alabama. He worked on the Senate Judiciary Committee. I remember seeing him. He looked like a competent, affable Senate staffer. We didn't have any direct relationship. Now that Senator Sessions has been elevated to Attorney General, he wants this staffer, Brian Allen Benczkowski, to head up one of the most important divisions in the Department of Justice. That is his connection. That is his angel. That is why his name is on this calendar. That is why the Trump administration chose him.

If that were the end of the story, it would be bad enough—someone with no experience whatsoever prosecuting a case to head up 600 Federal prosecutors. But as they say, and as Paul Harvey used to say, there is more to the story.

You see, what happened was this—and follow me if you will. After Donald Trump won the Presidency and was in his transition period, Mr. Benczkowski left his private practice of law to be part of the Trump transition team assigned to the Department of Justice. Between November and January, the swearing-in, he served on that transition committee, trying to smooth the way for the new administration to take over the Department of Justice.

At the end, when President Trump was sworn in, Mr. Benczkowski left the transition committee and went back to his private practice here in Washington for a well-known firm. But before he returned to that firm, he asked the Trump administration and his former boss, I hope you will consider appointing me as a U.S. attorney somewhere in the United States.

Remember, he has no experience—none. He has never prosecuted a case, but he suggested that he wanted to be considered for that lower level position—compared to the head of the division—as he returned to private practice.

He went back to his law firm, and follow the story. He goes back to this law firm, and one of the partners at the law firm calls him in and says: I need you to take over a case to represent one of our firm's clients. The client is known as Alfa Bank. It is a Russian bank, and it is a Russian bank, as I describe the story, that is very significant in terms of our conversation today about the Russian impact on the U.S. election. Alfa Bank needed Mr. Benczkowski to look at the so-called Steele dossier. Do you remember that? It was the memo that came out about then-Candidate Trump and things that were alleged that occurred in Russia. Well, they said to Mr. Benczkowski: Represent the Alfa Bank because their name popped up in the Steele dossier, and we think it is terrible, and they want to consider a defamation lawsuit. So Mr. Benczkowski took on the Alfa Bank as a client in reference to allegations made in the Steele dossier.

There is more to the story. During the course of the Trump campaign, there were unexplained pings and contacts between Alfa Bank and the Trump campaign computers—more than one. It is still unexplained as to why this Russian bank would have any access or communication with the computers of the Trump campaign.

The Alfa Bank is not just another corner bank. The Alfa Bank is run by individuals who are oligarchs in Russia. They are closer to Vladimir Putin than you can imagine.

This Alfa Bank is pretty well connected, and they had some communication, still unexplained, between that bank and the Trump campaign. Now, Mr. Benczkowski began representing the Alfa Bank on a question of defamation lawsuits concerning the Steele dossier as well conducting a forensic computer analysis of the server communications.

Wouldn't you think for a moment that if you were Mr. Benczkowski considering the possibility of a job in the Trump administration, you would have said to your law firm: I am not going to touch this one. We have all these allegations about Russian involvement in the campaign. We have some computer contact between Alfa Bank and the Trump campaign. We have this oligarch close to Vladimir Putin personally. We have this Steele dossier, which mentions the Alfa Bank. Wouldn't you think that the average lawyer would say to his law firm: Sorry, I am being considered for a position in the Trump administration. I am not going to get close to the Alfa Bank.

No, Mr. Benczkowski said: I will do the work for the Alfa Bank.

When the time came and he wasn't considered for the U.S. attorney spot, he was considered to head up the Criminal Division of the Department of Justice, and Mr. Benczkowski filed all of these papers about all of his activities—as a Senate staffer, as a lawyer, and all the rest. It came out in the course of that that he had represented the Alfa Bank.

That is not good. It was discovered, with some background checks through the FBI, that he was in that position. He was confronted. Basically, we said in the committee: Are you going to recuse yourself from any matters before the Department of Justice involving the Russia investigation?

He said: No, I will not. I am going to stick with involving myself in the Russia investigation.

What will you recuse yourself from, in light of this representation of Alfa Bank?

I will not take up any cases involving Alfa Bank.

That is it?

That is it.

That is the best we could get from him in terms of recusing himself from any potential conflict of interest. Why is this important at this moment in time? Because at this moment in time, I don't know when Bob Mueller will complete his investigation. I don't know how the White House will react. I don't know what will happen with Attorney General Sessions, who now has

recused himself from the Russia investigation. I don't know what will happen when it comes to any threats to the Deputy Attorney General in terms of his future.

There is a possibility that if this President decides that he is going to take an action that is going to have a direct impact on the Mueller investigation and if he decides, for example, that he is going to remove from consideration of this in the future the Deputy Attorney General who appointed Bob Mueller—I am talking about Rod Rosenstein—a vacancy in that position could be filled on an acting basis by Mr. Benczkowski. He could take up that position.

Is this an important decision, then, back here on page 8 of the calendar, to be voted on this afternoon? I think it is. First, there is the obvious gross incompetence and inexperience of this man to head up the Criminal Division of the Department of Justice; second, the fact that he represented the Alfa Bank, which is under suspicion as to its activities; third, the close connection between Alfa Bank and its owners with Vladimir Putin and Russia; fourth, the ongoing investigation of the Russian involvement in the last election campaign; fifth, the threat that this could occur again in the future; sixth, the fact that we need an aggressive Department of Justice to stand up and protect our democracy and the right to vote of every single American. The list goes on and on.

This is the wrong man for this job. I cannot believe, as a proud Democratic Senator, that the Republican Party couldn't find one experienced prosecutor in the United States to take over the Criminal Division of the Department of Justice. Instead, they are going to give it to a man who has never, ever darkened the door of a Federal courthouse. That is what they are doing.

It shows you the lengths they are going to go to, and it shows you the importance of just another nomination stuck on page 8 on the calendar that will be voted on this afternoon.

Here is the question. It is a majority vote. There are 50 Republican Senators and 49 Democrats in this Chamber. Senator MCCAIN, of course, is ill and hasn't been here for several months. It is 50 to 49, among those likely to attend today. Under the rules, as written in the Senate, a majority vote can move this man forward—Mr. Benczkowski. That is all it takes. What it boils down to is whether or not any Republican Senators see a problem with this nomination. I hope that each one of those Senators will reflect on the fact that they personally know a handful of individuals, maybe more, who are more qualified to take on this critical job than Mr. Benczkowski. Please join us in stopping this nomination. Let's put somebody in this job who understands it, who has experience.

How many people would walk into a lawyer's office and say: I would like you to represent me. Have you ever had a case like mine before?

And the lawyer says: No, I have never seen one like this and have never represented anybody like you.

And the client would reply: Perfect, that is just what I am looking for, someone who is so inexperienced and so incapable of representing me that I can't wait to pay their fee.

Let's not pay the fee to Mr. Benczkowski. Let's return him to his private practice.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter to President Trump urging the withdrawal of Mr. Benczkowski's nomination, dated May 9, 2018, and signed by all Democratic members of the Judiciary Committee, be printed in the RECORD.

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

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, DC, May 9, 2018.

President DONALD TRUMP,
The White House,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We urge you to withdraw the nomination of Brian Benczkowski to be Assistant Attorney General for the Department of Justice's Criminal Division and to submit another nominee for this important position.

With new information about Russia's election interference continuing to come to light and with a federal criminal investigation ongoing, it is imperative that we have a head of the Criminal Division who is free and clear from Russian connections. Mr. Benczkowski's representation of the Putin-allied Alfa Bank and his refusal to recuse himself from Russia-related matters mean that he will not be able to credibly oversee the Division's involvement in Special Counsel Mueller's investigation and other sensitive matters such as the criminal investigation of Michael Cohen. Furthermore, at a time when the Department of Justice's handling of criminal matters has come under intense public scrutiny, it is essential that the Criminal Division have an experienced and well-qualified leader whose judgment and independence are beyond reproach. Mr. Benczkowski, who has no prosecutorial experience, does not meet these criteria. Simply put, Mr. Benczkowski is not the nominee our country needs at this critical moment.

The Assistant Attorney General for the Criminal Division must oversee and manage litigation strategy for hundreds of federal prosecutors handling a wide range of criminal cases. Mr. Benczkowski, however, has never served as a prosecutor, nor has he ever tried a case. While Mr. Benczkowski does possess experience as a top aide to then-Senator Jeff Sessions and in various Department of Justice staff positions, this does not qualify him to lead the career prosecutors of the Criminal Division. His dearth of courtroom experience makes him ill-suited for the position he now seeks.

Mr. Benczkowski also demonstrated poor judgment by choosing to represent Alfa Bank, a Russian bank controlled by Putin-allied oligarchs, in March 2017—while he was seeking employment in the Justice Department and despite public reports that the bank was under FBI investigation for suspicious computer server contacts with the Trump Organization. He continued representing Alfa Bank in April and May 2017 even while he was under consideration to head the Criminal Division. At a time when we need the Department of Justice's Criminal Division to help uncover, prevent, and deter Russian interference in our democracy, Mr. Benczkowski's choices so far have not inspired confidence that he is the right person to lead that fight.

Additionally, unanswered questions remain about Alfa Bank that should be resolved before the Senate even considers voting to confirm this bank's lawyer to a top Justice Department position. The Senate does not know if Alfa Bank has been, or still is, under federal criminal investigation, nor do we know the full story behind Alfa Bank's suspicious contacts with the Trump Organization during the 2016 campaign. The work that Mr. Benczkowski did for Alfa Bank, which included reviewing the Steele Dossier for a potential defamation suit and overseeing a forensic data firm's analysis of Alfa's computer server contacts, in no way put to rest the serious questions about Alfa Bank's activities. It would be an abdication of the Senate's advice and consent role to confirm Mr. Benczkowski without first getting answers to these crucial questions.

We are further concerned about Mr. Benczkowski's capability to serve as an independent leader of the Criminal Division. Mr. Benczkowski has worked closely in the past with Attorney General Sessions and sought his help obtaining a Justice Department job in the Trump Administration. We are troubled by Mr. Benczkowski's refusal to commit to recuse himself from Russia-related matters if confirmed, and also by the Department's refusal to identify steps that would be taken to prevent Mr. Benczkowski from learning information about Special Counsel Mueller's investigation and relaying that information to Attorney General Sessions in contravention of the Attorney General's recusal commitments. Also, if confirmed Mr. Benczkowski would have visibility into the criminal investigation and potential prosecution of Michael Cohen, who reportedly sought to pursue business deals in Russia, among other alleged activities. Attorney General Sessions has reportedly declined to recuse himself from the Cohen matter, and Mr. Benczkowski, if confirmed, could serve as a conduit of information to the Attorney General about this sensitive matter, which may implicate the Russian interference investigation. We need a head of the Criminal Division who will instill confidence that recusal obligations will be respected and that criminal enforcement decisions will be made independently based solely on the facts and the law. Because of his own inadequate recusal commitment, Mr. Benczkowski does not inspire this confidence.

Many of us know Mr. Benczkowski and we respect his public service. But we can, and must, do better when it comes to the nominee to head the Justice Department's Criminal Division. There are many well-qualified attorneys who have significant prosecutorial experience, who are free and clear from Russian connections, and whose independence and judgment are unquestioned. Mr. Benczkowski is not such a nominee. We urge you to withdraw Mr. Benczkowski's nomination and send the Senate a new nominee who meets that standard.

Sincerely,
Richard J. Durbin, Dianne Feinstein, Patrick J. Leahy, Amy Klobuchar, Richard Blumenthal, Cory A. Booker, Sheldon Whitehouse, Christopher A. Coons, Mazie K. Hirono, Kamala D. Harris.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRUZ). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

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

(The remarks of Mr. JONES pertaining to the introduction of S. 3191 are printed in today's RECORD under ''Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.'')

Mr. JONES. I yield the floor.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, I rise to support Mark Jeremy Bennett's nomination to serve as a judge on the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

Mr. Bennett's nomination is how judicial nominations should work. His name was not on a rightwing wish list created by outside groups. Instead, the White House worked closely with both of Hawaii's Democratic Senators to find a consensus nominee that would get broad bipartisan support.

Senators are constitutionally directed to provide the executive branch with advice and consent. I encourage the White House to continue to consult with Members of both parties on all future nominees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

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

NOMINATION OF BRETT KAVANAUGH

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I come to the floor to discuss my strong opposition to the nomination of Judge Kavanaugh for a lifetime appointment to the U.S. Supreme Court.

There are few issues I take more seriously as a Senator than my duty to consider and vote on Supreme Court nominees. It was watching the Clarence Thomas hearings and seeing how my voice and the voices of people like me all across the country were not being heard that got me to run for the Senate in the first place. I believe it is one of the most important jobs we have on behalf of our constituents.

During my time in the Senate, I have had the opportunity to consider nominees from Democrats and from Republicans. For each one of these nominees, I made my evaluation and based my decision on their experience and record and on my understanding of whether they would uphold the Constitution and protect our rights and freedoms.

I voted for some of them, including a nominee from President Bush. I voted against some of them, each on their merits and each based on how I thought they would serve, but this time is different. There will still be scrutiny. There absolutely needs to be. This time we know everything we need to know already. This time, the balance of the Court is on the line. We know exactly where this nominee will fall on specific issues, no matter what vague answers he chooses to deliver throughout this process. We know this because President Trump told us openly, publicly, and repeatedly.

More than any President I have seen, he has been explicit about what he expects from his nominee. He has laid out specific tests and promised to only pick nominees from a prescreened list of people who would absolutely meet them.

Here is what he has said, and here is how we know exactly what this nominee will do. President Trump has said he wants a nominee who is fully committed to overturning Roe v. Wade, criminalizing abortions, and rolling back women's ability to access contraception and other basic healthcare.

On the campaign trail, he promised that Roe v. Wade ''can be changed'' and that he was going to be ''putting pro-life justices on the court'' so that it would be overturned ''automatically.''

He has said he wants a nominee who would immediately declare healthcare reform unconstitutional and cut off access to care for people with preexisting conditions.

On the campaign trail, he criticized Chief Justice Roberts because he—this is him—''should have, frankly, ended ObamaCare, and he didn't'' and promised ''a strong test'' for a ''strong conservative'' who would be different from Roberts on healthcare.

He has made it clear that he wants a nominee who would keep handing more power to massive corporations and the wealthiest Americans and keep diluting the power of regular voters. He has made it clear that he wants a nominee who would eliminate protections that preserve the air we breathe and the water we drink. He has made it clear that he wants a nominee who would roll back the rights and freedoms for our workers, for LGBTQ Americans, and for so many others.

So there is no doubt. It could not be any clearer. For a nominee who would swing the balance of the Court—I am going to believe that President Trump has told us the truth, and I am going to believe that the extreme rightwing groups who wrote this list for him are sure about where this nominee stands.

So I want to be very clear to anyone who may doubt it or who may think they need to learn more before making a decision. A vote for President Trump's Judge Kavanaugh is a vote to allow five men on the Supreme Court to overturn Roe v. Wade, criminalize abortion in America, and roll back the progress we have made to help more women and girls access the basic healthcare they need. A vote for President Trump's Judge Kavanaugh is a vote to put the government, bosses, and men in charge of the reproductive rights and freedoms of women and girls. A vote for President Trump's Judge Kavanaugh is a vote to go back to the days when women had to go into back alleys for healthcare, when women had to ask for permission, when women were shamed, and when women and girls died because of the laws of our land. We unfortunately already know all too well what this looks like because there are States nationwide where extreme politicians have chipped away at women's healthcare rights and have been waiting for exactly this moment—for someone exactly like Judge Kavanaugh—to go even further.

But that is not all. A vote for President Trump's Judge Kavanaugh is a vote to end protections for people with preexisting conditions and go back to the bad old days when insurance companies were in charge and people would have to pay more or be cut off from care simply for being sick.

A vote for President Trump's Judge Kavanaugh is a vote to give massive corporations even more power over our economy, our workers, and our elections.

A vote for President Trump's Judge Kavanaugh is a vote to eliminate environmental protections and make our air and water dirtier and less safe, erasing so much of the progress we have made in recent decades.

A vote for President Trump's Judge Kavanaugh is a vote to step back from the progress we have made to expand rights and freedoms and basic human decency to LGBTQ Americans.

I could go on, and in the coming days and weeks, as we learn even more about the ways Judge Kavanaugh will fulfill President Trump's promises, I absolutely will.

I voted against Judge Kavanaugh when he was nominated for the circuit court, and I strongly oppose this nomination now. I will be urging my colleagues to stand with me in rejecting him and calling on President Trump to send us someone who will stand with women and workers and families and who will truly commit to respecting settled law and the rights and freedoms we hold so dear.

I will be here urging people across the country to stand up and speak out and make their voices heard.

This is a critical moment right now. The U.S. Senate has the power to stop this Court from swinging against our rights and freedoms, and every Senator needs to know they will be held accountable for their vote.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2019

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to legislative session and that the Chair lay before the Senate the message to accompany H.R. 5515.

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

The Presiding Officer laid before the Senate the following message from the House of Representatives:

Resolved, That the House disagree to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 5515) entitled ''An Act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2019 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department or Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.'', and ask a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

COMPOUND MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendment, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and authorize the Chair to appoint conferees on the part of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at 5 p.m. today the Senate resume legislative session and vote on the pending compound motion; further that if the motion is agreed to, Senators Cornyn and Reed each be recognized to offer a motion to instruct conferees; that the Senate vote on the motions in the order listed with no further action on the motion; that there be 2 minutes of debate between each vote, equally divided in the usual form; and that following disposition of the Reed motion and the appointment of conferees, the Senate resume executive session.

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now resume executive session.

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

RECESS

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

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:36 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. PORTMAN).

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, all postcloture time has expired.

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

Mr. RUBIO. 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 senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 72, nays 27, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 145 Ex.]

YEAS—72

Alexander	Harris	Nelson
Baldwin	Hassan	Perdue
Bennet	Hatch	Peters
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Reed
Booker	Heitkamp	Roberts
Brown	Hirono	Rubio
Cantwell	Hyde-Smith	Sanders
Capito	Johnson	Schatz
Cardin	Jones	Schumer
Carper	Kaine	Shaheen
Casey	Kennedy	Shelby
Cassidy	King	Smith
Collins	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Coons	Leahy	Tester
Corker	Lee	Tillis
Cornyn	Manchin	Toomey
Cortez Masto	Markey	Udall
Donnelly	McCaskill	Van Hollen
Duckworth	McConnell	Warner
Durbin	Menendez	Warren
Feinstein	Merkley	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Murkowski	Wicker
Graham	Murphy	Wyden
Grassley	Murray	Young

NAYS—27

Barrasso	Ernst	Moran
Blunt	Fischer	Paul
Boozman	Flake	Portman
Burr	Gardner	Risch
Cotton	Heller	Rounds
Crapo	Hoeven	Sasse
Cruz	Inhofe	Scott
Daines	Isakson	Sullivan
Enzi	Lankford	Thune

NOT VOTING—1

McCain

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 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 Brian Allen Benczkowski, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Attorney General.

Mitch McConnell, Steve Daines, Chuck Grassley, Tom Cotton, John Kennedy, Marco Rubio, Thom Tillis, Mike Crapo, Orrin G. Hatch, John Barrasso, John Boozman, David Perdue, James Lankford, John Cornyn, Roger F. Wicker, John Thune, John Hoeven.

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 Brian Allen Benczkowski, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Attorney General, 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. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN).

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEVEN). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 51, nays 48, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 146 Ex.]

YEAS—51

Alexander	Flake	Murkowski
Barrasso	Gardner	Paul
Blunt	Graham	Perdue
Boozman	Grassley	Portman
Burr	Hatch	Risch
Capito	Heller	Roberts
Cassidy	Hoeven	Rounds
Collins	Hyde-Smith	Rubio
Corker	Inhofe	Sasse
Cornyn	Isakson	Scott
Cotton	Johnson	Shelby
Crapo	Kennedy	Sullivan
Cruz	Lankford	Thune
Daines	Lee	Tillis
Enzi	Manchin	Toomey
Ernst	McConnell	Wicker
Fischer	Moran	Young

NAYS—48

Baldwin	Harris	Nelson
Bennet	Hassan	Peters
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Reed
Booker	Heitkamp	Sanders
Brown	Hirono	Schatz
Cantwell	Jones	Schumer
Cardin	Kaine	Shaheen
Carper	King	Smith
Casey	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Coons	Leahy	Tester
Cortez Masto	Markey	Udall
Donnelly	McCaskill	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Menendez	Warner
Durbin	Merkley	Warren
Feinstein	Murphy	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Murray	Wyden

NOT VOTING—1

McCain

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 51, the nays are 48.

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 Brian Allen Benczkowski, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Attorney General.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

NOMINATION OF BRETT KAVANAUGH

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, there are a lot of things you need to know when you are considering voting on a candidate for Congress—for example, what are his or her views on healthcare, taxes, the military, the economy, the First Amendment? The list goes on and on. When it comes to judges, there are only two important questions: One, is this individual well-qualified, and two, does this person understand the proper role of a judge? Unlike legislators' opinions, judges' political opinions should be irrelevant because a good judge will leave his or her political opinions outside the courtroom door. A good judge knows that her job is to

judge based on the law and the facts, not political opinions or personal feelings.

Supreme Court Justice Antonin Scalia, whom we lost in 2016, had this to say about the proper role of a judge:

If you're going to be a good and faithful judge, you have to resign yourself to the fact that you're not always going to like the conclusions you reach. If you like them all the time, you're probably doing something wrong.

Current Supreme Court Justice Neil Gorsuch has said more than once that ''a judge who likes every outcome he reaches is very likely a bad judge.''

Last night, the President nominated Judge Brett Kavanaugh to be the next Supreme Court Justice. This is another outstanding pick from President Trump. Like Justice Scalia and Justice Gorsuch, Judge Kavanaugh understands that the job of a judge is to interpret the law, not write it; to judge, not legislate; to call balls and strikes, not rewrite the rules of the game.

His qualifications are outstanding. He is a graduate of Yale Law School. He clerked for a Supreme Court Justice. He is a lecturer at Harvard Law School. Most importantly, he has had an outstanding career as a judge on the DC Circuit Court of Appeals, where he has handed down thoughtful, well-reasoned decisions that reveal his deep respect for the law and the Constitution. His opinions have been endorsed by the Supreme Court more than a dozen times and are regularly cited by courts around the country.

I am looking forward to sitting down with Judge Kavanaugh during the confirmation process. We are going to follow regular order on this nominee, just as we did with Justice Gorsuch. The Judiciary Committee will vet Judge Kavanaugh, and Senators of both parties will have the chance to sit down with him before the full Senate votes on his nomination this fall.

Unfortunately, a number of Senate Democrats have already made it clear that they are going to make this process as partisan as possible. One Democratic Senator—the senior Senator from Pennsylvania—put out a statement yesterday announcing his intention to oppose the President's Supreme Court nominee before the President had even made his announcement. That is right—the Democratic Senator from Pennsylvania decided he wasn't even going to pretend to examine the nominee's qualifications. Instead, he announced his intention to oppose the nominee before he even knew whom he was opposing. That is, unfortunately, par for the course for the Democratic Party.

If one thing has been clear since Justice Kennedy announced his retirement, it is that Democrats are not interested in a nominee's qualifications or commitment to the rule of law; they are interested in a nominee's political opinions. They are ready to disqualify any nominee who doesn't share their political views.

Democrats' apparent belief that the only good judge is a judge who will use his role to advance their agenda is deeply disturbing. It betrays Democrats' failure to understand or their decision to ignore the fundamental purpose of the judiciary. Our judicial system was designed to secure the rights of citizens under the law, not to serve as the arm of a particular political party. Nobody's rights can be secure when judges start ruling based on political ideology instead of on the law.

Fortunately for the rule of law, President Trump doesn't believe in nominating judges based on their agreement with his personal opinions. Instead, he believes in nominating judges who understand that their job is to rule based on the law and the Constitution. That is exactly what he has done with Judge Kavanaugh.

I look forward to the process the Senate will undertake, starting with examining this judge's record, having hearings in the Judiciary Committee, and ultimately having a debate on the floor of the U.S. Senate and eventually a vote on this judge, this nominee's nomination to the Supreme Court.

It is an important matter, one that the Constitution charges the Senate with and one that we need to take very seriously. I intend—as I hope most of my colleagues do—to give fair consideration to this very qualified nominee, to examine his record, have him answer the hard questions, and then to have an opportunity to vote up or down.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

TRIBUTE TO THOMAS STEPHENSON

Mr. PETERS. Mr. President, today I would like to recognize a very special Michigander. It is my pleasure to welcome Tom Stephenson of Greenville, MI, and his family to Washington, DC, and to have them in the Senate Gallery right now. Tom is joined by his parents Hollie and Mark, as well as his younger sister Sarah.

Today Tom is fulfilling his wish to be a U.S. Senator for a day with the assistance of the Make-A-Wish Foundation. It is truly an honor to partner with Make-A-Wish to grant Tom's wish.

This wonderful organization creates life-changing wishes for children with critical illnesses, giving them and their families meaningful experiences while bringing communities together.

Tom discovered his passion for government and politics at 8 years old when he joined his grandmother on a trip to Washington, DC. During that trip, Tom met with legislators to advocate for heart defect research. Today he is getting a firsthand look at a day in the life of a U.S. Senator.

From my weekly constituent coffee to meetings with my fellow Senators, briefings, interviews, and even a conference call with the Michigan media, U.S. Senator-for-a-Day Stephenson is getting the full experience.

I am always inspired when I meet young people interested in public service, and I am impressed that Tom chose serving as a U.S. Senator for a day as his wish.

One issue that Tom is particularly concerned about is college affordability and how his generation will prepare for the future. This is a concern I share with Tom and that I know many of my fellow Michiganders share with us. Here in the Senate, I am working to ensure everyone has access to the skills and education that are vital to joining the modern workforce and competing in today's global economy.

I introduced legislation that will reduce the pricetag for higher education by allowing students to complete college-level courses while they are still in high school. I will continue to work with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to find commonsense solutions that will help make higher education more affordable.

I would like to thank my colleague from West Virginia, Senator CAPITO, for taking time out of her day to meet with me and Tom this morning. We wanted to show him that there is real bipartisanship in the Senate. We discussed how we worked together to enact legislation that will help recent graduates who have defaulted on their loans repair their credit and get back on track.

All of us in the Senate should draw inspiration from Tom. At a time when our country is increasingly polarized and politics can feel toxic, we need smart, hard-working young people to recommit to public service and to making our country a better place.

At 18, Tom is still 12 years away from being eligible to serve as a U.S. Senator, but his passion for our government gives me faith in the future and that our future is bright.

I would like to thank Tom for taking the trip to Washington and spending a long day with me, my colleagues, and my staff. I hope Tom leaves the Senate today with an even deeper interest in our government and a better idea about how we can work together to improve the lives of Michiganders and all Americans.

Although Tom's term as ''Senator for a Day'' winds down tonight, I am committed to serving as his advocate and voice here. As he prepares to start his freshman year at Michigan State University, I am proud to welcome Tom both as a fellow Senator and as a fellow Spartan. I look forward to everything he will accomplish in the coming years and decades.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

NOMINATION OF BRETT KAVANAUGH

Mr. SASSE. Mr. President, one of the most consequential duties of the Senate is the consideration of a Supreme Court nominee. This is the Congress's opportunity to shape the direction of the Federal courts and to defend a judiciary that is focused on laws, not policy. For those of us who have been called to this role for a limited time, this work is important. It will outlast us by decades. None of us should take this duty lightly.

With the appointment of Justice Gorsuch last year and now a record 22 judges to the courts of appeals, the past 18 months have been among the most consequential for the judiciary in the history of the Nation—and that was before Justice Kennedy's retirement.

As significant as these confirmations have been for the last year and a half in the judiciary, the current Supreme Court vacancy is arguably the most important task before the Senate this year. This vacancy is a remarkable opportunity to affirm the role of a judge under our constitutional system of republican self-government.

Fundamentally, this shouldn't be an exercise in policymaking, as vital and important as policymaking can be. Making law is not the job of the courts in any way, shape, or form.

Don't get me wrong. Setting goals and making policy can be very important, but it is done in the open, and it starts at home. Americans answer our biggest questions outside of government with our friends and neighbors, with our communities of worship, in our rotary clubs, and in our small businesses with entrepreneurship and all sorts of volunteerism in America.

With regard to government, policymaking choices are made by the American people through their representatives whom they elect and can hire and fire. To put it bluntly, Members of the Senate and Members of the House of Representatives at the other end of this building can be fired. In fact, 435 of the 535 people we work with in the Congress are always within 23 months and 29 days of being sent back home by the ''we the people'' who are actually in charge of policymaking in America.

But the Court is different. Nobody back home can fire a Supreme Court Justice. They have lifetime tenure. We should reflect more often on why our Founders decided to give members of the judiciary lifetime tenure. That is why we don't want those judges with their lifetime tenure to be writing laws or making policy. If a judge wants to make policy, he or she should take off the black robe of impartiality and run for office. It is a legitimate thing to do. All of us in this body have done it. We think it is a way to love our neighbor and serve our country, but in our system of ''we the people,'' the voters decide who gets to make policy. Judges have black robes, and they have lifetime tenure. They are not policymakers.

Regrettably, as our ever-fraying sense of common identity in America is falling apart in the eyes of many of our citizens, we are warping the role of the Court and of judges, reducing the role of the Court from the plain and ever-compelling words of Marbury v. Madison ''to say what the law is,'' not what some judge wishes it were; we are, instead, seeing the judiciary warped into a profane occupation of pronouncing policy preferences but without any mechanism of meaningful accountability by which the people could still be in charge. We should not let that stand. We should not want to see that perpetual warping of the judiciary into a place of being policymakers—yet policymakers without accountability.

We need a recovery of basic civics in the country about what the role of a judge is and what the purposes of the courts are. We should not let this confirmation process turn into a battle for our own policy preferences that just breaks down our constitutional architecture—the constitutional architecture on which an American free society depends.

Sadly, that is apparently what many people in the Resistance aim to do. They aim to bork Judge Kavanaugh's nomination by any means necessary. We are less than 24 hours into this, and folks are already declaring that if you can't see that Brett Kavanaugh is a cross between Lex Luthor and Darth Vader, then you apparently aren't paying enough attention.

The American people are smarter than that. That kind of charge is silly, and the American people don't want judges who think of themselves as superlegislators.

Unfortunately, far-left super PACs are shouting that we have reached the apocalypse. I was outside last night, right at the edge of the Supreme Court steps. In addition to the signs that were being held up, saying that Brett Kavanaugh was hastening the end of days, there were other signs on the ground, which had been printed with the names of other potential nominees to the Court, about how they were the ones who would bring about the end of days. This isn't true. We need less WWE ''Thunderdome'' and a lot more ''Schoolhouse Rock.''

The confirmation process of the Supreme Court nominee should be an occasion to do basic civics with our kids, and it shouldn't be dividing Republicans and Democrats about policy preferences. It should be an occasion for Americans to come together and talk again about why judges wear black robes and why they have lifetime tenure. This should be a test of the character, competence, and constitutional commitments of someone who has been nominated to the judiciary because in the American system, judges have a peculiar role—no more and no less than what article III of the Constitution gives them.

In Judge Kavanaugh, we have a compelling guy. He is a standout dad, and even his most ardent critic will acknowledge that he is one of the most thoughtful and influential judges on the courts of appeals across the Nation today. He has a ton of impressive opinions to his name, especially on the subjects of separation of powers and administrative law, which are now dominating the docket not only of the DC Circuit Court of Appeals, where he currently sits, but also at the Supreme Court to which he has been nominated.

Judge Kavanaugh was put on the circuit court at age 41—12 years ago—a remarkably young man to be put on such a prestigious court. In his 12 years on the court, he has authored more than 300 opinions. I think the current count is that more than 100 of his opinions have been cited by more than 200 of his peers on other courts across the country. He is truly a judge's judge.

Last night, I heard from people on both the right and left ends of the policy spectrum, but legal experts said to me quotes that were remarkably eerie in their echo: Brett Kavanaugh is always the smartest person in every room he is in, yet when you are in the room, you would never know that he knows it because of his humble manner and his winsome ways.

If my colleagues want to pursue these confirmation hearings as mere naked partisanship, they should actually resign their seats and try to get cable news jobs. But if we want to take our jobs seriously, if we want to have an honest debate, then we should be taking seriously our charge to uphold the three branches of government, their separate responsibilities, and the ways they check and balance one another.

With those more than 300 opinions, we have a lot of homework to do. I am looking forward to beginning to dive further into Judge Kavanaugh's opinions over the course of the last 12 years. I am pretty confident that what we are going to find is a guy who has lots of deference and respect for the limited job that a judge is called to fulfill. I hope my colleagues in this Chamber will join me in diving into those opinions, sort of foreswearing the ''Thunderdome'' silliness that many people outside are urging us to turn the confirmation process into.

Thank you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

NATO

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I want to start by thanking my colleagues who will be joining me shortly on the floor to voice their support for the NATO alliance. Once again, we find ourselves facing a crisis of President Trump's own creation.

For nearly 70 years, NATO has served as a pillar of stability and security for the United States and our democratic allies across Europe. It was there as Europe rebuilt after World War II. It was there to win the Cold War. It was there to defend the United States after September 11. Yet today, for the first

time since World War II, an American President has given our closest allies in Europe reason to question the trustworthiness of the United States and our reliability as a NATO partner.

President Trump's slapdash approach to foreign policy, borne out of heated campaign rallies instead of thoughtful Cabinet meetings, has real implications for our national security. Such reckless behavior by President Trump has weakened the United States on the global stage and has created a more dangerous world for our citizens and our troops serving abroad.

Today the President is on his way to Europe, and his intentions are clear. President Trump will use every opportunity that comes his way to admonish our allies, alienate our closest friends, and degrade the post-World War II international order in the hopes of winning favor with the dictator from Moscow.

In fact, this morning the President said his easiest meeting during this trip would probably be with Vladimir Putin. Is it easy because they share common values? Is it easy because he wants to be Putin's friend? Is it easy because Trump would rather deal with an autocrat than negotiate with democratically elected leaders?

Let's be clear. Meeting with a thug intent on undermining American democratic values should not be easy, and it should not be chummy. Yet as National Security Advisor H.R. McMaster reportedly said in the past:

> The president thinks he can be friends with Putin. I don't know why, or why he would want to be.

I agree with those comments of the former National Security Advisor, General McMaster. It makes no sense. Attacking American democracy is not exactly an act of friendship.

We know the circumstances are dire. The leaders of our intelligence community and the entire Senate Intelligence Committee, on a bipartisan basis, have concluded that Russia not only attacked the United States in 2016 through its cyber efforts but continues to sow discord and destabilize institutions that are at the very heart of American democracy.

Yet to this day, President Trump continues to take Putin at his word. With his warm embrace of the Russian dictator, many of us find ourselves questioning the President's true loyalties, and it is no surprise that our allies in Europe are questioning the loyalty and commitment of the United States to the post-World War II international order.

In the absence of U.S. Presidential leadership, I want to make clear to our allies abroad, as well as our adversaries in the Kremlin, where Members of the U.S. Senate stand. We stand for the rule of law and an international order based on liberal democratic values; we stand for security alliances among democracies based on mutual defense against our enemies; we stand against dictators who invade our neighbors with soldiers and cyber attacks; and we stand with our friends through thick and thin.

Tomorrow, on the Foreign Relations Committee, we expect to make such a declaration explicit with a bipartisan resolution affirming that the U.S. national security is inextricably linked to the security of Europe. We are not schmucks, Mr. President, for leading an alliance that has brought peace and security for decades in the wake of two devastating World Wars.

The Foreign Relations Committee will reaffirm a commitment to article 5 of the NATO charter, which says that an attack on one is an attack on all.

We recognize that since article 5 took effect, it has only been triggered once—only once—by and in support of the United States following the September 11 attack. To this day, nearly 17 years later, NATO troops still serve in Afghanistan in support of the American effort.

These countries have all sent their sons and daughters to fight and die alongside ours. They stand with us—and we with them—against extremism, terrorism, authoritarianism, and proudly in support of democracy, human rights, and the rule of law.

Members of the NATO alliance had been steadily increasing their defense spending for the past 4 years in reaction to Putin's invasion of Crimea and the implications for regional security, not Trump's bluster.

Our allies understand the threat posed by a dictator who tears away territory from its neighbors. The question is, Does President Trump? Is there more work to be done to meet the 2-percent commitment in countries across the alliance? Of course, but we need to acknowledge the progress that has been made and the trend lines that are headed in the right direction. Let's not jeopardize those trends by insulting the very leaders we need by our side.

This week in Brussels, the President should do something he has proven completely incapable of thus far—he should thank our allies for their steadfastness, for their resilience, and for their commitment to working with us to counter the threat posed by Russia.

President Trump should work with our allies to collectively increase sanctions on Moscow. He should work with NATO to build our collective cyber defenses against the onslaught of Russian cyber attacks and disinformation. These are all things he should do—things a normal American President would do—but based on the tweets and his past actions, I have little hope he will choose such a path.

The President should also work with our allies to continue the fight against ISIS. NATO countries form the core of the Global Coalition to Defeat ISIS. NATO governments host working groups, contribute resources, participate in airstrikes, provide stabilization assistance, and face serious challenges in addressing the plight of foreign fighters.

In Iraq, NATO is working to share more responsibility in training the Iraqi security forces. This is exactly how strategic partnerships are supposed to work. We identify challenges, cooperate on solutions, share the burden of funding, troop deployments, and assistance in support of a shared objective—in this case, a stable, unified Iraq that can stand up to Iran.

In Syria, NATO should be a natural ally in countering Russian and Iranian aggression. Despite regular, irrefutable evidence of war crimes and crimes against humanity committed by Bashar al-Assad, Putin continues to bolster the Butcher of Damascus.

In fact, Russian forces are directly complicit in targeting civilians and civilian structures in Syria. These are facts that cannot be ignored. Russian forces are actively working with Assad's regime to bomb opposition in southern Syria into submission. These military operations are taking place today inside the very deescalation zone President Trump touted last year with Putin in Vietnam.

These developments have led to the largest displacement of civilians in southern Syria since the beginning of this war. The President must make clear, once and for all, that Russia is not a constructive partner on Syria; that it is a willing accomplice and a perpetrator of war crimes.

Our friends in Ukraine are fighting for their country on a daily basis, battling Russian troops. As the globe focuses on the World Cup in Russia, at least 17 Ukrainian troops have been killed or injured in their own country by Russian forces—killed or injured in their own country. We are helping our Ukrainian friends with training and equipment. Under no circumstances, can this aid be diminished in any way. President Trump needs to understand that any attempt to do so will be met with strong and unified opposition in the Senate. President Trump can never lose sight of the importance of eastern Ukraine, nor can he forget the plight of so many Crimeans who suffer under Russian repression to this day.

Today I submitted a resolution with Senator PORTMAN calling for the United States to declare a policy of nonrecognition of Russia's illegal annexation of Crimea. This idea is modeled under the Welles Declaration, which said the United States would never recognize the Soviet annexation of the Baltic States. The Welles Declaration meant something to the beleaguered people of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia, all who yearned to be free of Moscow's repression, and today they are free.

It represented the U.S. commitment to the territorial integrity of independent countries. Today we have the same opportunity to send the same message to those courageous Ukrainian citizens living in Crimea.

President Trump was reported to have said the people of Crimea want to be part of Russia because they speak

Russian. Instead of misinformed judgments from the President, we and the world need clear leadership that says definitively to President Putin that we will not stand for his illegal occupation of Crimea; we will not stand by in the face of ongoing attacks in eastern Ukraine by Russian forces; we will not stand by while President Putin participates in the commission of war crimes in Syria; and we will not stand by while Russia attacks democratic institutions in the United States and those of our closest allies.

I hope our President will meet with Putin in Helsinki and express these simple but powerful statements. Yet nothing in his track record gives me much hope that he will do so.

We have a President who is so enamored of Putin that to this day, he still refuses to criticize the Russian leader, a President who sought early in his term to lift sanctions on Russia, a President who has questioned Ukraine's sovereignty over Crimea, and a President who routinely trashes partners in the strongest military alliance the world has ever seen. This behavior is bizarre, it is erratic, and it is no reflection of who we are as a country or a people.

In closing, I would remind the President that the Russia sanctions law, CAATSA, restricts his ability to unilaterally lift sanctions on Russia. Such a move would be subject to approval. So as he embarks on his ''easiest meeting'' with Vladimir Putin, he is constrained by a law that was supported by 98 Senators.

We know Putin seeks sanction relief. We must make clear that such relief will only come when he withdraws from Ukraine, returns Crimea, ends his support for Bashar al-Assad, and stops interfering in our elections.

As someone who is personally sanctioned by Vladimir Putin, I will not stop working to ensure that the CAATSA law is fully implemented by this administration.

The hallmark struggle of our time is between those who champion democracy and autocrats who use oppression, military evasions, and disinformation to achieve their nefarious ends, and this week this battle comes into sharp contrast.

Will our President side with our democratic allies in Brussels or will he side with an autocrat in the Kremlin? Either way, the world needs to know the U.S. Senate has made its view clear. We stand with NATO. We stand with our allies. We stand for democracy and the rule of law. We stand for the international liberal order that has kept the peace for decades. We stand on these values today, and we will never shy away from their defense.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. First, Mr. President, let me thank my colleague, my neighbor from New Jersey, for the excellent job he does in just about anything he does but particularly today as ranking member of the Foreign Relations Committee. His leadership is invaluable to this country so I thank him for it.

Mr. President, President Trump is on his way to attend the annual summit of NATO leaders in Brussels. The President should use the occasion to reinforce and build up the transatlantic alliance rather than tear it down.

Since its founding nearly 70 years ago, NATO has become the most powerful and successful security partnership ever created. The first half of the 20th century was marked by unprecedented human suffering—depression, war, and genocide. After World War II, in the face of Soviet aggression and expansion, NATO showed the world a different way.

Working together with other international institutions, NATO established the political and economic rules of the road that have promoted our national security and our mutual prosperity.

This institution now finds itself under incredible and completely unnecessary strain from Russia's interference in democracies across Europe and including the United States, from China's rapacious economic aggression and geopolitical provocations, from the evolving threat of terrorism, and, shockingly, from within.

Our President, President Trump, has routinely berated the leaders of our NATO allies in far harsher terms than the President has ever criticized President Putin of Russia, a dictator who has invaded a sovereign country, murdered journalists and political dissenters, directed a nerve agent attack in the United Kingdom, and continues to prop up the brutal Assad regime in Syria. He has shown an eagerness to impose tariffs against Europe but a reluctance to sanction President Putin and his cronies. He has accepted the word of President Putin over the consensus of 17 agencies of the American intelligence community.

For reasons that continue to baffle so many, President Trump will follow up his summit with a one-on-one meeting with President Putin in Helsinki, a mere 100 miles from the Russian border.

Before leaving for Europe this morning, the President summed up his agenda. He said: ''I have NATO, I have the UK . . . and I have Putin. Frankly, Putin may be the easiest of all. Who would think?''

Who would think? President Trump, considering all you have said and done in the past 2 years, considering your kid glove approach to President Putin that has everyone here scratching their head, any one of us could have predicted that Putin would be your easiest meeting, but every one of us is in fear of what Putin might get out of it.

Every time the President has negotiated one-on-one with President Xi, with Kim Jong Un, our rival has gotten the better of him and of our country. And many of us fear what President Trump will do alone with Putin, what he will concede and what Putin will get out of him.

The President of the United States should be a clarion voice for our values, bolstering our allies and isolating our adversaries. President Trump has, unfortunately and alarmingly, been the opposite.

The values at the foundation of our NATO alliance are worth fighting for—free markets, free and fair elections, representative government, rule of law. These are the values that protect our citizens from the encroachment of tyranny. President Trump should recognize that power resides in the values shared by our NATO allies as well as the strategic sense of using NATO as a powerful bulwark against the abuses of a resurgent Russia.

Later this afternoon, the Senate will vote on a motion to instruct conferees on the Defense bill to reaffirm Congress's enduring and unequivocal support for NATO. I hope it receives the overwhelming bipartisan, if not unanimous, approval it so deserves.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FLAKE). The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, 2 weeks ago, Secretary Pompeo appeared before the Senate Appropriations Committee, and I got the chance to ask him a simple question. I asked him whether it was still the position of the United States that Russia should not be allowed to join the G7 without adhering to the outlines of the Minsk agreement. That is the agreement that seeks to try to resolve the crisis that has been created in Europe and in Ukraine by the Russian invasion of eastern Ukraine. I give Secretary Pompeo credit because his answer was brutally honest. He said that he certainly could foresee a series of trade-offs with the Russians by which they would be allowed to join the G7—rejoin the G7—without withdrawing their forces from eastern Ukraine or Crimea.

That is a stunning reversal of prior U.S. policy—the idea that we would trade away Ukraine for some set of concessions from Russia on another area of national security, maybe in the Middle East—but it is not surprising. It is not surprising because, as Donald Trump has made clear over and over again, his primary objective is to become friends with Vladimir Putin. His primary objective is to try to square himself and the Kremlin without regard to the consequences for U.S. national security.

So I am very pleased to join Senator MENENDEZ and Senator SCHUMER and Senator REED on the floor today to express our hope and desire that President Trump finds some way to stop undermining the NATO alliance as he heads for this important summit and understands that Russia presents a real and present danger to the world order, to American security, and to the future of global security if we continue to communicate to them that they pay no

consequences for their erasure of borders in and around their periphery and for their continued attempts to manipulate elections outside of their borders.

I hope there are others in the room with President Trump and Vladimir Putin when they meet because it is hard for us to understand what leverage Putin has over Trump such that he would continue to give away so much to Russia without getting very much in return; why he would continue to do Russia's bidding in trying to tear apart NATO, in trying to tear apart the EU, without getting anything in return. I don't know what leverage Putin has over Trump, but I would feel much more comfortable if there were some other people in that room who could be witness to those discussions to make sure the discussion with Putin doesn't go the same way the discussion with President Kim did in North Korea.

I also am here on the floor to remind my colleagues about the importance of this underlying relationship with Europe. I am sure my colleagues have already said it, but let's just remember that article 5 has only been exercised one time, and that was in the defense of the United States. That was when the United States was attacked, and we asked our NATO allies to join with us to try to rid Afghanistan of a government that had given shelter to those who had attacked us. Don't forget that NATO exists for our benefit as well as for Europe's benefit.

Also don't forget that for 4 consecutive years, European governments have been increasing their defense spending. For 4 consecutive years, countries have been scaling up their contributions to their defense budgets. But I also don't want my colleagues to think that the measure of transatlantic security is simply the amount of money we are putting into a defense budget. I am not saying that isn't important, but this administration from the beginning has had backwards the way in which you protect America from the threats that we face all around the world. Peace does come through military strength, but increasingly, the threats we face—increasingly, the threats Russia presents to the United States and to our allies—are nonkinetic threats, are not military threats, and they require other means of counteraction.

So as we are trying to measure whether Europe is a full and meaningful participant in a security arrangement with the United States, I don't mind measuring defense contributions, which are increasing year by year, but let's also remember that it is Europe that is handling the flood of refugees leaving the security vacuum in the Middle East. The United States is doing nothing—nothing of consequence, of importance—to handle that refugee flow. It is Europe that is dealing with that refugee flow.

It is Europe that often deals with the most mature terrorist organizations setting up cells inside of Europe. It has, in fact, been Europe that has borne the brunt of terrorist attacks since 9/11 due to those mature organizations being able to exist inside Europe. It is the counterterrorism capacity and the law enforcement capacity that Europe offers to confront those threats that also matters to our security.

It is Europe that has had to stand up capacities to counter Russian propaganda that floods in particular Eastern Europe and the Balkans but also Central and Western Europe as well. We don't measure those counterpropaganda resources in the defense budget, but they are serious and they are increasing.

It is Europe that has spent billions of dollars trying to diversify their energy supplies so as to cut off Russia's most important revenue source—the export of oil and gas. The United States provides advice to Europe on how to do that, but it is Europe that is spending hard dollars—reverse flowing, diversifying domestic energy, bringing in gas from other countries besides Russia, which has made the biggest difference.

I want my friends here to understand the holistic nature of the security partnership that we enjoy with Europe and with our NATO allies. Yes, defense spending matters, but it is representative of this administration's unwillingness to understand the panoply of ways in which we need to defend our country, besides just a robust defense budget, which causes them to misunderstand the nature of this relationship. It is Europe's focus on refugee resettlement. It is Europe's focus on counterpropaganda capacities. It is Europe's focus on fighting Russian propaganda and their focus on diversifying their energy supplies that add, frankly, just as much to our joint security as their defense spending does.

Now, I don't expect that Donald Trump, given how little study he affords to the national security of the United States, is going to get up to school on all of these different capacities that Europe lends to the alliance, but it is important for us on a bipartisan basis to recognize that this is a strong alliance and that as much as we both push and pull each other, it remains strong. And don't think that the grievances only lie on our side of the aisle. Our European partners for years told us that we were making our collective security weaker by continuing an invasion and occupation of Iraq that was creating more terrorists than it was killing. So we have grievances with our partners in Europe, but they have had historic grievances with us, and it is important for us to recognize that historical fact as well.

I am here to express my desire that this President acknowledge the importance of this alliance. I am here expressing the hope that the summit won't be the unmitigated disaster that most people think it will be given the spirit in which the President leaves for it—castigating our NATO allies on his way out the door. And I don't want us to come to the conclusion that without NATO, without the European Union, without the post-World War II structures that we created in the midst of the rubble of that global conflict, that global security can be preserved.

We have taken for granted that countries don't march on each other, by and large, any longer. While we still have instability, we don't have nations invading other nations in the way that we did 100 years ago. That is because of NATO. That is because of the set of global security structures that the United States and Europe have helped stand up together. And if they fall apart—as it seems that this President roots for on a regular basis—then our assumption of how conflict will play out or not play out over the course of the next 10 to 20 years falls apart as well.

I am glad to join my colleagues today in support of the NATO alliance and in hope that the President understands the importance of it as he heads off to this critical summit.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, today I have submitted a motion to instruct conferees on the National Defense Authorization Act regarding the critical importance of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization for the security of the United States, for our protection. I join my colleagues this afternoon in support of the motion, which sends an important message to our allies, our partners, and our adversaries that the United States is unwavering in its support of Europe—a Europe free from the threat of external aggression—and in support of the rules-based international order that has promoted international security for decades.

The motion to instruct provides important guidance at this critical juncture before the NATO summit in Brussels and the U.S.-Russia summit in Helsinki. The motion instructs the Senate conferees on the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019 to ensure that the final conference report on the NDAA reaffirms the ironclad U.S. commitment under article 5 to the collective defense of the alliance. It reaffirms the U.S. commitment to NATO as a community of shared values, including liberty, human rights, democracy, and the rule of law.

The motion also calls for the United States to pursue an integrated approach to strengthen European defense as part of a long-term strategy that uses all elements of U.S. national power to deter and, if necessary, to defeat Russian aggression.

It also calls on the Trump administration to urgently complete a comprehensive, whole-of-government strategy to counter Russian malign influence activities, as required by last year's National Defense Authorization Act, and to submit that strategy to Congress without delay. We are still

awaiting—for over a year now—this strategy.

Finally, the motion reiterates U.S. support for the rules-based international order and for expanding and enhancing our alliances and partnerships, which are some of our greatest security advantages.

No one should ever doubt the U.S. resolve in meeting its commitments to the mutual defense of the NATO alliance. Unfortunately, this motion has become necessary because some of our closest allies have come to question the U.S. commitment to collective self-defense. President Trump has at times called the alliance ''obsolete'' and has denigrated NATO as being ''as bad as NAFTA,'' which he strongly opposes. Our allies are starting to wonder whether they can rely on the United States to come to their defense in a crisis. Recently, German Foreign Minister Maas said the ''world order that we once knew . . . no longer exists.'' He added that ''old pillars of reliability are crumbling'' and that ''alliances dating back decades are being challenged in the time it takes to write a tweet.''

To make matters worse, the administration's eagerly scheduled summit meeting with Russian President Vladimir Putin, on the heels of the NATO summit in Brussels, only adds to fears that President Trump does not share the security concerns of our European allies and partners. Instead of concentrating on rebuilding alliance cohesion and unity after his divisive diplomacy at the G7 meeting in Canada, President Trump appears intent on orchestrating another photo op with an authoritarian ruler who oppresses his people and threatens the security of the United States, its allies, and partners—this time in the person of President Putin.

Meeting with Putin now is, in my view, ill-advised, and President Trump appears to be ill-informed about the threat Russia poses to the security of the United States and that of our allies and partners. The National Defense Strategy, which this administration authored and promoted, refocused our attention from international terrorist groups to our two major challenges, Russia and China. Yet the President, in his actions and words, appears to be undercutting his own National Defense Strategy.

In addition, I am deeply concerned that President Trump is meeting one-on-one with a former KGB spymaster like Putin. President Trump's ''attitude'' will not be enough to challenge Putin over Russia's aggression against the United States and our allies.

Let's be clear. President Putin is not ''fine.'' As recently reaffirmed by the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, on which I sit, President Putin directed an attack on our 2016 elections with the intent of undermining public confidence in our democratic process. To this day, Russia continues, according to administration intelligence officials, to target elections in democratic countries, including the upcoming midterm elections in the United States. Russia's use of hybrid operations—including disinformation, propaganda, corruption and financial influence, hidden campaign donations, and even chemical attacks on civilians in foreign countries—fundamentally threatens our security and the security of our allies. And Russia's ongoing aggression against the sovereignty and territorial integrity of neighboring countries, including Ukraine, is unacceptable and violates international norms.

In light of this Russian threat, President Trump should take the opportunity at this important NATO summit to lead the alliance toward greater solidarity and cohesion. Unfortunately, President Trump's statements ahead of the summit point in the opposite direction.

I understand and share the concern of many across the political spectrum that our NATO allies are not spending enough on their own defense, and many are not on track to meet the pledge to be spending 2 percent of GDP on national defense by 2024. This issue has been raised by previous administrations, including the Bush and Obama administrations. But, ultimately, the United States participates in NATO because we believe the transatlantic partnership is in the U.S. national security interest and not because other countries are paying us for protection.

We must look at the whole picture of allied contributions to NATO operations and to the strategic competition with Russia and China that I mentioned was the singular point of the National Defense Strategy approved by President Trump after being prepared by Secretary of Defense Mattis. The whole picture includes the following:

Our allies stood with us following the September 11, 2001, terrorist attack, invoking for the first and only time, as my colleagues have said, the obligation under article 5 of the NATO treaty for collective self-defense.

As of the end of this year, 7 of the 28 non-U.S. NATO members will meet the 2 percent of GDP pledge on defense spending. In addition, 18 members have put forth a credible plan to get to 2 percent of GDP by 2024.

Since 2014, all NATO members have halted the decline in their national defense spending, and total defense expenditures have increased by more than $87 billion.

U.S. foreign military sales to NATO members are up significantly in the past few years, from less than $5 billion in 2015 to an estimate of nearly $40 billion in 2018.

Our NATO partners provide significant host nation support to the tens of thousands of U.S. troops stationed in Europe, including Germany's $51 billion in military infrastructure and $1 billion annually in host nation support to the 33,000 U.S. troops stationed in Germany.

NATO members have deployed thousands of troops on NATO operations in Afghanistan, Kosovo, the NATO training mission in Iraq, and elsewhere, with many making the ultimate sacrifice. NATO soldiers have died serving side by side with U.S. soldiers, sailors, marines, and airmen in defense of the fundamental values we share, and we cannot ignore that.

The motion to instruct recognizes that in strategic competition with near-peers Russia and China—again, the singular feature of the new National Defense Strategy of this administration—one of the United States' greatest competitive advantages is our alliances and partnerships and the benefits they bring to the fight.

I urge my Senate colleagues to support the motion to instruct. This is not a partisan issue. It is not a Republican issue or a Democratic issue. It is a national security issue. In fact, the motion supports a number of provisions in the Senate version of the fiscal year 2019 NDAA proposed by my Republican colleagues on the Armed Services Committee that reaffirm the U.S. national security interest in the NATO alliance.

At this critical juncture before the summits in Brussels and Helsinki, Congress, as a coequal branch of government, has an opportunity to lead, just as Congress demonstrated leadership in overwhelmingly passing the Russia sanctions bill as part of the Countering America's Adversaries Through Sanctions Act, or CAATSA, by a vote of 98 to 2. That bill sent a clear message to Russia that there are costs to its malign activities and that Russia's behavior must change.

Similarly, strong Senate support for the motion to instruct will send an important message to our allies, our partners, and our adversaries. It will demonstrate solidarity with our NATO allies and partners and support for the vision of a Europe whole, free, and secure. It will send a message of support for the rules-based international order and the need for Russia to stop its disruptive behavior. It sends a message to President Putin that his behavior is not fine, that there is a continuing cost to be paid for Russia's malign activities, and that he will not succeed in dividing the NATO alliance.

In conclusion, I urge my colleagues to send a strong message of U.S. support for NATO by voting later today for the motion to instruct.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority whip is recognized.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Rhode Island, as well as those who were on the floor earlier. The remarks we are delivering today address the future of our relationship with the NATO alliance, particularly in light of the visit that President Trump is now making to meet with Vladimir Putin of Russia.

I am glad many of my colleagues came here today to speak on the threats posed by President Trump to America's core national security alliance—something that would have once

been unimaginable. In fact, there was a time when a Republican President named Ronald Reagan really inspired the United States and the world by noting how important the NATO alliance is to the world and to the United States. In a speech that he gave to the Parliament of Great Britain in 1982, Ronald Reagan said:

We're approaching the end of a bloody century plagued by a terrible political invention: totalitarianism. Optimism comes less easily today, not because democracy is less vigorous, but because democracy's enemies have refined their instruments of repression. Yet optimism is in order, because day by day democracy is proving itself to be a not-at-all fragile flower.

Reagan went on to say:

Our military strength is a prerequisite to peace, but let it be clear we maintain this strength in the hope it will never be used, for the ultimate determinant in the struggle that's now going on in the world will not be bombs and rockets, but a test of wills and ideas, a trial of spiritual resolve, the values we hold, the beliefs we cherish, the ideals to which we are dedicated.

President Reagan then went on to say to the British Parliament:

I've often wondered about the shyness of some of us in the West about standing for these ideals that have done so much to ease the plight of man and the hardships of our imperfect world.

Contrast what President Reagan said about the partnership of the Atlantic alliance nations in NATO with what has happened with this current White House and President regarding some of these same key Western allies at the G7 summit last month.

First, President Trump stunned the Western world by saying even before arriving at the summit that Russia should be welcomed back into the group of G7 nations, even though Russia was expelled after invading and seizing sovereign Ukrainian territory, which it still holds. President Trump made this plea to try to win over this effort of support for Putin to a Western world that is skeptical of Putin and his tactics.

Putin launched an aggressive cyber act of war right here in the United States in an attempt to void and change a national election and to favor his candidate over another. That, in many respects, is a cyber act of war, which President Trump refuses to acknowledge.

At the summit itself, President Trump arrived late and left early after letting it be known that he didn't even want to attend the G7 summit with our traditional allies. The President, sad to say, was utterly disrespectful to our Nation's oldest and most reliable allies.

In fact, a White House trade adviser, Peter Navarro, said that Canadian Prime Minister Justin Trudeau ''stabbed us in the back,'' and then Mr. Navarro went on to say, ''There's a special place in hell for any foreign leader that engages in bad-faith diplomacy with President Donald J. Trump and then tries to stab him in the back on the way out the door.'' Navarro's comments echoed a series of tweets from the President withdrawing from a joint G7 statement after initially agreeing to it.

Then the President went on in this tweet, personally attacking Prime Minister Trudeau in the coarsest terms and criticizing and disparaging America's oldest Western allies simply for imploring him not to end decades of shared Western-led international order and cooperation.

One senses that President Trump's sense of history extends to the day before yesterday. Has he forgotten that since the attack on the United States of 9/11, the Canadians have stood by us, as so many other countries have as well? One hundred fifty-nine Canadians have given their lives standing by our troops in Afghanistan in a NATO effort since operations began there in 2002. Could we ask anything more of a trusted ally than to sacrifice the lives of its young soldiers? Canada has, and continues to, despite this language from President Trump.

Then, to add insult to injury, President Trump showered one of the world's most brutal nuclear-armed dictators with glowing warmth, pats on the back, flattery, and even a White House-made propaganda video showing North Korean leader Kim Jong Un as a great statesman.

Can anyone here imagine what would have happened if President Obama had constructed a propaganda video before beginning his negotiations with Iran or if the President had saluted an Iranian general? FOX TV, the Republicans, and many other leaders would have had a field day with that image.

I am all for talking to one's adversaries in the pursuit of diplomacy. I have met with my share of autocrats around the world, trying, in my small way, to advance America's interests and values, but I don't check America's values or reality at the door at those meetings. I do not know of any modern President who let normal disagreements between key allies turn into a personal spat that alienates our friends and undermines our security.

In fact, I am increasingly convinced that President Trump is so enamored by validation-seeking autocrats and offended by our traditional allies expressing disagreements that he is incapable of distinguishing friends from enemies. This is truly problematic and dangerous. Now, our allies have just cause to worry that President Trump will give away concessions to Vladimir Putin, just as he did with the North Korean dictator.

Against all reason and international norms, Trump is considering recognizing Russia's illegal occupation of Crimea because, sadly, President Trump has no sense of history and little knowledge of Vladimir Putin's true agenda.

He is making threats and belittling NATO, the strongest alliance on the face of the Earth, while at the same time craving time with Vladimir Putin, whom he describes as a fine man. That is something which I am sure the people in our NATO alliance find incredible.

Quite simply, the first and long overdue statement from Trump to Putin ought to be: Do not interfere in America's elections ever again. I don't want your help, which was an attack on our democracy, and I do not believe your denials.

That ought to be the opening remark with Vladimir Putin. My guess is that it will not even be close.

I can think of few times in history that the party of Ronald Reagan has sat so quietly on its hands while an American President's actions threatened our Western security alliance and our place in the world. I don't understand why the Senate Foreign Relations Committee has not held a full committee hearing on Russia in more than 1 year, not to mention ever conducted an investigation into Russia's attack on our last election—something clearly within the jurisdiction of this committee and which it did in the past amid allegations of foreign election interference.

What of the Republicans' stunning silence about President Trump's undermining of NATO? There are some national needs and congressional responsibilities that ought to call on all of us in both political parties to rise to the occasion. Think about what Russia's President Putin would most like to see happen in the West and compare it to what is happening under President Trump. President Trump has called NATO obsolete and questioned the centrality of the collective security guarantee of article 5. He has questioned whether NATO should come to the aid of NATO's Baltic States—NATO members. In fact, President Trump reportedly asked NATO at the recent G7: Why do we need it?

Is that now the official position, not just of President Trump but of his Republican Party? I would implore those Members of the Senate of both parties who have visited the Baltic nations and understand the vulnerability of those states and their bloody history over the last century and a half to speak up on behalf of the need for NATO to stand in concert and in alliance with those Baltic States.

This week the Canadians sent their forces and representatives to Latvia, where they are providing special help on the ground. Similar NATO forces are in Lithuania and Estonia. They are doing their best to convince Putin not to engage in acts of aggression against these small nations, while at the same time the President of the United States questions the purpose of this effort.

President Trump has withdrawn the United States from key international agreements on trade, climate, and even the expansion of nuclear weapons in Iran. In doing so, the President has estranged the United States from its allies. While I hope we do reach a diplomatic agreement with North Korea, I

want to note that what little was agreed to in Singapore doesn't even come close to the terms and inspections that were in the Iran nuclear agreement from which President Trump simply walked away.

President Trump has insulted and strained relations with America's closest European and Western allies, so much so that European Council President Donald Tusk recently dismissed the United States by saying: ''With friends like that, who needs enemies.''

It has reached the point that just ahead of the NATO summit, we lost another senior career diplomat when James Melville, our Ambassador to Estonia, resigned over frustration with the controversial comments being made by President Trump. Ambassador Melville served under 6 different Presidents and 11 Secretaries of State, and he never thought the day would come when he couldn't support a President's policies—until now.

President Trump has tried to discredit key democratic institutions and processes in the United States, sowing mistrust in our political system and government. He has insulted poor nations, made immigrants a manufactured enemy, separated children from parents forcibly, and declared that America must come first in this world, isolating the United States day by day and more and more from the nations and countries that have been our traditional allies.

Why in the world is this President pursuing the agenda of one of our adversaries, who attacked our election process, militarily seized sovereign territory of our allies, murdered and attempted to murder dissidents on our allies' soil, provided weapons to Ukrainian separatists that shot down a Malaysian commercial airliner, killing hundreds of innocent people, repeatedly buzzes and tests NATO defenses, and jails and represses its own people when they advocate for basic democratic rights?

Before departing this morning for Brussels, instead of setting a positive tone for the NATO meeting to follow, President Trump, incredibly, decided to take to Twitter to criticize our allies again.

My friend and American patriot, Senator JOHN MCCAIN, was one of the few Republicans—one of the few—to recently speak up on behalf of our alliance. Here is what he said:

> To our allies: bipartisan majorities of Americans remain pro-free trade, pro-globalization & supportive of alliances based on 70 years of shared values. Americans stand with you, even if our president doesn't.

I couldn't agree more. I wish JOHN MCCAIN were on the floor of the Senate today to deliver those remarks in person, but his spirit is here among those on both sides of the aisle who value our NATO alliance and cannot understand the relationship between President Trump and Vladimir Putin.

The cause of democracy and freedom in this world requires a strong alliance that stands together for values the Americans believe in, share, fight for, and die for in war after war. We need that spirit to return again to the United States.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSON). The Senator from Iowa.

NOMINATION OF BRETT KAVANAUGH

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, last evening I joined many of my Senate colleagues at the White House as the President introduced Judge Brett Kavanaugh to serve as an Associate Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court. Judge Kavanaugh is one of the most widely respected judges in the country. I heard the President last night refer to him as a judge's judge. He is an outstanding choice to serve as a Justice of the Supreme Court.

Judge Kavanaugh is a former law clerk of the Justice he has been nominated to replace, and that is Justice Kennedy. I talked about Justice Kennedy's service on the Supreme Court and to the people of this country in my speech yesterday. Judge Kavanaugh earned both his undergraduate and law degrees from Yale University. He then clerked for judges on the Third and Ninth Circuit before joining the chambers of Justice Kennedy as a law clerk. He served in the Office of the Solicitor General and also the Office of the Independent Counsel.

After several years in private practice, Judge Kavanaugh returned to public service, working in the White House Counsel's office and as staff secretary for President George W. Bush. In 2006, he was confirmed to the DC Circuit, where he has served since. He is also a well-regarded law professor at Harvard, Yale, and Georgetown.

Judge Kavanaugh is a leader not only in the law but throughout his community. As examples, he volunteers at Catholic Charities on a regular basis and coaches both daughters' youth basketball teams.

The committee has received a letter from former law clerks of Judge Kavanaugh, people who represent views across the political and ideological spectrum. Many judges describe their former law clerks as adopted family members. In other words, law clerks know their judges best.

So I turn to what some of those said through letters they sent to our committee. Judge Kavanaugh's former law clerks write that he is a person with immense ''strength of character, generosity of spirit, intellectual capacity, and unwavering care for his family, friends, colleagues, and us, his law clerks.''

I want to read a longer quote from that letter.

> He is unfailingly warm and gracious with his colleagues no matter how strongly they disagree about a case, and he is well-liked and respected by judges and lawyers across the ideological spectrum as a result. . . . He always makes time for us, his law clerks. He makes it to every wedding, answers every career question, and gives unflinchingly honest advice. That advice often boils down to the same habits we saw him practice in chambers every day: Shoot straight, be careful and brave, work as hard as you possibly can, and then work a little harder.

His judicial record is extraordinary. The Supreme Court has adopted his view of the law in a dozen cases. Judge Kavanaugh's opinions demonstrate profound respect for the Constitution's separation of powers. He understands that it is Congress' job to pass laws, and where he sits, in judicial chambers, it is the role of those people—and he figures it is his role—to faithfully apply those laws as Congress intended. That is why his opinions emphasize that judges must focus on the text and apply laws as written by those of us elected to the Congress, not by unelected and, in turn, largely unaccountable, Federal judges. It is meant that they aren't to be accountable except to the Constitution and the laws of this country. Courts may not rewrite laws to suit their policy preferences.

Judge Kavanaugh has a record of judicial independence. He has shown a willingness to rein in executive branch agencies when they abuse or exceed their authority. You don't have to be in Congress very long to understand that it is a daily habit of people in the executive branch of government to go way beyond—or to feel their way, way beyond—what the law allows that person or that program to do. As Judge Kavanaugh has explained in numerous opinions, executive branch agencies may not assume more power than Congress has specifically granted them, and he has emphasized that judges may not surrender their duty to interpret laws to executive branch agencies. Now, that is pretty common sense for anybody who has had eighth grade civics, high school government, or political science classes in college, but it isn't something that all judges agree with.

The Senate Judiciary Committee will hold a hearing for Judge Kavanaugh's nomination in the coming weeks.

As I noted in my remarks to this body yesterday, liberal outside groups and Democratic leaders decided weeks ago to block whomever the President nominates. They are already pushing feeble arguments to cause needless delays. For example, some Democratic leaders and Democratic Members of the Senate who aren't leaders say that we shouldn't confirm a nominee nominated during a midterm election year. Where did they get that idea? The Senate has never operated the way they would suggest. Sitting Justices Breyer and Kagan—prominent examples that I can freely give to you but also numerous of their predecessors—were nominated and confirmed in midterm election years. Where do my colleagues get that idea, that just because this is a midterm election year, you can't take up these nominations? It happens that Kagan was approved in August 2010, as an example.

The American people see this argument for what it is—obstruction, pure

and simple. After all, Democratic leaders announced that they will oppose anyone nominated by President Trump—anyone. In fact, some Democratic Senators announced their opposition to Judge Kavanaugh mere minutes after the President nominated him. It is clear that a number of my Democratic colleagues have chosen the path of obstruction and resistance, not, as the Constitution offers, every Senator giving advice and consent.

We have a highly qualified nominee who has authored numerous influential judicial opinions. I stated how they have been respected even when those same cases got to the Supreme Court. Leading liberal law professor Akhil Reed Amar endorsed Judge Kavanaugh in the pages of the New York Times. But some of my colleagues can't even bring themselves to at least consider Judge Kavanaugh's nomination.

As I mentioned yesterday, liberal outside groups and their allies are trying to convince Senators to ask Judge Kavanaugh his views on specific cases and Supreme Court precedent. I want to emphasize that these questions are inappropriate. In greater detail, I said that yesterday.

Justice Ginsburg announced—a famous statement of hers—during her own confirmation hearing that a nominee should offer ''no hints, no forecasts, no previews'' of cases that can potentially come before the Court.

Maybe some of my colleagues think, well, if some are going to come in a couple of months after you are on the Court, why can't you give us your views on that? But they might be asking questions about something 10 years down the road, so how legitimate are the views? Are you going to overturn this President, or are you going to rule this particular way in a particular case?

We also have Justice Kagan declining to state her views on Roe v. Wade, saying: ''The application of Roe in future cases, and even its continued validity, are issues likely to come before the Court in the future.''

So you expect a Justice to look at the facts of a case, look at the law, or look at the Constitution, and leave their own personal views out of it, but you expect them to do it independent of anything they said in their hearing before the Judiciary Committee because nothing should be said there that is going to influence something 10 years down the road.

I expect that Judge Kavanaugh will likewise decline to comment on his views of particular cases decided by the Supreme Court.

I congratulate Judge Kavanaugh on this nomination. I had the opportunity to meet with Judge Kavanaugh earlier today. I know he looks forward to answering questions from my colleagues in the coming weeks. I look forward to hearing from him again when he appears before our Senate Judiciary Committee.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION BILL

Mr. INHOFE. First of all, Mr. President, we are about to go to conference. The first three votes here are very, very significant. They are considered to be maybe the most consequential votes of the year.

We have been working closely with the President on our John S. McCain National Defense Authorization Act. It is going to be a reality. We have done this through regular order in a very effective way. The Senate Armed Services Committee has been in concert with our combatant commanders, with Secretary Mattis, with the service chiefs, with the President. We have had a markup, our committee markup. We actually had over 300 amendments.

I am disturbed that we can't change this policy we have had for a long period of time that says that if one person on the floor objects when we are considering a bill—the NDAA, which we have considered successfully for 57 years—we are not going to be able to consider amendments. That is something we may want to address. To overcome that, we adopted 47 bipartisan amendments, both through the managers' package and the votes on the floor.

Tomorrow, we are going to hold our first big meeting of the conferees. I have been through a number of these in the past. This is where Members of the House and the Senate meet each other, talk about their issues, and talk about their successes and what they want to accomplish in this conference report. I have already visited with Ranking Member Senator REED, Chairman THORNBERRY, and Ranking Member SMITH, and we have a commitment to finish this conference report by the end of July. It is very ambitious. It is something we will be able to do.

The second vote we are going to have is to instruct the conferees in terms of the CFIUS issue. Personally, having recently been to China and the South China Sea, seeing what they are doing right now in northern Africa, in Djibouti—we have a different China than we had before. We are going to have to thoroughly review foreign transactions for national security concerns. I think Senator CORNYN is on the right track. I fully support his amendment.

The last one we will have is from Senator REED, and I think this is significant too. Our President has said several times—I have to say this. Not one President in my memory, Democratic or Republican, has been successful in getting our allies and NATO to carry their share of the burden. This President is getting very tough on that. I think the Reed motion to instruct conferees on NATO is one that will give him a lot of the force that he needs to impact these other countries.

If you take 29 countries—67 percent of our actual budget for our country is the entire amount for 29 countries. That isn't right. This is something we can change, and we will hopefully succeed in doing that during this conference we will have.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for 5 p.m. be moved to now.

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2019—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume legislative session.

VOTE ON COMPOUND MOTION

The question occurs on agreeing to the pending motion with respect to the House message to accompany H.R. 5515.

Mr. INHOFE. 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. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN).

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RUBIO). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 91, nays 8, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 147 Leg.]

YEAS—91

Alexander	Fischer	Murray
Baldwin	Flake	Nelson
Barrasso	Gardner	Perdue
Bennet	Graham	Peters
Blumenthal	Grassley	Portman
Blunt	Hassan	Reed
Booker	Hatch	Risch
Boozman	Heinrich	Roberts
Brown	Heitkamp	Rounds
Burr	Heller	Rubio
Cantwell	Hirono	Sasse
Capito	Hoeven	Schatz
Cardin	Hyde-Smith	Schumer
Carper	Inhofe	Scott
Casey	Isakson	Shaheen
Cassidy	Johnson	Shelby
Collins	Jones	Smith
Coons	Kaine	Stabenow
Corker	Kennedy	Sullivan
Cornyn	King	Tester
Cortez Masto	Klobuchar	Thune
Cotton	Lankford	Tillis
Crapo	Leahy	Toomey
Cruz	Lee	Udall
Daines	Manchin	Van Hollen
Donnelly	McCaskill	Warner
Duckworth	McConnell	Whitehouse
Durbin	Menendez	Wicker
Enzi	Moran	Young
Ernst	Murkowski	
Feinstein	Murphy	

NAYS—8

Gillibrand	Merkley	Warren
Harris	Paul	Wyden
Markey	Sanders	

NOT VOTING—1

McCain

The motion was agreed to.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I have at the desk a motion to instruct conferees, which I ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CORNYN] moves that the managers on the part of the Senate at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the Senate amendment to the bill H.R. 5515 be instructed to insist that the final conference report include language to maintain the position of the Senate regarding modernization of the Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States, as reflected in title XVII of the Senate amendment.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, this motion to instruct conferees for the Defense authorization bill is related to our reforms of the operation of the Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States.

It is no secret that China is weaponizing its investments in the United States to exploit national security vulnerabilities, including backdoor transfers of dual-use U.S. technology and related know-how.

I am delighted to be working with Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the Senator from California, on this issue. I thank our friend Senator INHOFE, who has taken a leadership role on the Armed Services Committee, and Senator CRAPO for the unanimous vote on the Banking Committee.

I yield to Senator INHOFE.

Mr. INHOFE. Just for one comment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I commend the Senator from Texas, Mr. CORNYN, for the effort he has put forth on a very difficult issue. I wholeheartedly agree with him.

I must say that this morning I received a phone call from Secretary Mattis, who strongly supports this and says we really need to have this.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the remaining votes in the series be 10 minutes in length, and I yield back the remaining time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I commend Senator CORNYN and Senator FEINSTEIN for their extraordinary work on this vital legislation and urge complete support.

I yield the floor, and I yield back all time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to instruct.

Mr. CORNYN. 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 senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 97, nays 2, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 148 Leg.]

YEAS—97

Alexander	Gardner	Nelson
Baldwin	Gillibrand	Perdue
Barrasso	Graham	Peters
Bennet	Grassley	Portman
Blumenthal	Harris	Reed
Blunt	Hassan	Risch
Booker	Hatch	Roberts
Boozman	Heinrich	Rounds
Brown	Heitkamp	Rubio
Burr	Heller	Sanders
Cantwell	Hirono	Sasse
Capito	Hoeven	Schatz
Cardin	Hyde-Smith	Schumer
Carper	Inhofe	Scott
Casey	Isakson	Shaheen
Cassidy	Johnson	Shelby
Collins	Jones	Smith
Coons	Kaine	Stabenow
Corker	Kennedy	Sullivan
Cornyn	King	Tester
Cortez Masto	Klobuchar	Thune
Cotton	Lankford	Tillis
Crapo	Leahy	Toomey
Cruz	Manchin	Udall
Daines	Markey	Van Hollen
Donnelly	McCaskill	Warner
Duckworth	McConnell	Warren
Durbin	Menendez	Whitehouse
Enzi	Merkley	Wicker
Ernst	Moran	Wyden
Feinstein	Murkowski	Young
Fischer	Murphy	
Flake	Murray	

NAYS—2

Lee	Paul

NOT VOTING—1

McCain

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I have a motion at the desk, and I ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. REED] moves that the managers on the part of the Senate at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the Senate amendment to the bill H.R. 5515 be instructed to—

(1) reaffirm the commitment of the United States to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) alliance as a community of freedom, peace, security, and shared values, including liberty, human rights, democracy, and the rule of law;

(2) reaffirm the ironclad commitment of the United States to its obligations under Article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty to the collective self-defense of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization alliance;

(3) establish as the policy of the United States pursuit of an integrated approach to strengthening the defense of allies and partners in Europe as part of a broader, long-term strategy using all elements of United States national power to deter and, if necessary, defeat Russian aggression;

(4) call on the Administration to urgently prioritize the completion of a comprehensive, whole-of-government strategy to counter malign activities of Russia that seek to undermine faith in democratic institutions in the United States and around the world, and to submit that strategy to Congress without delay; and

(5) reflect the support of the United States for the rules-based international order that has ensured, and will continue to promote, an international system that benefits all nations, and for deepening and expanding alliances and partnerships to jointly work with one another on shared challenges in Europe and the Indo-Pacific Region and throughout the world.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, this would instruct the conferees of the National Defense Authorization Act conference to support our traditional relationship with NATO, reaffirm our commitment to work with them, recognize their work with us as they deploy personnel in Afghanistan, as they deploy personnel to training missions in Iraq, and, as members of NATO armed forces, have given their lives to help us in Afghanistan. It recognizes our traditional, long-term support for NATO, and it looks forward to continued support.

I urge adoption.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I agree with the Senator from Rhode Island.

I would like to say that there are 29 members of NATO. Of the 29 countries, if you take all of their defense budgets and add them together, the United States' defense dollars equal about 67 percent of that.

I believe this is sending the right message to let them know that we appreciate them—that is, our partners in NATO—but also that our President has made a very strong pitch that each one of them come up with 2 percent for their commitment, and they have not done it. I think the President needs to have our support. I think this does add legitimacy to that request.

I believe that burden-sharing has always been a problem. We have never been able to do it under Republican or Democrat Presidents, and this, maybe, is the time that we can get it done.

I support this motion.

Mr. REED. 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 question is on agreeing to the motion to instruct.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN).

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DAINES). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 97, nays 2, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 149 Leg.]

YEAS—97

Alexander	Gardner	Nelson
Baldwin	Gillibrand	Perdue
Barrasso	Graham	Peters
Bennet	Grassley	Portman
Blumenthal	Harris	Reed
Blunt	Hassan	Risch
Booker	Hatch	Roberts
Boozman	Heinrich	Rounds
Brown	Heitkamp	Rubio
Burr	Heller	Sanders
Cantwell	Hirono	Sasse
Capito	Hoeven	Schatz
Cardin	Hyde-Smith	Schumer
Carper	Inhofe	Scott
Casey	Isakson	Shaheen
Cassidy	Johnson	Shelby
Collins	Jones	Smith
Coons	Kaine	Stabenow
Corker	Kennedy	Sullivan
Cornyn	King	Tester
Cortez Masto	Klobuchar	Thune
Cotton	Lankford	Tillis
Crapo	Leahy	Toomey
Cruz	Manchin	Udall
Daines	Markey	Van Hollen
Donnelly	McCaskill	Warner
Duckworth	McConnell	Warren
Durbin	Menendez	Whitehouse
Enzi	Merkley	Wicker
Ernst	Moran	Wyden
Feinstein	Murkowski	Young
Fischer	Murphy	
Flake	Murray	

NAYS—2

Lee	Paul

NOT VOTING—1

McCain

The motion was agreed to.

The Presiding Officer appointed Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. WICKER, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. COTTON, Mr. ROUNDS, Mrs. ERNST, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. SASSE, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. REED, Mr. NELSON, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. DONNELLY, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. KAINE, Mr. KING, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. WARREN, Mr. PETERS, and Mr. BROWN conferees on the part of the Senate.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now resume executive session.

The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 15 minutes as in morning business.

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

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, this past year and half of the Trump administration has been a constant, daily barrage of scandal, corruption, and chaotic incompetence. In this environment, the Senate now considers the President's controversial nomination of Brian Benczkowski to lead the Criminal Division of the U.S. Department of Justice. It has been over a year since Benczkowski was first nominated, and there have been repeated calls for his nomination to be withdrawn.

Why this man, for this job, at this time? There is a very good chance that something fishy is happening here. The warning signals of something fishy should be evident to Democratic and Republican Senators alike.

The obvious question is whether President Trump and his political or legal team are using this appointment to sneak a fast one by the American people and put themselves in a position to interfere, from the inside, with the Department of Justice investigation into the dealings between Russia and the Trump campaign—the so-called Mueller investigation, though it has expanded beyond Bob Mueller into several other parts of the Department of Justice.

How would this fast one work exactly? We will be voting tomorrow to install a Trump ally and nominee—a longtime political operative with ties to a Russian bank and to the recused Attorney General Jeff Sessions—into one of the most powerful posts at the Department of Justice, a position that just so happens to have significant supervisory control over Special Counsel Mueller's investigation and the criminal investigation of the Southern District of New York into Trump's personal lawyer, Michael Cohen. What could possibly go wrong?

Remember, we are dealing with a President who remains the subject of an ongoing criminal investigation by the Department of Justice. We are dealing with a President who repeatedly violates longstanding rules and norms in his continuing effort to interfere with that investigation. We are dealing with a President who has told the press he believes he has ''absolute control'' over the Department of Justice and who repeatedly criticizes Attorney General Sessions' recusal from the Russian interference investigation as insufficiently ''loyal.''

We are dealing with a President who appears to have actively interfered in the Department's investigations into Michael Flynn, who insisted on ''loyalty'' from his FBI Director, and who admitted that firing that FBI Director was to ease pressure over what he called ''the Russia thing.''

We know all of this in the Senate, often from this President's own mouth and his own tweets. With that backdrop from the Oval Office for this nomination, extra caution is warranted to be sure we are not being led into trouble.

Worse still, it is not just the President who is up to no good with respect to the ongoing criminal investigation. Republicans in the House—I suspect hand in hand with the White House and legal team—are pressing their smear campaign against Deputy Attorney General Rosenstein, seeming to want to kneecap the independence of the Mueller investigation and get access to its confidential investigative files.

As a former U.S. attorney, I recoil from the notion that a legislative body wants to peek over the shoulders of prosecutors in an ongoing investigation, particularly when those legislators are so closely allied with the subject of that investigation.

Against that added backdrop of House interference, the Senate is being asked to install a Trump loyalist into a key position of authority and control over the Russia-Trump collusion investigation. Even more caution is warranted for this nomination, given the behavior of the House.

Why this man, for this job, at this time? Why Benczkowski? Let's review. He is nominated to be the Chief of the Criminal Division, a critically important office within the Department of Justice. He will oversee nearly 700 career prosecutors who are some of the most talented and experienced lawyers in the country. Criminal Division lawyers prosecute nationally significant cases, from high-profile public corruption to child exploitation, to complicated money laundering and international organized crime cases.

One thing that is obvious—that is obvious—is that Mr. Benczkowski brings astoundingly weak qualifications to that task. Given the stakes and the complexity of the Criminal Division's work, you would expect someone leading the Division who had years of experience as a prosecutor, who had tried cases to a verdict—someone who knew the ins and outs of the Division's work and knew his way around Federal courtrooms.

To say that Benczkowski lacks this experience is putting it mildly. He may be the weakest candidate ever put forward in the history of the Department to oversee the Criminal Division. He is probably not hirable into the career positions he will oversee. The man has less courtroom time than the average citizen who has sat on a jury. He has never tried a case of any sort, criminal or civil, State or Federal. He has never argued a motion—something most litigators have done in their first years out of law school. He has never worked as a prosecutor. His stints at the Department of Justice were never as a practicing lawyer but always on the political side. In his whole career, he told the Senate, he could only come up with one or two times he ever entered a courtroom on what he called ''routine scheduling or other matters.''

So it is not Benczkowski's experience or qualifications that are the reasons for his appointment. If qualifications and experience are not the reasons for his appointment, why put this prosecutorial neophyte into one of the most powerful, important prosecutorial positions at the Department of Justice? What, one might ask, is the motive? What do we know?

Although serious questions remain unanswered by the Department of Justice and by Mr. Benczkowski, we know from our correspondence with the Department that the Russia-Trump collusion investigation is being run under Department of Justice procedures that require approvals by the Criminal Division for a wide array of investigative and prosecutorial steps. As the U.S. attorney for Rhode Island, I used to have

to work with the Department of Justice and go through those approvals and those steps. The Mueller investigation and the Cohen investigation in the Southern District of New York are both subject to those same rules. That gives Mr. Benczkowski, if he is confirmed, not just a window into the Russia-Trump collusion investigation but the ability to actually interfere.

What else we know about Mr. Benczkowski is that he was a longtime political operative here in the Senate, on the Senate Judiciary Committee, where he worked as staff director for none other than Senator Jeff Sessions. Well, Attorney General Jeff Sessions has recused himself from the Russia-Trump collusion investigation. It is therefore an obvious question, if this person brings no experience as a prosecutor but plenty of experience as a close political operative for Jeff Sessions, whether that close political relationship is the reason.

That, in turn, presents the obvious question: Since Benczkowski is not there for his experience or for his qualifications, is he being installed as some kind of back channel, either as a trusted intermediary to get information to Attorney General Sessions around his recusal from this investigation perhaps or perhaps, in a worst-case scenario, to be a pipeline to Trump and his lawyers of confidential investigative information—the kind of information that House Republicans are trying to get their hands on? Maybe it is simply to jam the bureaucratic gears whenever Robert Mueller seeks approvals from the Criminal Division.

These are not easy questions, but there is an easy answer to these questions, and that easy answer is, don't worry, Mr. Benczkowski will be fully recused from that investigation. But the Department and Mr. Benczkowski won't say that. There have been no meaningful answers to these questions. Why won't they just say he will be recused? That should be easy.

It gets weirder. Benczkowski has his own Russia-Trump angle. After the election, with his old boss Sessions tapped to become Attorney General, Benczkowski volunteered for the Trump transition team, leading the so-called landing team at DOJ. It was on his way out the door from that role, heading back to his law firm, that Benczkowski told Sessions he was interested in securing a political appointment in the Department of Justice.

Scroll forward 2 months to March of 2017, when Benczkowski got a call from one of his law partners. The firm was representing the Russian Alfa Bank against allegations that Alfa Bank was serving as a back channel to the Trump organization. Alfa Bank is one of Russia's largest banks, and its owners reportedly have longstanding ties to Vladimir Putin. The partner wanted to know whether Benczkowski—fresh off the Trump Department of Justice transition team—could help the Russian bank. Benczkowski joined the firm's Alfa Bank legal team.

The next month, in April of 2017, Benczkowski was contacted by the Attorney General's office to ask whether he would like this job to head up the Department's Criminal Division. Press reports as early as May 4 indicated that Benczkowski was likely to be tapped for this Criminal Division job. Surely a person of sound judgment at this point would have stopped representing a Russian bank that might be under DOJ investigation for secret ties to the President. Surely. But no. Rather than withdraw from his representation, Benczkowski expanded his portfolio with Alfa Bank to review the now famous and widely verified Steele dossier.

The Steele dossier has been a feature not only in the Russia-Trump collusion investigation, it has also been a feature of Republican political efforts to discredit and besmirch the collusion investigation.

Benczkowski's new portfolio was to advise whether Alfa Bank, the Russian bank, should file a defamation suit against publisher BuzzFeed for disclosing the Steele dossier, which Alfa Bank subsequently did in New York State court.

There is more. Benczkowski's nomination to this position triggered confirmation obligations to disclose information to the Senate Judiciary Committee about his background, publications, and clients. This client was a Putin-tied Russian bank, and Benczkowski's work related to the red-hot Steele dossier. So obviously he disclosed this client relationship—actually, not. Benczkowski's Senate Judiciary questionnaire included no mention whatsoever of the Russian bank. Only when Democratic Senators reviewed Benczkowski's confidential FBI background report did questions arise about his relationship with Alfa Bank and his review of the Steele dossier for this Russian client. Benczkowski explained the troubling omission, telling us that he had been forbidden by his firm's confidentiality agreement from disclosing his work for Alfa Bank.

Some people would have thought his obligations of disclosure to the Senate mattered more than obligations of nondisclosure to such a client. These disclosure issues are customarily waived by clients in these circumstances or the nominee can withdraw. You don't just fail to list such a client, but that is what he did.

Mr. Benczkowski was voted out of the Judiciary Committee on a party-line vote a year ago. Now, with the Russia-Trump investigation heating up, with significant new potential cooperating witnesses, and with millions of pages of new documents available to the Department of Justice from Michael Cohen, now Republicans bring this nomination forward. Particularly this week, when the country has turned its focus to the Supreme Court announcement—an announcement obviously likely to dominate the news cycle—this bizarre nomination gets called up for a vote. It is almost as if they don't want people watching while this happens.

This is a nomination that should fail on qualifications alone. In the long history of the Department of Justice, there has never been so unqualified a nominee, in my view. In the name of the 700 career prosecutors in the Criminal Division who deserve an experienced and capable leader at their helm, in the name of the crime victims our criminal laws and their enforcement are intended to protect, I urge my colleagues to vote no just on qualifications. But this goes beyond an unqualified nominee; this is a nominee exhibiting a flashing array of warnings that there may be mischief afoot here. No Senator should take this vote unaware of these obvious warnings. Why somebody so unqualified? Why somebody so politically connected to the Attorney General? Why right now, right in the middle of constant interference by President Trump and his legal team and constant interference by House Republicans with this investigation? Now we put someone in who won't say he will recuse himself, who will have a window into this investigation, who will have the power to interfere with this investigation? That seems like a lot to let pass.

In the name of the integrity and independence of the Department of Justice, Senators should vote no because of the contamination risk Mr. Benczkowski poses even if he were qualified for the post. This combination of lack of qualification—a flagrant, flat-out unqualified nominee—and the risk of contamination in an environment in which there are abundant political efforts to interfere with this investigation—that is a combination no Senator ought to accept—not for this man, not for this job, not at this time.

If mischief is afoot and if these dark prospects should come to pass, Senators, we will have been warned. We will have been warned.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the provisions of rule XXII, all postcloture time on Executive Calendar No. 639 be considered expired at 2 p.m. tomorrow and the Senate immediately vote on the nomination; that if confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table and the President be immediately

notified of the Senate's action; and that following disposition of the nomination, the Senate vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the Ney nomination.

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume 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.

ARMS SALES NOTIFICATION

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act requires that Congress receive prior notification of certain proposed arms sales as defined by that statute. Upon such notification, the Congress has 30 calendar days during which the sale may be reviewed. The provision stipulates that, in the Senate, the notification of proposed sales shall be sent to the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

In keeping with the committee's intention to see that relevant information is available to the full Senate, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the notifications which have been received. If the cover letter references a classified annex, then such annex is available to all Senators in the office of the Foreign Relations Committee, room SD–423.

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

DEFENSE SECURITY COOPERATION AGENCY,
Arlington, VA.

Hon. BOB CORKER,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, we are forwarding herewith Transmittal No. 18–03, concerning the Air Force's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance to the Government of the United Kingdom for defense articles and services estimated to cost $650 million. After this letter is delivered to your office, we plan to issue a news release to notify the public of this proposed sale.

Sincerely,

CHARLES W. HOOPER,
Lieutenant General, USA, Director.

Enclosures.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 18–03

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended

(i) Prospective Purchaser: The Government of the United Kingdom.

(ii) Total Estimated Value:
Major Defense Equipment* $600 million.
Other $50 million.
Total $650 million.

(iii) Description and Quantity or Quantities of Articles or Services under Consideration for Purchase:
Major Defense Equipment (MDE):
Up to two hundred (200) AIM–120D Advanced Medium-Range Air-to-Air Missiles (AMRAAMs).
Non-MDE:
Also included in this sale are missile containers; weapon system support equipment; support and test equipment; site survey; transportation; repair and return support; warranties; spare and repair parts; publications and technical documentation; maintenance and personnel training; training equipment; U.S. Government and contractor engineering, logistics, and technical support services; and other related elements of logistics and program support.

(iv) Military Department: Air Force (UK–D–YAM).

(v) Prior Related Cases, if any: UK–D–YAL, 6 Sep 17.

(vi) Sales Commission, Fee, etc., Paid, Offered, or Agreed to be Paid: None.

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology Contained in the Defense Article or Defense Services Proposed to be Sold: See Attached Annex.

(viii) Date Report Delivered to Congress: July 10, 2018.

*As defined in Section 47(6) of the Arms Export Control Act.

POLICY JUSTIFICATION

United Kingdom—AIM–120D Advanced Medium Range Air-to-Air Missile (AMRAAM)

The Government of the United Kingdom has requested to buy up to two hundred (200) AIM–120D Advanced Medium Range Air-to-Air Missiles (AMRAAMs). Also included in this sale are missile containers; weapon system support equipment; support and test equipment; site survey; transportation; repair and return support; warranties; spare and repair parts; publications and technical documentation; maintenance and personnel training; training equipment; U.S. Government and contractor engineering, logistics, and technical support services; and other related elements of logistics and program support. The estimated cost of the overall possible sale is $650 million.

The proposed sale will support the foreign policy and national security policies of the United States by helping to improve the security of a NATO ally which has been, and continues to be, an important partner on critical foreign policy and defense issues.

The proposed sale will improve the Royal Air Force's aircraft capabilities for mutual defense, regional security, force modernization, and U.S. and NATO interoperability. This sale will enhance the Royal Air Force's ability to defend the United Kingdom against future threats and contribute to future NATO operations. The United Kingdom will have no difficulty absorbing these missiles into its armed forces.

The proposed sale of this equipment will not alter the basic military balance in the region.

The principal contractor will be Raytheon Missile Systems Company, Tucson, AZ. At this time, there are no known offset agreements proposed in connection with this potential sale.

Implementation of this proposed sale will not require the assignment of any additional U.S. Government or contractor representatives to the United Kingdom.

There will be no adverse impact on U.S. defense readiness as a result of this proposed sale.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 18–03

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act

Annex Item No. vii

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology:

1. The AIM–120D Advanced Medium Range Air-to-Air Missiles (AMRAAM) is a guided missile featuring digital technology and micro-miniature solid-state electronics. AMRAAM capabilities include look-down/shoot-down, multiple launches against multiple targets, resistance to electronic countermeasures, and interception of high- and low-flying and maneuvering targets. The AMRAAM is classified CONFIDENTIAL, major components and subsystems range from UNCLASSIFIED to CONFIDENTIAL, and technical data and other documentation are classified up to SECRET.

2. The AIM–120D AMRAAM hardware, including the missile guidance section, is classified CONFIDENTIAL. State-of-the-art technology is used in the missile to provide it with unique beyond-visual-range capability. The increase in capability from the AIM–120C–7 to AIM–120D consists of a two-way data link, a more accurate navigation unit, improved High-Angle Off-Boresight (HOBS) capability, and enhanced aircraft-to-missile position handoff.

3. AIM–120D features a target detection device with embedded electronic countermeasures, and an electronics unit within the guidance section that performs all radar signal processing, midcourse and terminal guidance, flight control, target detection, and warhead burst point determination.

4. If a technologically advanced adversary obtains knowledge of the specific hardware and software elements, the information could be used to develop countermeasures or equivalent systems that might reduce weapon system effectiveness or be used in the development of a system with similar or advanced capabilities.

5. A determination has been made that the Government of the United Kingdom can provide substantially the same degree of protection for the sensitive technology being released as the U.S. Government. This proposed sale is necessary to the furtherance of the U.S. foreign policy and national security objectives outlined in the policy justification.

6. All defense articles and services listed in this transmittal are authorized for release and export to the Government of the United Kingdom.

DEFENSE SECURITY COOPERATION AGENCY,
Arlington, VA.

Hon. BOB CORKER,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, we are forwarding herewith Transmittal No. 18–24, concerning the Air Force's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance to the Kingdom of Denmark for defense articles and services estimated to cost $90 million. After this letter is delivered to your office, we plan to issue a news release to notify the public of this proposed sale.

Sincerely,

CHARLES W. HOOPER,
Lieutenant General, USA, Director.

Enclosures.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 18–24

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended

(i) Prospective Purchaser: Kingdom of Denmark.

(ii) Total Estimated Value:
Major Defense Equipment * $75 million.
Other $15 million.
Total $90 million.

(iii) Description and Quantity or Quantities of Articles or Services under Consideration for Purchase:

Major Defense Equipment (MDE):

Twenty-eight (28) AIM–120 C–7 Advanced Medium Range Air-to-Air Missiles (AMRAAM).

One (1) AMRAAM Spare Guidance Section.

Non-MDE:

Also included are missile containers, control section spares, weapon systems support, test equipment, spare and repair parts, publications and technical documentation, personnel training, training equipment, U.S. Government and contractor engineering, logistics, and technical support services, and other related elements of logistics and program support.

(iv) Military Department: Air Force (DE–D–YAO).

(v) Prior Related Cases, if any: DE–D–YAS (AIM–120B).

(vi) Sales Commission, Fee, etc., Paid, Offered, or Agreed to be Paid: None.

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology Contained in the Defense Article or Defense Services Proposed to be Sold: See Attached Annex.

(viii) Date Report Delivered to Congress: July 10, 2018.

*As defined in Section 47(6) of the Arms Export Control Act.

POLICY JUSTIFICATION

Denmark—AIM–120 C–7 Advanced Medium Range Air-to-Air Missile (AMRAAM)

The Government of Denmark has requested to buy twenty-eight (28) AIM–120 C–7 Advanced Medium Range Air-to-Air Missiles (AMRAAM) and one (1) AMRAAM spare guidance section. Also included are missile containers, control section spares, weapon systems support, test equipment, spare and repair parts, publications and technical documentation, personnel training, training equipment, U.S. Government and contractor engineering, logistics, and technical support services, and other related elements of logistics and program support. The total estimated program cost is $90 million.

This proposed sale will contribute to the foreign policy and national security of the United States by helping to improve the security of a NATO ally that is an important force for political stability and economic progress in the European region.

This proposed sale would support Denmark's F–16 and future F–35 fighter programs and enhance Denmark's ability to provide for its own territorial defense and support coalition operations. The proposed sale also enables interoperability and standardization between the armed forces of Denmark and the United States. Denmark already maintains the AIM–120B in its inventory and will have no difficulty absorbing this additional equipment and support into its armed forces.

The proposed sale of these systems and equipment will not alter the basic military balance in the region.

The principal contractor will be Raytheon Cooperation in Tucson, Arizona. The purchaser has requested offsets. At this time, agreements are undetermined and will be defined in negotiations between the purchaser and contractor.

Implementation of this proposed sale will not require the assignment of any additional U.S. Government or contractor representatives to Denmark.

There will be no adverse impact on U.S. defense readiness as a result of this proposed sale.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 18–24

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act

Annex Item No. vii

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology:

1. AIM–120C Advance Medium Range Air-to-Air (AMRAAM) is a radar-guided missile featuring digital technology and micro-miniature solid-state electronics. AMRAAM capabilities include look-down/shoot-down, multiple launches against multiple targets, resistance to electronic counter measures, and interception of high flying and low flying and maneuvering targets. The AMRAAM All Up Round is classified CONFIDENTIAL, major components and subsystems range from UNCLASSIFIED to CONFIDENTIAL, and technology data and other documentation are classified up to SECRET.

2. If a technologically advanced adversary were to obtain knowledge of the hardware and software elements, the information could be used to develop countermeasures or equivalent systems which might reduce system effectiveness or be used in the development of a system with similar or advanced capabilities.

3. A determination has been made that Denmark can provide substantially the same degree of protection for the sensitive technology being released as the U.S. Government. This sale is necessary in furtherance of the U.S. foreign policy and national security objectives outlined in the Policy Justification.

4. All defense articles and services listed in this transmittal have been authorized for release and export to Denmark.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO JULIETTE C. HAMILL

● Ms. HASSAN. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize and extend my sincerest congratulations and happy birthday wishes to Juliette C. Hamill, who celebrates her 100th birthday on July 10.

Juliette was born and raised in Manchester, NH, the same city where she resides today. She worked as a legal secretary, as well as a Federal housing authority, before retiring.

Juliette and her husband, Warren, were married for 45 years before he passed away in 2001. During the course of their marriage, they visited all the continental U.S. State capitals on road trips. While the couple spent most of their years in New Hampshire, they also briefly lived in New York, California, Ohio, and Nebraska.

Together, Juliette and Warren raised four children: Theresa McKenney, Warren G. Hamill, Catherine Mary Burge, and Gary C. Hamill. Juliette also has 9 grandchildren and 10 great-grandchildren, whom she loves deeply.

Today Juliette is an active member of her churches: St. Marie's Catholic Church and St. Catherine's Catholic Church.

Mr. President, I hope you join me, Juliette's friends and family, and many people in the city of Manchester and across the Granite State in wishing Juliette C. Hamill a very happy 100th birthday.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

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

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

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH) announced that on July 9, 2018, he had signed the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, which were previously signed by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MCHENRY) of the House:

H.R. 770. An act to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in recognition of American innovation and significant innovation and pioneering efforts of individuals or groups from each of the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and the United States territories, to promote the importance of innovation in the United States, the District of Columbia, and the United States territories, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2061. An act to reauthorize the North Korean Human Rights Act of 2004, and for other purposes.

S.J. Res 60. Joint resolution providing for the reappointment of Barbara M. Barrett as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

At 12:31 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MCHENRY) has signed the following enrolled bills:

H.R. 1496. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 3585 South Vermont Avenue in Los Angeles, California, as the ''Marvin Gaye Post Office''.

H.R. 2673. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 514 Broadway Street in Pekin, Illinois, as the ''Lance Corporal Jordan S. Bastean Post Office''.

H.R. 3183. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 13683 James Madison Highway in Palmyra, Virginia, as the ''U.S. Navy Seaman Dakota Kyle Rigsby Post Office''.

H.R. 4301. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 201 Tom Hall Street in Fort Mill, South Carolina, as the ''J. Elliott Williams Post Office Building''.

H.R. 4406. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 99 Macombs Place in New York, New York, as the ''Tuskegee Airmen Post Office Building''.

H.R. 4463. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 6 Doyers Street in New York, New York, as the ''Mabel Lee Memorial Post Office''.

H.R. 4574. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 108 West Schick Road in Bloomingdale, Illinois, as the ''Bloomingdale Veterans Memorial Post Office Building''.

H.R. 4646. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1900 Corporate Drive in Birmingham, Alabama, as the ''Lance Corporal Thomas E. Rivers, Jr. Post Office Building''.

H.R. 4685. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 515 Hope Street in Bristol, Rhode Island, as the ''First Sergeant P. Andrew McKenna Jr. Post Office''.

H.R. 4722. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 111 Market Street in Saugerties, New York, as the ''Maurice D. Hinchey Post Office Building''.

H.R. 4840. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 567 East Franklin Street in Oviedo, Florida, as the ''Sergeant First Class Alwyn Crendall Cashe Post Office Building''.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

At 5:10 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MITCHELL) has signed the following enrolled bills:

H.R. 219. An act to correct the Swan Lake hydroelectric project survey boundary and to provide for the conveyance of the remaining tract of land within the corrected survey boundary to the State of Alaska.

H.R. 220. An act to authorize the expansion of an existing hydroelectric project, and for other purposes.

H.R. 446. An act to extend the deadline for commencement of construction of a hydroelectric project.

H.R. 447. An act to extend the deadline for commencement of construction of a hydroelectric project.

H.R. 951. An act to extend the deadline for commencement of construction of a hydroelectric project.

H.R. 2122. An act to reinstate and extend the deadline for commencement of construction of a hydroelectric project involving Jennings Randolph Dam.

H.R. 2292. An act to extend a project of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission involving the Cannonsville Dam.

H.R. 5956. An act to incentivize the hiring of United States workers in the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, July 10, 2018, she had presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled joint resolution:

S.J. Res. 60. Joint resolution providing for the reappointment of Barbara M. Barrett as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC–5803. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting the report of five (5) officers authorized to wear the insignia of the grade of rear admiral or rear admiral (lower half) in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–5804. A communication from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report on the approved retirement of Vice Admiral Herman A. Shelanski, United States Navy, and his advancement to the grade of vice admiral on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–5805. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting a report on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Edward C. Cardon, United States Army, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–5806. A communication from the Executive Assistant to the Director of Army Financial Services, Department of the Army, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Military Pay Certificates'' ((RIN0702–AA91) (32 CFR Part 538)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 2, 2018; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–5807. A communication from the Alternate Federal Register Liaison Officer, Office of the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''National Security Education Program (NSEP) Grants to Institutions of Higher Education'' (RIN0790–AJ93) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 28, 2018; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–5808. A communication from the Sanctions Regulations Advisor, Office of Foreign Assets Control, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Removal of the Sudanese Sanctions Regulations and Amendment of the Terrorism List Government Sanctions Regulations'' (31 CFR Parts 538 and 596) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 28, 2018; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–5809. A communication from the Sanctions Regulations Advisor, Office of Foreign Assets Control, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Global Magnitsky Sanctions Regulations'' (31 CFR Part 583) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 26, 2018; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–5810. A communication from the General Counsel of the National Credit Union Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Involuntary Liquidation of Federal Credit Unions and Claims Procedures'' (RIN3133–AE82) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 6, 2018; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–5811. A communication from the Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Inline XBRL Filing of Tagged Data'' (RIN3235–AL59) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 2, 2018; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–5812. A communication from the Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendments to Smaller Reporting Company Definition'' (RIN3235–AL90) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 2, 2018; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–5813. A communication from the Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Investment Company Liquidity Disclosure'' (RIN3235–AM30) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 2, 2018; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–5814. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Air Plan Approval; California; Eastern Kern Air Pollution Control District; Reclassification'' (FRL No. 9980–48–Region 9) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 2, 2018; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–5815. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Colorado; Regional Haze State Implementation Plan'' (FRL No. 9980–13–Region 8) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 2, 2018; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–5816. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality State Implementation Plans; California; Chico Redesignation Request and Maintenance Plan for the 2006 24-hour PM2.5 Standard'' (FRL No. 9980–49–Region 9) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 2, 2018; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–5817. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Oklahoma; Interstate Transport Requirements for the 2012 PM2.5 NAAQS'' (FRL No. 9979–96–Region 6) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 2, 2018; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–5818. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Interstate Transport Prongs 1 and 2 for the 2012 Fine Particulate Matter (PM2.5) Standard for Colorado, Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota and Wyoming'' (FRL No. 9980–12–Region 8) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 2, 2018; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–5819. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Remaining Requirements for Mercury and Air Toxics Standards (MATS) Electronic Reporting Requirements'' (FRL No. 9980–41–OAR) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 2, 2018; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–5820. A communication from the Director of Congressional Affairs, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Consolidated Guidance About Materials Licenses: Program-Specific Guidance About Exempt Distribution Licenses'' (NUREG–1556, Volume 8, Revision 1) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 29, 2018; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–5821. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulations and Reports Clearance, Social Security Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule

entitled ''Rules of Conduct and Standards of Responsibility for Appointed Representatives'' (RIN0960–AH63) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 2, 2018; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–5822. A communication from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the Case-Zablocki Act, 1 U.S.C. 112b, as amended, the report of the texts and background statements of international agreements, other than treaties (List 2018–0113–2018–0124); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–5823. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a petition to add workers who were employed at the Feed Materials Production Center in Fernald, Ohio, to the Special Exposure Cohort; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–5824. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a petition to add workers who were employed at the Grand Junction Facilities in Grand Junction, Colorado, to the Special Exposure Cohort; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–5825. A communication from the Deputy White House Liaison, Department of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, two (2) reports relative to vacancies in the Department of Education, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 6, 2018; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–5826. A communication from the Deputy Assistant General Counsel for the Division of Regulatory Services, Office of the Chief Privacy Officer, Department of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Technical Assistance on Student Privacy for State and Local Educational Agencies When Administering College Admissions Examinations'' received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 3, 2018; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–5827. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Services, Office of Postsecondary Education, Department of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Program Integrity and Improvement'' (RIN1840–AD39) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 29, 2018; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–5828. A communication from the Director of the Directorate of Standards and Guidance, Occupational Safety and Health Administration, Department of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Revising the Beryllium Standard for General Industry'' (RIN1218–AB76) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 3, 2018; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–5829. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for General Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Deputy Administrator, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 6, 2018; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–5830. A communication from the Chief of the Border Security Regulations Branch, Customs and Border Protection, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Elimination of Nonimmigrant Visa Exemption for Certain Caribbean Residents Coming to the United States as H–2A Agricultural Workers'' (RIN1651–AB09) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 3, 2018; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–5831. A communication from the Regulation Policy Development Coordinator, Office of Regulation Policy and Management, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Medical Care in Foreign Countries and Filing for Reimbursement for Community Care Not Previously Authorized by VA'' (RIN2900–AP55) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 29, 2018; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. THUNE, from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 2202. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to authorize appropriations for the National Transportation Safety Board, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 115–293).

By Mr. BARRASSO, from the Committee on Environment and Public Works:

Report to accompany S. 2800, a bill to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct various projects for improvements to rivers and harbors of the United States, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 115–294).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. CORKER for the Committee on Foreign Relations.

*Randy W. Berry, of Colorado, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Federal Democratic Republic of Nepal.

Nominee: Randy W. Berry.

Post: Ambassador to Nepal.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

1. Self: $500, 9/30/16, Hillary for America; $250, 9/30/16, Hillary Victory Fund.

2. Spouse: Pravesh Singh: $558, 9/30/16, Hillary for America; $308, 9/30/16, Hillary Victory Fund.

3. Child: Arya Berry-Singh: None; Child: Alexander Berry-Singh: None.

4. Father: Russell Berry: None; Mother: Eunice Berry: None.

5. Grandfather: Charles Berry—Deceased; Grandmother: Hattie Berry—Deceased; Grandfather: Harry Atwood—Deceased; Grandmother: Margaret Atwood—Deceased.

6. Sister: Rhonda Patterson: None; Spouse: Gary Patterson: None; Sister: Rita Wilson: None; Spouse: Scott Wilson: None.

---

*Donald Lu, of California, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kyrgyz Republic.

Nominee: Donald Lu.

Post: U.S. Embassy Bishkek, Kyrgyzstan.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

1. Self: none.

2. Spouse: Ariel C. Ahart: none.

3. Children and Spouses: Kipling I. Lu: none; Aliya A. Lu: none.

4. Parents: Allena F. Kaplan, none; David S. Lu—deceased.

5. Grandparents: Abbie Fong—deceased; Allen Fong—deceased; Paternal Grandfather—deceased; Paternal Grandmother—deceased.

6. Brothers and Spouses: Gene Lu, none; Terry Lu, none; William Hart, none; Julie Hart, none.

7. Sisters and Spouses: Bonnie Morgan, none; Doug Morgan, none.

---

*Alaina B. Teplitz, of Colorado, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Democratic Socialist Republic of Sri Lanka, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Maldives.

Nominee: Alaina B. Teplitz.

Post: The Democratic Socialist Republic of Sri Lanka and the Republic of Maldives.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

1. Self: None.

2. Spouse: None.

3. Children and Spouses: Maximilien H. Mellott: $75.00, 2017, Mari Manoogian; Miles F. Mellott: None.

4. Parents: Marsha J. Neece; Jack B. Teplitz, see attached; Marcella B. Teplitz, see attached—jointly with Jack B. Teplitz.

5. Grandparents: Janet Teplitz—deceased; Henry Teplitz—deceased; Janis Freeman—deceased; Thomas Freeman—deceased.

6. Brothers and Spouses: Nathan B. Teplitz, None.

7. Sisters and Spouses: n/a.

Attachment: Campaign Contributions for Jack and Marcella Teplitz 2013–2017

2013: 01/31/13, Chuck Grayeb for Council (Peoria City Council), $200.00.

Total 2013: $200.00.

2014: 08/07/14, ActBlue*Cheri Bustos (US Rep from IL), $50.00.

Total 2014: $50.00.

2015: 04/12/15, HILLARY FOR AMERICA 6468541432 NY, $25.00.

Total 2015: $25.00.

2016: 10/19/16, Chuck Grayeb for Council, $100.00; 11/03/16, HILLARY FOR AMERICA—NEW YORK CITY, NY, $100.00.

Total 2016: $200.00.

2017: 02/12/17, Friends of Sid Ruckriegel, $100.00.

Total 2017: $100.00.

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, for the Committee on Foreign Relations I report favorably the following nomination lists which were printed in the

RECORDs on the dates indicated, and ask unanimous consent, to save the expense of reprinting on the Executive Calendar that these nominations lie at the Secretary's desk for the information of Senators.

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

*Foreign Service nominations beginning with Polly Catherine Dunford-Zahar and ending with William M. Patterson, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 9, 2018. (minus 1 nominee: Tanya S. Urquieta)

*Foreign Service nominations beginning with Sandillo Banerjee and ending with Robert Peaslee, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 9, 2018. (minus 1 nominee: Dao Le)

*Foreign Service nomination of Peter A. Malnak.

By Mr. ISAKSON for the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

*Robert L. Wilkie, of North Carolina, to be Secretary of Veterans Affairs.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

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. SCHUMER:

S. 3187. A bill to authorize veterans service organizations to solicit donations at post offices before and after Federal holidays; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. KAINE):

S. 3188. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit gay and trans panic defenses; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

S. 3189. A bill to exclude the discharge of certain Federal student loans from the calculation of gross income; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. LEE (for himself, Mr. CRUZ, and Mr. RUBIO):

S. 3190. A bill to empower States with authority for most taxing and spending for highway programs and mass transit programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. JONES (for himself, Mrs. MCCASKILL, and Ms. HARRIS):

S. 3191. A bill to provide for the expeditious disclosure of records related to civil rights cold cases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. PERDUE (for himself, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. COTTON, Mr. INHOFE, and Mr. LEE):

S. Res. 570. A resolution emphasizing the importance of meeting NATO spending commitments; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. COONS, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. CARDIN, and Mr. BROWN):

S. Res. 571. A resolution condemning the ongoing illegal occupation of Crimea by the Russian Federation; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. BLUNT (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. COONS, Mr. COTTON, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. RISCH, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. PERDUE, and Mrs. HYDE-SMITH):

S. Con. Res. 41. A concurrent resolution recognizing 100 years of the United States-Australia relationship—100 years of Mateship; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 58

At the request of Mr. HELLER, the names of the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER) and the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 58, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the excise tax on high cost employer-sponsored health coverage.

S. 428

At the request of Mr. BENNET, the names of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) and the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) were added as cosponsors of S. 428, a bill to amend titles XIX and XXI of the Social Security Act to authorize States to provide coordinated care to children with complex medical conditions through enhanced pediatric health homes, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 428, supra.

S. 486

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. JONES) was added as a cosponsor of S. 486, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the non-application of Medicare competitive acquisition rates to complex rehabilitative wheelchairs and accessories.

S. 515

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 515, a bill to require the Secretary of Labor to maintain a publicly available list of all employers that relocate a call center overseas, to make such companies ineligible for Federal grants or guaranteed loans, and to require disclosure of the physical location of business agents engaging in customer service communications, and for other purposes.

S. 681

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 681, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the benefits and services provided by the Department of Veterans Affairs to women veterans, and for other purposes.

S. 794

At the request of Mr. CARPER, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. JONES) was added as a cosponsor of S. 794, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act in order to improve the process whereby Medicare administrative contractors issue local coverage determinations under the Medicare program, and for other purposes.

S. 835

At the request of Mr. MURPHY, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 835, a bill to require the Supreme Court of the United States to promulgate a code of ethics.

S. 1109

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. JONES) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1109, a bill to amend title VIII of the Public Health Service Act to extend advanced education nursing grants to support clinical nurse specialist programs, and for other purposes.

S. 1121

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1121, a bill to establish a postsecondary student data system.

S. 1596

At the request of Mr. PETERS, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1596, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase certain funeral benefits for veterans, and for other purposes.

S. 1690

At the request of Ms. DUCKWORTH, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. JONES) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1690, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide greater support to students with dependents, and for other purposes.

S. 2076

At the request of Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2076, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize the expansion of activities related to Alzheimer's disease, cognitive decline, and brain health under the Alzheimer's Disease and Healthy Aging Program, and for other purposes.

S. 2101

At the request of Mr. DONNELLY, the names of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SHELBY), the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN), the

Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) and the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 2101, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the crew of the USS Indianapolis, in recognition of their perseverance, bravery, and service to the United States.

S. 2105

At the request of Mr. BOOZMAN, the names of the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) and the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) were added as cosponsors of S. 2105, a bill to modify the presumption of service connection for veterans who were exposed to herbicide agents while serving in the Armed Forces in Thailand during the Vietnam era, and for other purposes.

S. 2597

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2597, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize the program of payments to children's hospitals that operate graduate medical education programs, and for other purposes.

S. 2784

At the request of Mr. HELLER, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2784, a bill to reauthorize the Family Violence Prevention and Services Act.

S. 2823

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the names of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) and the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 2823, a bill to modernize copyright law, and for other purposes.

S. 2881

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2881, a bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to seek to enter into an agreement with the city of Vallejo, California, for the transfer of Mare Island Naval Cemetery in Vallejo, California, and for other purposes.

S. 2945

At the request of Mr. YOUNG, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2945, a bill to authorize the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to carry out a housing choice voucher mobility demonstration to encourage families receiving the voucher assistance to move to lower-poverty areas and expand access to opportunity areas.

S. 2957

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2957, a bill to amend the Horse Protection Act to designate additional unlawful acts under the Act, strengthen penalties for violations of the Act, improve Department of Agriculture enforcement of the Act, and for other purposes.

S. 3014

At the request of Mr. GARDNER, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3014, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to support rural residency training funding that is equitable for all States, and for other purposes.

S. 3051

At the request of Mr. HOEVEN, the names of the Senator from Iowa (Mrs. ERNST) and the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) were added as cosponsors of S. 3051, a bill to require the Secretary of Transportation to establish a working group to study regulatory and legislative improvements for the livestock, insect, and agricultural commodities transport industries, and for other purposes.

S. 3066

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3066, a bill to amend the General Education Provisions Act to allow the release of education records to facilitate the award of a recognized postsecondary credential.

S. 3090

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3090, a bill to amend the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 to clarify that a State may not use an individual's failure to vote as the basis for initiating the procedures provided under such Act for the removal of the individual from the official list of registered voters in the State on the grounds that the individual has changed residence, and for other purposes.

S. 3148

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mrs. ERNST) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3148, a bill to prohibit certain business concerns from receiving assistance from the Small Business Administration, and for other purposes.

S. 3172

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the names of the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH), the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) and the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) were added as cosponsors of S. 3172, 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. RES. 556

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 556, a resolution reaffirming the commitment of the United States to hold the Ortega regime accountable for acts of violence and human rights abuses perpetrated against the Nicaraguan people.

S. RES. 557

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the names of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG) and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 557, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate regarding the strategic importance of NATO to the collective security of the transatlantic region and urging its member states to work together at the upcoming summit to strengthen the alliance.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. SCHUMER:

S. 3187. A bill to authorize veterans service organizations to solicit donations at post offices before and after Federal holidays; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 3187

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 Access, Improving Service to Enable Veterans Engaging To Fundraise Act of 2018'' or the ''RAISE VET FUND Act''.

SEC. 2. SOLICITATION BY VETERANS SERVICE ORGANIZATIONS AT POST OFFICES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 404 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(f) SOLICITATION BY VETERANS SERVICE ORGANIZATIONS AT POST OFFICES.—

''(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection—

''(A) the term 'business day' means a day on which a post office is open;

''(B) the term 'Federal holiday' means—

''(i) a legal public holiday under section 6103(a) of title 5; and

''(ii) Flag Day, as designated under section 110 of title 36;

''(C) the term 'holiday period' means the period beginning 2 business days before, and ending 2 business days after, a Federal holiday; and

''(D) the term 'veterans service organization' means an organization recognized by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs for the representation of veterans under section 5902 of title 38.

''(2) AUTHORIZATION.—The Postal Service shall permit a veterans service organization to solicit donations by distributing items that are symbols for veterans at a post office on any business day during a holiday period.''.

(b) REGULATIONS.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the United States Postal Service shall promulgate regulations governing the use of post offices by veterans service organizations, including with respect to scheduling, under subsection (f) of section 404 of title 39, United States Code, as added by subsection (a).

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Subsection (f) of section 404 of title 39, United States Code, as added by subsection (a), shall take effect on

the date that is 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

By Mr. JONES (for himself, Mrs. MCCASKILL, and Ms. HARRIS):

S. 3191. A bill to provide for the expeditious disclosure of records related to civil rights cold cases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I rise to speak on a matter of both personal and national importance.

As many folks know by now, a defining moment in my career as a prosecutor was bringing to justice two former Ku Klux Klansmen for the bombing of Birmingham's 16th Street Baptist Church in 1963. That act of domestic terrorism, and that is exactly what it was, killed four innocent, beautiful little girls. As one of their mothers, Miss Alpha Robertson, described, ''It sounded like the whole world was shaking.''

There is no doubt it did. The whole world shook as people asked: How could this happen in America, the land of the free and the home of the brave? Despite the feeling that the whole world shook—and indeed the horrific crime did add momentum to the civil rights movement—the criminals responsible for the murder of those four little girls were not brought to justice for decades.

The first came in 1977, 14 years after the fact, by my friend and former Alabama attorney general, Bill Baxley. It would be 24 and 25 years later, in 2001 and 2002, that my team of Robert Posey, Jeff Wallace, Don Cochran, Bill Fleming, Ben Herren, and I completed that journey. The bombing of the 16th Street Baptist Church was but one of many civil rights-era crimes that have gone unsolved.

Solving and successfully prosecuting an almost 40-year-old case was no easy task, and the effort involved a team of both Federal and State law enforcement. Media coverage also contributed to some key breaks in that case. In fact, it was through the dedicated efforts of my friend Jerry Mitchell, an award-winning journalist at the Jackson, MS, Clarion Ledger, that these unsolved civil rights cases even got a second look. It was when the State of Mississippi opened closed files of a Jim Crow-era State commission that Jerry discovered it might be possible to reopen several unsolved cases, including the cases of Medgar Evers and Vernon Dahmer. When those cases resulted in convictions, law enforcement officers and communities around the South began to reexamine so many of the unsolved crimes, including the bombing of the 16th Street Baptist Church.

Today there are more than 100 unsolved civil rights criminal cases out there. Many of them are 50 years old or older. Some were investigated a little, some were investigated a lot, but because these were State not Federal crimes most were never really investigated at all.

While it is certainly never too late for justice, years of delays can create serious and sometimes insurmountable obstacles: Memories fade or are lost to death, evidence disappears. Potential defendants also die, taking the details of their crimes to their graves.

Justice can take many forms. It doesn't always have to be a criminal conviction. One measure of justice—not a full measure but a measure nonetheless—can be achieved through a public examination of the facts and determination of the truth about what happened and why, but because these were criminal cases, the records and files relating to these unsolved cases are often classified or shielded from public view, and sometimes they are literally scattered among various agencies and hard to find.

Yet the victims of these crimes and their families have no less right to justice than they did at the time the crimes were committed, and the American people have a right to know this part of our Nation's history. As has often been said, if we do not learn from the mistakes of the past, we are doomed to repeat them. In today's climate, I believe we need to be more than ever vigilant and knowledgeable about the mistakes of the crimes of the civil rights era.

Eleven years ago, nearly to the day, I testified as a lawyer before the House Judiciary Committee in support of the Emmett Till Unsolved Civil Rights Crimes Act. That act created the Department of Justice's Civil Rights Cold Case Division to focus exclusively on solving these unsolved civil rights cases. Since the bill's passage, the Civil Rights Division has reexamined a number of these cases. I certainly applaud their efforts in doing so, but often, as was my experience, these cases end up being solved with the help of journalists, historians, private investigators, and local law enforcement, but that requires having access to the files. It is not an easy task getting access to these kinds of files. However, by ensuring public access to the files and records relating to these cases, we can expand the universe of people who can help these victims receive the justice they have long since been denied. If we are going to find the truth, it has to start with transparency.

That is why today I am introducing the Civil Rights Cold Case Records Collection Act of 2018, which will require the assembly, collection, and public disclosure of government cold case records about unsolved civil rights cases.

This legislation would not have been possible without the dedicated efforts of students at Hightstown High School in Hightstown, NJ, and their teacher Stuart Wexler, who have joined me in the Gallery today.

It was a couple of years ago, long before becoming a U.S. Senator was really on my radar, that I received a call from Mr. Wexler explaining that he and his students had been stymied in efforts to obtain documents through the Freedom of Information Act about some of these cases. They wanted my support and others for legislation they were drafting to open these files to the public. Since I had already made that suggestion to folks at the Justice Department and others, I enthusiastically endorsed their project. Who would have imagined that 2 or 3 years ago we would be here today?

I thank them for reminding me of our conversations and our shared commitment and for working with me and my staff to make the introduction of this legislation possible today. It means a lot that these young people from New Jersey, who were not even born when these crimes were committed, care so much about this issue.

I also thank a few other folks. I thank John Hamilton and Jay Bosanko at the National Archives for working with the staff, and Professor Hank Klibanoff, who is also with us in the Gallery today, a former journalist and Pulitzer Prize winner for the book ''The Race Beat'' that examined the role of the journalist during the civil rights movement.

I thank them for their help in drafting this legislation and others who dedicated their lives to working on these cold cases—people like Andrew Sheldon in Atlanta and Alvin Sykes, who worked so hard on the Emmett Till bill and the Emmett Till case; Margaret Burnham, a law professor from Northeast Eastern University Law School; and Paula Johnson from Syracuse University Law School have all done remarkable work in trying to reexamine these cases.

While prosecuting the church bombing cases, I learned how deeply important this work is to anyone who lost a loved one just because someone else hated the color of their skin. It is also important to the communities where these crimes occurred.

It is impossible to express the emotion and satisfaction our team felt at the conclusion of those trials and the guilty verdicts we obtained. It was a privilege to work on cases that meant so much to so many. We have come a long way since 1963, but justice delayed does not have to mean justice denied.

When I testified at the House Judiciary Committee 11 years ago, I noted that we could never prosecute all of these cases but that as a country of compassion, we should find other ways to heal these old wounds. Reconciliation can be the most potent medicine for healing. After all this time, we might not solve every one of these cold cases, but my hope is, our efforts today will, at the very least, help us find some long overdue healing and understanding of the truth.

Each civil rights crime, each victim of that era deserves as much attention and effort as Carol Robertson, Denise McNair, Addie Mae Collins, and Cynthia Morris Wesley, the young girls who lost their lives that Sunday morning in 1963.

Thank you.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 570—EMPHASIZING THE IMPORTANCE OF MEETING NATO SPENDING COMMITMENTS

Mr. PERDUE (for himself, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. COTTON, Mr. INHOFE, and Mr. LEE) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 570

Whereas, for over six decades, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) has been a successful intergovernmental political and military alliance;

Whereas NATO's collective defense serves as a deterrent against aggression from adversaries and external security threats;

Whereas NATO strengthens the security of the United States by utilizing an integrated military coalition;

Whereas Article 3 of the North Atlantic Treaty states that ''in order more effectively to achieve the objectives of this Treaty, the Parties, separately and jointly, by means of continuous and effective self-help and mutual aid, will maintain and develop their individual and collective capacity to resist armed attack'';

Whereas, since the formation of NATO, the United States has negotiated with NATO allies over fair and equitable burden sharing;

Whereas, in 1953, President Dwight Eisenhower invited European NATO allies to increase their contribution in defense spending, pointing out that the ''American well had run dry'';

Whereas, at a 1963 National Security Council meeting, President John F. Kennedy stated that ''we cannot continue to pay for the military protection of Europe while the NATO states are not paying their fair share and living off the fat of the land'';

Whereas President Richard Nixon's Second Annual Report to the Congress on United States Foreign Policy stated, ''The emphasis is no longer on their sharing the cost of America's military commitment to Europe—although financial arrangements may play a part—but on their providing the national forces needed in conjunction with ours in support of an effective common strategy.'';

Whereas the first NATO defense-spending target was issued in the 1977 NATO Ministerial Guidance, where NATO allies agreed to increase defense spending by 3 percent annually to address the substantially larger defense resource allocations of the Soviet Union;

Whereas, during the 1980s, the United States drastically increased its defense spending to combat threats posed by the Soviet Union, causing its share of total NATO defense spending to rise dramatically, while at the same time, NATO allies failed to meet the 1977 spending target;

Whereas the National Defense Authorization Act, 1985 (Public Law 98–525) included a sense of Congress that the President should ''call on the pertinent members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization to meet or exceed their pledges for an annual increase in defense spending'';

Whereas, in the 1988 NATO Summit Declaration, NATO allies reaffirmed their ''willingness to share fairly the risks, burdens and responsibilities as well as the benefits of our common efforts'';

Whereas, in 1990, as the Soviet Union was trending towards collapse, NATO defense ministers agreed to drop the 3-percent annual increase policy, as allies looked to ''reap the benefits of the greatly improved climate in East-West relations'';

Whereas, while defense spending among all NATO allies decreased throughout the 1990s, conflicts in Bosnia, and later in Kosovo, clearly illustrated that European NATO allies severely lacked key military capabilities, causing British Prime Minister Tony Blair to state, ''If Europe wants the United States to maintain its commitment to Europe, Europe must share more of the burden of defending the West's security interests.'';

Whereas, at the 2002 NATO Prague Summit, NATO allies entered into a nonbinding agreement to raise defense spending to 2 percent of their gross domestic product (GDP) in order to meet the goals set out in the Prague Capabilities Commitment;

Whereas, before the 2006 NATO Riga Summit, United States Ambassador to NATO Victoria Nuland called the 2-percent metric the ''unofficial floor'' on defense spending in NATO;

Whereas, at the 2006 NATO Riga Summit, NATO allies declared that ''we encourage nations whose defense spending is declining to halt that decline and to aim to increase defense spending in real terms'';

Whereas, at the 2008 NATO Bucharest Summit, NATO allies reaffirmed their defense-spending goal;

Whereas, in 2011, Secretary of Defense Robert Gates said, ''The blunt reality is that there will be dwindling appetite and patience in the U.S. Congress—and in the American body politic writ large—to expend increasingly precious funds on behalf of nations that are apparently unwilling to devote the necessary resources or make the necessary changes to be serious and capable partners in their own defense.'';

Whereas, in 2014 at the NATO Wales Summit, NATO members officially declared to increase their defense spending to 2 percent of their gross domestic product by 2024;

Whereas the Wales Summit Declaration stated that ''[a]llies currently meeting the NATO guideline to spend a minimum of 2% of their Gross Domestic Product (GDP) on defense will aim to continue to do so'' and continued, ''Allies whose current proportion of GDP spent on defense is below this level will: halt any decline in defense expenditure; aim to increase defense expenditure in real terms as GDP grows; aim to move towards the 2% guideline within a decade with a view to meeting their NATO Capability Targets and filling NATO's capability shortfalls.'';

Whereas, for the first time since 1990, there have been three consecutive years of increases in NATO defense spending;

Whereas, since the end of 2014, defense expenditures by NATO Europe and Canada have risen by $28,000,000,000, representing a 10-percent increase;

Whereas, in 2014, only three NATO allies met the 2-percent spending target, while NATO expects eight allies to meet the target in 2018, and 15 allies to reach the target by 2024;

Whereas, while the 2-percent defense-spending target is an important measure of allies' commitment to NATO, it is imperative that defense expenditures are both interoperable with, and strengthen, NATO's critical military capabilities;

Whereas Russia fundamentally challenges the peaceful world order that NATO has sought to foster and aspires to extend as it continues its illegal occupation of territory in Ukraine, Moldova, and Georgia; and

Whereas strengthening NATO's capabilities is critical to the future of the alliance to deter an increasingly aggressive Russia to NATO's east, the threat posed by ISIS, and instability to NATO's south, as well as emerging security challenges, including terrorism and cybersecurity: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) reaffirms the commitment of the United States to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) as the foundation of transatlantic security and defense;

(2) encourages all member countries of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization to fulfill their commitments to levels and composition of defense expenditures as agreed upon at the NATO 2014 Wales Summit;

(3) calls on NATO allies to finance, equip, and train their armed forces to achieve interoperability and fulfill their national and regional security interests; and

(4) recognizes NATO allies who meet their defense spending commitments or are otherwise providing adequately for their national and regional security interests.

SENATE RESOLUTION 571—CONDEMNING THE ONGOING ILLEGAL OCCUPATION OF CRIMEA BY THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION

Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. COONS, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. CARDIN, and Mr. BROWN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 571

Whereas, in February 2014, unidentified Russian armed forces entered Ukrainian territory and took control of key military and government infrastructure in the Crimean peninsula of Ukraine;

Whereas, in March 2014, the parliament of the Russian Federation gave rubber-stamp approval to President Vladimir Putin's request to use military force against Ukrainian territory ostensibly because of the ''threat of violence from ultranationalists'';

Whereas, on March 27, 2014, the United Nations General Assembly adopted Resolution 68/262 calling on states and international organizations not to recognize any change in Crimea's status and affirmed the commitment of the United Nations to recognize Crimea as part of Ukraine;

Whereas the Russian Federation's illegal invasion and annexation of Crimea has been widely seen as an effort to stifle the spread of pro-democracy developments across Ukraine in 2014 in the wake of the Euromaidan protests;

Whereas the Russian Federation is a signatory to the 1994 Budapest Memorandum and thus committed to respect the independence, sovereignty, and borders of Ukraine and to refrain from threats, coercive economic actions, or the use of force against Ukraine's territorial integrity and political independence;

Whereas the Russian Federation committed in the 1975 Final Act of the Conference for Security and Cooperation in Europe (Helsinki Final Act) to respect the sovereign equality and territorial integrity of other participating States;

Whereas the Russian Federation's obligations under the Charter of the United Nations prohibit the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity and political independence of other states;

Whereas the Russian Federation's ongoing illegal occupation of Crimea in Ukraine have been widely condemned by the international community as illegal acts;

Whereas the United States and European Union have imposed sanctions on individuals

and entities who have enabled the illegal invasion, annexation, and occupation of Crimea;

Whereas the Department of State has stated in its Country Reports on Human Rights Practices that security services and local authorities in Crimea installed by the Government of the Russian Federation have ''worked to consolidate control over Crimea and continued to restrict human rights by imposing repressive Federal laws of the Russian Federation on the Ukrainian territory of Crimea'' and that ''the most significant human rights problems in Crimea [were] related directly to the Russian occupation'';

Whereas the Department of State has described ''an extensive campaign of intimidation to suppress dissent and opposition to the occupation'' that has been carried out by Russian security services inside Crimea, including the use of torture and physical abuse, kidnapping, disappearances, and deportations, and reporting from independent human rights groups inside and outside Crimea has documented such alleged human rights violations by Russian security services and paramilitary groups;

Whereas the campaign of intimidation in Crimea has resulted in the prosecution and imprisonment of individuals who oppose or criticize the occupation or support Ukrainian sovereignty as well as the transfer of some individuals from Crimea to Russian Federation territory from prosecution and imprisonment;

Whereas the Department of State has noted that illegal occupying authorities in Crimea have also restricted the fundamental human rights of particular groups, including ethnic Ukrainians and Crimean Tatars, ''particularly regarding expressions of nationality and ethnicity, and subjected them to systematic discrimination;''

Whereas human rights groups have cited that such discrimination has been carried out in myriad ways, including through the outlawing in 2016 of the elected representative body (mejilis) of the Crimean Tatar people, the closing of Crimean Tatar and Ukrainian-language schools, and forced conscription;

Whereas the Department of State and other international human rights groups have noted further continuing human rights concerns in Crimea, including the suppression of independent media and civil society through harassment and harsh administrative measures, politicized and unfair judicial processes, and poor prison conditions;

Whereas the Government of the Russian Federation has worked to extend Russian citizenship to individuals inside Crimea and deprived access to public services of those who refuse such citizenship;

Whereas civil society groups have alleged that the Government of the Russian Federation has encouraged Russian citizens to relocate to the Crimean peninsula and has supported the physical destruction of historical sites in Crimea, ostensibly to influence the demographics and political character of the region in favor of the Kremlin; and

Whereas the Government of the Russian Federation has supported the development of infrastructure and institutional ties between Crimea and the Russian Federation, including the opening of a road and rail bridge over the Kerch Strait on May 15, 2018; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) reiterates that Crimea is part of the sovereign territory of Ukraine;

(2) stresses that United States policy should remain that Crimea is part of Ukraine and should reject attempts to change the status, demographics, or political nature of Crimea;

(3) reaffirms respect for the values of democracy, human rights, and rule of law that all individuals in Crimea deserve, including non-Russian ethnic groups and religious minorities;

(4) condemns all human rights violations against individuals in Crimea, and underscores the culpability of the Russian Federation for such violations while this territory is under illegal Russian occupation;

(5) calls on the Government of the Russian Federation to immediately respect the political and human rights of individuals in Crimea, including those detained in Crimea or who have been transferred from Crimea to the territory of Russia, and to cease efforts to restrict dissent or change the demographic or political nature of the peninsula;

(6) urges the United States Government, in coordination with the European Union, NATO, and members of the international community, to prioritize efforts to prevent the further consolidation of illegal occupying powers in Crimea, reaffirm unified opposition to the actions of the Russian Federation in Crimea, and secure the human rights of individuals there;

(7) welcomes the sanctions that have been imposed and maintained to date by the United States and European Union against individuals engaged in furthering the illegal occupation of Crimea by the Russian Federation;

(8) calls on the United States Government to continue to use relevant sanctions authorities codified in the Countering America's Adversaries Through Sanctions Act of 2017 (Public Law 115–144), as well as under the Global Magnitsky Human Rights Accountability Act (subtitle F of title XII of Public Law 114–328; 22 U.S.C. 2656 note), to address and deter those engaged in furthering the illegal occupation of Crimea and human rights abuses and corruption committed in Crimea or against individuals from Crimea;

(9) welcomes further efforts by the United States Government to encourage the European Union to impose additional Crimea-related sanctions; and

(10) calls upon the United States Government to declare it the foreign policy of the United States to never recognize the illegal annexation of Crimea by the Russian Federation, similar to the 1940 Welles Declaration in which the United States refused to recognized the Soviet annexation of the Baltic States.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 41—RECOGNIZING 100 YEARS OF THE UNITED STATES-AUSTRALIA RELATIONSHIP—100 YEARS OF MATESHIP

Mr. BLUNT (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. COONS, Mr. COTTON, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. RISCH, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. PERDUE, and Mrs. HYDE-SMITH) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. CON. RES. 41

Whereas United States and Australian troops first fought together in and won the Battle of Hamel on the Western Front in France on July 4, 1918, under the command of Australian General John Monash;

Whereas the hard fought victory achieved by the combined forces at Hamel helped turn the tide of World War I;

Whereas Australia has fought together with the United States in every major conflict since 1918;

Whereas more than 100,000 Australian service members have given the ultimate sacrifice alongside their brothers and sisters in arms from the United States;

Whereas the United States and Australia officially established bilateral diplomatic relations on January 8, 1940;

Whereas the United States and Australia formalized their security alliance with the signing of the Australia, New Zealand, United States Security Treaty, done at San Francisco September 1, 1951 (commonly known as the ANZUS Treaty);

Whereas the ANZUS Treaty was invoked the first and only time in response to the terrorist attacks on the United States on September 11, 2001;

Whereas the United States and Australia share information essential for security and defense through the Five Eyes intelligence alliance;

Whereas the Force Posture Agreement between the Government of Australia and the Government of the United States of America, done at Sydney August 12, 2014, enables closer security and defense cooperation between the 2 allies;

Whereas the United States and Australia conduct diverse joint military exercises and training to enhance capabilities throughout the world, and Australia hosts United States Marines at bases in its Northern Territory;

Whereas the United States and Australia work closely in a number of international fora, including the Group of Twenty (G–20);

Whereas the Australia–United States Free Trade Agreement, done at Washington May 18, 2004, came into effect on January 1, 2005;

Whereas the United States and Australia conduct $65,000,000,000 in 2-way trade and have an investment relationship valued at $1,100,000,000,000,

Whereas July 4, 2018, marks the 100-year anniversary of the Battle of Hamel and serves as the date on which the United States and Australia celebrate the first 100 years of Mateship:

Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That Congress—

(1) commemorates the 100-year anniversary of the Battle of Hamel, forging the unique and enduring relationship between the United States and Australia;

(2) reaffirms the strong military alliance relationship between the United States and Australia; and

(3) supports continued diplomatic, security, and economic cooperation between the United States and Australia.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 3393. Ms. SMITH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 8, to provide for improvements to the rivers and harbors of the United States, to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 3393. Ms. SMITH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 8, to provide for improvements to the rivers and harbors of the United States, to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. PRAIRIE ISLAND INDIAN COMMUNITY.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) PRAIRIE ISLAND RESERVATION.—The term ''Prairie Island Reservation'' means the Prairie Island Indian Community Reservation in Goodhue County, Minnesota.

(2) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Interior.

(3) TRIBE.—The term ''Tribe'' means the Prairie Island Indian Community, a federally recognized Indian tribe.

(b) STUDY OF FEDERAL LANDS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall carry out an analysis to determine whether land within the Federal domain is suitable for addition to the Prairie Island Reservation.

(2) CONSIDERATIONS.—Land shall not be considered suitable for addition to the Prairie Island Reservation unless such land—

(A) consists of contiguous acres of land suitable for housing and economic development;

(B) is located within Minnesota and within 100 miles of the Prairie Island Reservation;

(C) is not subject to compatible use or wildlife-dependent recreational use restrictions pursuant to the National Wildlife Refuge System Administration Act of 1966 (16 U.S.C. 668dd et seq.); and

(D) is not administered by the National Park Service.

(3) REPORT.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to Congress and the Tribe a report detailing the results of the analysis conducted pursuant to paragraph (1).

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, I have 2 requests for committees to meet during today's session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today's session of the Senate:

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, July 10, 2018, at 2:15 p.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, July 10, 2018, during votes, to conduct a hearing on the nomination of Robert L. Wilkie, of North Carolina, to be Secretary of Veterans Affairs.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. PETERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my intern, Thomas Stephenson, be granted floor privileges while the Senate is in session on Tuesday, July 10, 2018.

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

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—HOUSE MESSAGE TO ACCOMPANY H.R. 5895

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding rule XXII, at 12 noon on Wednesday, July 11, the Senate proceed to legislative session and the Chair lay before the Senate the message to accompany H.R. 5895; further, that the majority leader or his designee be recognized to make a compound motion to go to conference and that the Senate immediately vote on the motion; further, that if the motion is agreed to, Senators CASSIDY and CORKER each be recognized to offer a motion to instruct conferees; that the Senate vote on the motions in the order listed with no further action on the compound motion; that there be 2 minutes of debate between each vote, equally divided in the usual form; and that following disposition of the Corker motion and the appointment of conferees, the Senate resume executive session.

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

RECOGNIZING 100 YEARS OF THE UNITED STATES-AUSTRALIA RELATIONSHIP

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Con. Res. 41, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the concurrent resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 41) recognizing 100 years of the United States-Australia relationship—100 years of Mateship.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 41) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, JULY 11, 2018

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m., Wednesday, July 11; 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. I ask that following leader remarks, the Senate resume consideration of the Benczkowski nomination and that all time during adjournment, leader remarks, and morning business count postcloture on the nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 7:29 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, July 11, 2018, at 10 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

BRETT M. KAVANAUGH, OF MARYLAND, TO BE AN ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES, VICE ANTHONY M. KENNEDY, RETIRING.

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be brigadier general

COL. GREGORY K. ANDERSON
COL. CHRISTINE A. BEELER
COL. PETER N. BENCHOFF
COL. MARK S. BENNETT
COL. GREGORY J. BRADY
COL. MICHELE H. BREDENKAMP
COL. EDMOND M. BROWN
COL. ROBERT M. COLLINS
COL. KIMBERLY M. COLLOTON
COL. DAVID S. DOYLE
COL. THOMAS J. EDWARDS, JR.
COL. MARCUS S. EVANS
COL. BRETT T. FUNCK
COL. JAMES J. GALLIVAN
COL. BRIAN W. GIBSON
COL. AMY E. HANNAH
COL. JERED P. HELWIG
COL. DONN H. HILL
COL. SCOTT A. JACKSON
COL. JOHN D. KLINE
COL. GAVIN A. LAWRENCE
COL. KEVIN C. LEAHY
COL. MICHELLE M. LETCHER
COL. CHARLES J. MASARACCHIA
COL. MICHAEL C. MCCURRY II
COL. JOHN V. MEYER III
COL. DUANE R. MILLER
COL. SCOTT M. NAUMANN
COL. CHRISTOPHER R. NORRIE
COL. ALLAN M. PEPIN
COL. ANDREW D. PRESTON
COL. MARK C. QUANDER
COL. JOHN L. RAFFERTY, JR.
COL. JETH B. REY
COL. JOSEPH A. RYAN
COL. JAMES M. SMITH
COL. BRETT G. SYLVIA
COL. JOEL B. VOWELL
COL. TODD R. WASMUND

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. ROBERT D. KATZ

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate July 10, 2018:

THE JUDICIARY

MARK JEREMY BENNETT, OF HAWAII, TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HONORING THE CAREER AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF MR. FRANK T. LIBBY

HON. DANIEL LIPINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 2018

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mr. Frank T. Libby and recognize his accomplishments as President and Executive-Secretary Treasurer of the Chicago Regional Council of Carpenters. Frank's 42 years of service and dedication is nothing short of remarkable and deserves distinct recognition.

Throughout his career, Frank Libby took on many roles in order to benefit his fellow carpenters and members of organized labor throughout Chicagoland. Since 2008, Frank has served as President and Executive-Secretary Treasurer of the Chicago Regional Council of Carpenters, the largest building trades union in the state, representing over 70 counties and tens of thousands of members. Under Frank's leadership, the Chicago Regional Council of Carpenters' Labor and Management Committee piloted Built to Last, an Emmy-nominated television program to educate future contractors to think innovatively, use sustainable building techniques, and be energy efficient in their construction. Only one of Frank's many successes, this example hardly scratches the surface, with his contributions ranging from countless dispute negotiations and resolutions, to bolstering the local economy by bringing a variety of organizations together. During his tenure, he has protected the interests of thousands of skilled men and women, all of whom provide integral services to our community.

Frank Libby has also served as a board member for both the Carpenters' Welfare and Pension Funds as well as the Carpenters' Apprenticeship Training Fund, strengthening a carpenter's entrance to and exit from the profession. He has been a president of a Local, a champion of trade shows, a trustee of apprenticeships, and even a guest columnist. The dedication Frank has demonstrated for his fellow workers is admirable and certainly deserves recognition. As such I congratulate Mr. Libby on his retirement, where he will now have time to share his favorite diversion with his wife and daughter: fishing.

I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Mr. Frank T. Libby. His commitment to organized labor and successes in leadership have improved the lives of tens of thousands of families. I thank him for his service and wish him and his family well in the future.

CAPTAIN THOMAS A. HOFFMAN

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 2018

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor Captain Thomas A. Hoffman, U.S. Army, for his service to our country.

Captain Hoffman graduated from Indiana University of Pennsylvania in 1965 with a Bachelor of Science in Social Science and as a Distinguished Military Graduate from the Army Reserve Officer Training Corps (ROTC). He was commissioned as a second lieutenant upon his graduation and went on to serve on active duty for almost five years in the U.S., Europe and Republic of Vietnam. He served with the 14th Cavalry Regiment patrolling the border of East Germany and as an airborne parachutist officer in Vietnam. While in Vietnam, Captain Hoffman participated in the TET Counteroffensive and the Vietnam Counteroffensive Phase III and IV. His military awards and decorations include the Army Commendation, National Defense Service Medals and Vietnam Service Medal with three bronze service stars.

Captain Hoffman served for 24 years in the Jefferson County Public School system in various positions from teacher to school administrator. Additionally, Captain Hoffman continued his public service as a community activist, mediator, ski instructor, and volunteer firefighter and on the board of directors for the Coal Creek Canyon Fire Protection District.

Captain Hoffman's courageous service has charted the path for future generations of men and women to serve in the military. I extend my deepest appreciation to Captain Hoffman for his dedication, integrity and outstanding service to the United States of America.

IN RECOGNITION OF MSGT (RET.) MILTON LOCKETT, JR.

HON. SANFORD D. BISHOP, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 2018

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a dedicated husband, father, community servant, trailblazer, and Army Ranger, MSGT (RET) Milton ''Davey'' Lockett, Jr., Sadly, MSGT Lockett passed away on June 27, 2018. His funeral services were held on July 3, 2018, at 11:30 a.m. in the Chapel of Hill-Watson-People's Funeral Service LLC, in Columbus, Georgia.

MSGT Lockett was born on February 5, 1935, to the union of Milton Lockett, Sr., and Bessie Mae Richards Lockett in College Park, Georgia. He married Ida Clay Lockett on February 12, 1955, and God blessed that union to last for 52 years. One son was born to that union. God has blessed his current union to his wife, Angela for seven years.

It has been said that, ''Service is the rent that we pay for the space that we occupy here on this earth.'' MSGT Lockett paid his rent and he paid it well. His distinguished Military career commenced in the United States Army in February, 1952. Over the course of the next 21 plus years, MSGT Lockett distinguished himself as a great soldier. He served in the Korean Conflict and served two tours of duty in Vietnam. His first tour was with the 1st Infantry division in 1966 and 1967. His second tour was with the 101st Airborne Division in 1968 and 1969. During his distinguished career, he received multiple Decorations, Medals, Badges, Citations and Campaign Ribbons to include: the National Defense Service Medal with Oak Leaf Cluster, the Republic of Vietnam Campaign Medal w/60 device, the Vietnam Service Medal w/1 silver star, the Bronze Star Medal, the Meritorious Unit Citation, an Army Service Gallantry with Palm and Bronze Star, and 4 Overseas Service Bars.

Not only was MSGT Lockett a great soldier, he was also a trailblazer. He was the first African-American Ranger Instructor in the History of the Army in 1959. Because of his excellence, he performed for President John F. Kennedy in 1961. He was inducted in the Ranger Hall of Fame in 2001 and the Georgia Military Veterans Hall of Fame in 2014. One portion of the Ranger Creed reads as follows: . . . ''Never shall I fail my comrades.'' I will always keep myself mentally alert, physically strong and morally straight and I will shoulder more than my share of the task whatever it may be, one-hundred percent and then some. . . .'' MSGT Lockett always gave ''one hundred percent and then some.''

Even after his distinguished military career ended, he continued to give of himself in service to his community. He was a member of the First African Baptist Church in Columbus, Georgia, Past Master of the Sons of King Solomon No. 358, Electric City Chapter No. 482, 32 degree, Royal Arc and also, a Shriner. He was well known in the Columbus community for his anti-crime efforts to include neighborhood watches and leading marches against crime. The Columbus City Council recognized him in 2007 for his work as president of Columbus Against Drugs.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me, my wife Vivian and the more than 730,000 constituents of the Second Congressional District in recognizing MSGT (Ret.) Milton ''Davey'' Lockett for his dedicated service to our country and his community. I further ask my colleagues to join us in expressing condolences to his family, friends and the Columbus, Georgia community. May they be consoled and comforted by their abiding faith and the Holy Spirit in the days, weeks and months ahead. May we all learn from the example of MSGT Ret. Lockett in giving ''one hundred percent and then some.''

● 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.

NATIONAL ACADEMY OF FUTURE PHYSICIANS, MEDICAL SCIENTISTS, FUTURE SCIENTISTS, AND TECHNOLOGISTS 2018

HON. SCOTT R. TIPTON

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 2018

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate high school students from Colorado's Third District who were recently accepted by the National Academy of Future Physicians and Medical Scientists and the National Academy of Future Scientists and Technologists. These students will represent Colorado as delegates to the Congress of Future Medical Leaders and the Congress of Future Science and Technology Leaders this summer at the University of Massachusetts at Lowell.

All of the delegates were nominated by their teachers or the Academy based on academic success and a proven desire to enter the medical or science and technology professions. Some delegates have been chosen for partial and full academic scholarships by school administrators, based on their leadership ability, achievement, and dedication.

The National Academy of Future Physicians and Medical Scientists accepted three high school honor students from the Third Congressional District:

Trinity Castleman (Hayden, CO)
Madeline Dunn (Pueblo, CO)
Katelyn Jessop (Rye, CO)

The National Academy of Future Scientists and Technologists accepted two high school honor students from the Third Congressional District:

Marlee Anderson (Durango, CO)
Austin Green (Dove Creek, CO)

Both Academies offer free services and programs to students that include online social networks, opportunities for students to be guided and mentored by leaders in the academic field of their interest, internships, career guidance, and communications on college acceptance.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to recognize these fine young men and women for their hard work that led to their nominations and acceptance. I stand with the residents of Colorado's Third Congressional District in commending them on their accomplishment and I wish them luck as they prepare for the summer.

HONORING JULIA WEST HAMILTON LEAGUE INC.

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 2018

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to The Julia West Hamilton League, Inc., which was formed in 1938 as an outgrowth of 10 women who dared to dream. Mrs. Ellen V. Johns Britain believed that women joined together as a dedicated unit might accomplish some of the things that seemed impossible at the time—achievements that contributed to the advancement of community, education, youth and self.

The League was named in honor of Mrs. Julia West Hamilton, who gave unsparingly of her time, devotion and love to the causes of humanity, and was herself a participating member of the League until her death. The League was incorporated in 1971 and first led by Mary EC Gregory. The current president of the League is Mary J. Thompson.

The purpose of the League is (1) to promote benevolence, cultural and education interests in the community; (2) to strive to gain new knowledge and skills of achieving better self-understanding, learning to interact more sensitively and honestly with others; (3) to encourage young people to aim early in life for education and to develop good character and find a useful place in society; and (4) to establish a monetary award known as the Julia West Hamilton Award. This award is presented to a student in each of the 14 senior high schools in Washington, DC and a four-year Julia West Hamilton Scholarship is awarded to one of the award recipients every four years. To date, the League has provided over $1 million in student awards and scholarships.

The League has donated approximately $175,000 to the Hospital for Sick Children and has supported Howard University's Sickle Cell Anemia Program over the past 41 years. The League has also contributed to the United Negro College Fund, the Cardozo and Eastern High School bands and the Eastern High School Choir for travel abroad. Assistance is also provided to needy families during the Thanksgiving and Christmas holidays. The League holds lifetime memberships with the National Council of Negro Women and the Phyllis Wheatley YWCA. In 1980, the Ellen V. Johns Britain Award was established in honor of the founder of the Julia West Hamilton League, Inc. This award is presented to a longstanding member of the League for outstanding and dedicated service.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that the House of Representatives join me, on the occasion of the 80th anniversary, in paying tribute to the gentle ladies of the Julia West Hamilton League, Inc. whose motto, ''The only gift is a portion of thyself,'' and good works are worthy to be praised.

IN RECOGNITION OF POLICE CHIEF SCOTT BROWN

HON. MARK MEADOWS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 2018

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the exemplary career of Scott Brown, Chief of Police at the Lenoir Police Department, Caldwell County, North Carolina. I would like to express my appreciation to Chief Brown for over 32 years of dedicated service to the citizens of Western North Carolina.

Chief Brown's career in public service began as a telecommunicator for Caldwell County Sheriff's Office in 1987. He then joined the City of Lenoir's Police Department as a patrolman in 1989. Chief Brown went on to become a detective with the Caldwell County Sheriff's Office in 1990 and was promoted to both Patrol Sergeant and D.A.R.E Officer.

Chief Brown proudly rejoined the Lenoir Police Department in 1998 as the D.A.R.E. Officer and went on to serve as Sergeant, Lieutenant, and later took over the roles of Operations Division Commander, overseeing both the Patrol and Investigation Divisions as a Captain. He acted as the interim chief of police while being a Commander and was later selected to become the Chief of Police on April 23, 2012.

During Chief Brown's six years as Chief of Police, he has served the people of Lenoir with humility and honor. As an advocate for building up community relations with the Police Department, Chief Brown participated in and implemented several programs, including: Take 25, Take a Kid Fishing, Coffee with a Cop, Chat with the Chief, and the lunch buddy program in schools. He is known for treating every person he meets with respect and for being a kind and generous leader.

Under Chief Brown's leadership, the Lenoir Police Department expanded the Narcotics Investigation Unit to address opioid abuse, instigated the Narcan program, implemented department-wide Body Worn Cameras, and was named the 4th safest city in North Carolina in 2017. Chief Brown has been supported throughout his tenure as Chief of Police by his wife, Dawn, and his two children, Staff Sergeant Grayson Brown and Molly Brown.

Chief Brown has deeply impacted the lives of the people he has proudly served through his dedication to the citizens of Lenoir and his overwhelming involvement in the community. He has served well, and it is my distinct honor to recognize his outstanding work and express the best wishes of the people of Western North Carolina to Chief Brown on the occasion of his retirement.

SERGEANT GEORGE J. SEADER, JR.

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 2018

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor Sergeant George J. Seader, Jr., U.S. Army Air Corps and U.S. Air Force, for his service to our country.

Sergeant Seader served in the Army Air Corps from March 11, 1942 to October 23, 1945 as an aircraft engine mechanic in the Air Forces in the European Theater of Operations. He performed maintenance and repair work on B–17 bomber motors, inspecting, testing and replacing parts in the motors and flight control systems of the bomber aircraft. During his service overseas, Sergeant Seader was stationed in England, France and Belgium with the 353rd Headquarters Detachment, 353rd Fighter Group. Sergeant Seader was awarded the Army Good Conduct, European-African-Middle Eastern Campaign and WW II Victory Medals.

Upon his honorable discharge from the military, Sergeant Seader returned to Colorado and worked as a farmer, in construction and as a truck driver. Sergeant Seader celebrated his 100th year birthday on June 30, 2018.

Sergeant Seader's courageous service has charted the path for future generations of men and women to serve in the military. I extend my deepest appreciation to Sergeant Seader for his dedication, integrity and outstanding service to the United States of America.

HONORING MASTER SERGEANT AARON KLIATCHKO

HON. JEFF DENHAM

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 2018

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge and honor Master Sergeant Aaron Kliatchko, who proudly served his country during two World Wars and was awarded the Prisoner of War Medal, Purple Heart Medal, and the Medal of Freedom. He was killed in action on December 31, 1944. Master Sergeant Aaron Kliatchko, the ''Rabbi of Cabanatuan,'' was honored with a formal military funeral on Friday, June 29, 2018 at Arlington National Cemetery.

Kliatchko was born in 1887 to an Orthodox Jewish family. As a teenager, he was forced to serve in the Russian Imperial Army during the Russo-Japanese War, where he was taken prisoner by Imperial Japan. After the war, Kliatchko migrated to the United States and enlisted in the Army, becoming a U.S. citizen in July 1913. After moving to the Army Corps of Engineers in 1914, Corporal Kliatchko deployed to the Philippine Islands in November 1915, where he served the duration of World War I. He was honorably discharged in 1919 and remained in the Philippines until World War II.

When the Japanese invaded in December 1941, Kliatchko volunteered as an American intelligence agent. By March 1942, Kliatchko was fighting the invading Japanese on the Bataan peninsula. There, he reenlisted with the Army Corps of Engineers as a Master Sergeant. He was in Bataan for the U.S. surrender on April 9, 1942. Once again, Kliatchko was a prisoner of the Imperial Japanese military, surviving the Bataan Death March and two prisoner of war camps. He led his fellow prisoners and brothers in arms in Jewish services and funerals, earning himself the title ''Rabbi of Cabanatuan.''

On December 13, 1944, Kliatchko and 1,600 prisoners were forced to board the Japanese ''hellship'' *Oryoku Maru*, destined for slave labor in Japan. After it was sunk near Subic Bay by American bombers, the survivors, including Kliatchko, were forced onboard two other hellships to continue the voyage north. Kliatchko succumbed to wounds received during the ordeal on December 31, 1944, aboard the *Brazil Maru* as it arrived in Takeo Harbor, Formosa. His final resting place is unknown.

In 1948, Master Sergeant Kliatchko was posthumously awarded the Medal of Freedom. Like so many immigrants who came to America, his service and sacrifice embodies their unique commitment to liberty and democracy. God bless him always.

HONORING MRS. GLORIA RICHMOND JACKSON

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 2018

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mrs. Gloria Richmond Jackson.

Gloria Richmond Jackson came into this world on a windy day in March of 1957. She is the eleventh of thirteen children born to Floyd and Earnestine Richmond. She spent her early years on the Adams Plantation, three miles southwest of Lambert, Mississippi in Quitman County.

She left the State of Mississippi in 1972, and spent 33 years living in Louisiana, Texas, California and Illinois. In 2005, the Lord led her back to Lambett to work with the youth; but the true blessing of her return was the loving and nurturing relationship that developed between her and her mother who passed away July 17, 2011.

Jackson's mission quickly led her to become immersed in community work. In June 2005, she began working with the youth at the North Delta Youth Development Center in Lambert. As Director of The Children's Village Project, she encouraged them by sharing her story of trials and triumphs in an attempt to assist them with healthy development.

Jackson is proud of her southern upbringing and credits a lot of her accomplishments as a direct result of having a wonderful mother. She describes her mother as being, ''Mississippi Strong.'' Her mother wasn't afraid to get involved with the Civil Rights Movement of the 1960's. She worked with others to help get African Americans registered to vote in Quitman County. She even defied the Superintendent of Education's warning, that if any of the school bus drivers participated in a Freedom March with Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., they would be fired. She marched, but kept her job as a Bus Driver for the elementary school in Lambert.

Mrs. Earnestine Richmond's positive impact wasn't limited to only a few of her children: Her first-born daughter, Tressie Richmond Woods, in 1965 became the first African American to work as a Loan Officer for the Quitman County Farmers Home Administration, located in Marks, Mississippi.

Her daughter, Evon Richmond Ector, participated in the now famous, ''Poor People's Mule Train March to Washington'' in 1968.

Her daughter Mae Richmond Mosley was the first African American to become Vice President of Human Resources for Briggs and Stratton Engines Corporation in Milwaukee, Wisconsin from 2003 to 2007 when she retired.

Gloria Richmond Jackson, her youngest daughter, was the first African American to attend Lambert Jr. High School in 1969. Five of Mrs. Richmond's sons have owned businesses: Edgar Richmond (Automotive Repair Shop) Chicago, Illinois. Benjamin and Leo Richmond, co-owners (Bar and Lounge) Chicago, Illinois. Charles Richmond (Vending Machine Service Company, St. Louis, Missouri and a Home Health Service Company with locations in St. Louis and Kansas City, Missouri. James Richmond currently owns an Automotive Towing Service in Wellston, Missouri.

Jackson was appointed to the position of Town Clerk for Lambert, June 13, 2016. Prior to her appointment as Town Clerk, she was employed with Youth Opportunities Unlimited, Inc. of Lambert, Mississippi for eight years. There she worked as a Data Research Associate and Abstinence Educator in the Quitman, South Panola and Coahoma Municipal School Districts.

Her career with American Airlines began at O'Hare Airport in Chicago, Illinois in 1989; it spanned for over fifteen years. She started out at American while working evenings in Facilities Maintenance, concurrently attending Catherine Business College at night. After graduation, she was promoted to Ticket Counter Agent, two years later she was promoted to Sales Support Representative, and later she accepted the position of City Ticket Office Sales Representative until 2001. At that time she returned to Chicago O'Hare Airport to fill a position as Premium Service Representative in the very same office where she once worked as a janitor (Facilities Maintenance). Following a seven-year leave from American Airlines, she returned to work at AA in 2012, commuting from Lambert to Chicago for seven months. She retired May 13, 2013 after fifteen years of dutiful service.

Jackson is a Baptist Minister and Assistant Pastor, Sunday School Teacher and Lecturer at Pleasant Hope Missionary Baptist Church in Lambert, Mississippi under the leadership of Pastor Reginald Griffin.

She is a Published Author, ''Leaving Lambert'' (a painful journey to joy in God from a small Mississippi town) Inspirational Speaker, Certified Abstinence Educator, Data Researcher and Retired Premium Service Representative.

Jackson also entered into the political arena where she ran for Quitman County Tax Assessor and also ran for Chancery Clerk. She remains engaged in community activities, writing, her church ministry and mentoring the youth of Quitman County.

In December 2010, Jackson married Robert L. Jackson, Mississippi State Senator for District 11. They have a blended family of six children, eight grandchildren and three great grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Mrs. Gloria Richmond Jackson for her dedication in serving her community.

RECOGNIZING THE RECIPIENTS OF THE GLOBAL ORGANIZATION OF PEOPLE OF INDIAN ORIGIN AWARDS OF EXCELLENCE

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 2018

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the Global Organization of People of Indian Origin (GOPIO) and to congratulate the recipients of its Annual Awards of Excellence. Founded in 1989, the mission of GOPIO was battling human rights violations committed against persons of Indian origin. Today, while that mission continues, GOPIO has also broadened its mission to include pooling resources of persons of Indian origin for the benefit of not only themselves and their Indian homeland, but also the communities they currently reside in.

Indian-Americans have made countless contributions to the United States in the fields of business, education, medicine, science, technology, and public service while preserving and sharing their culture in a manner that promotes tolerance and mutual understanding.

Many of our awardees tonight have been at the forefront of those efforts. It is my honor to include in the RECORD the names of the following individuals:

Dr. Ravi Chaudary—Science and Technology
Dr. Ram Reddy—Entrepreneur
Dr. Prashanth N. Bharadwaj—Education
Mr. Jay Mandal—Journalism
Dr. Rajesh Mehra—Medicine
Ms. Swati Sharma—Arts and Culture

Northern Virginia, which I am proud to represent in Congress, is blessed by its diversity. We are home to more than 40,000 people of Indian descent and (one of) the largest number of Asian-American, including Indian-American owned small businesses and tech firms in the nation. This diversity enriches our entire community and contributes to our region being considered one of the best places in the country in which to live, work, raise a family, and start a business.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating all of the recipients of the GOPIO Awards of Excellence on their accomplishments. I commend them for their service to their communities and to our nation, and I wish them success in all their future endeavors.

TRIBUTE TO A BORDER SECURITY EXPERT

HON. MICHAEL T. McCAUL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 2018

Mr. McCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the professional achievements and service of my go-to border security guy and friend, Mr. Paul Anstine.

Paul has a long history of putting his country first. He served over seven years as a United States Marine, completing two tours in Iraq. But his service did not end there.

Paul found his way to the House of Representatives in 2007 with a determination to make this country safe from those who seek to do us harm. Paul spent the past eleven and a half years working in the halls of Congress, starting as a scheduler for my former colleague, Candice Miller of Michigan. Paul eventually worked his way up to become the Staff Director for the House Homeland Security Subcommittee on Border and Maritime Security, also known as BMS, a position which he has masterfully held for the past seven and a half years.

Paul's role as Staff Director transcended beyond his leadership in conducting oversight of the Department of Homeland Security and crafting thoughtful, pragmatic legislative solutions. Paul's positive demeanor, data-driven mindset, and work ethic made his presence not only a valued component of the committee but also in my day-to-day role as Chairman. Paul served as a subject matter expert, confidant, and trusted senior advisor whose counsel I always held in the highest regard.

His expertise helped to inform new Committee members and elevate discussions at briefings and hearings. Paul's talents were most notably on display in his role crafting countless border and maritime security bills. Paul was also the lead author for over ten bills that were signed into law, including the first ever authorization of Customs and Border Protection (CBP) and the critical Visa Waiver Program Improvement and Terrorist Prevention Act. During his tenure, he also coordinated numerous trips overseas and to the southwest border where he provided contextual information and expert analysis of the complex situation at the border to Members and Congressional staff.

Paul has left an outstanding legacy on the Committee especially with Steven Giaier, Jason Miller, Chad Carlough, Matt Coughlin, Keith Robinson, Mary Rose Rooney, Kris Ensley, Emily Trapani, Kris Carlson, Steve Roth, and Matthew Fournier, who he affectionately refers to as ''Team BMS''. Paul's quick wit, political savvy, and ability to see humor in all things will be missed profoundly.

Today, I am honored to be able to put the spotlight on him. I am hopeful that Paul's next chapter will allow him to spend more time with his wife, Rosella, and his two young boys, Alexander and Lucas. I know Paul's friendship and counsel will remain constant, and that his service to this Nation does not end here.

I thank Paul for everything, and I am excited to see what he will accomplish next.

CORPORAL ROSS BLANK

HON. KEN BUCK

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 2018

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the remarkable courage of Corporal Ross Blank, a law enforcement officer in Brush, Colorado.

On April 28, a man stole a semi-truck in Logan County, Colorado, and he proceeded to rampage though the town of Brush and the surrounding areas. With the police in pursuit, the semi-truck wrecked anything in its way—destroying cars, injuring several civilians, and nearly killing a police officer.

In the midst of this chaos, Corporal Blank began pursuing the semi-truck through town. He soon realized that the situation was becoming serious enough that he must resort to lethal force to stop the semi-truck. From his police car, Corporal Blank began firing at the truck's tires. As the chase led into open country, he then moved alongside the cab and fired several rounds at the driver, but even this did not stop the suspect. Later, Corporal Blank confronted the truck from the parking lot of a middle school. As the truck bore down on him, Corporal Blank bravely fired round after round after round through the truck's windshield. He escaped just before the semi-truck smashed into his patrol car. Undeterred, Blank grabbed his ammunition from the wreckage of his car and continued pursuing the truck on foot until the driver was eventually caught.

For his heroism, Corporal Blank was recently honored by Brush Police Chief Travis Anderson at a ceremony packed with town residents. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join the people of Brush in thanking Corporal Blank for his courage, quick-thinking, and dedication to protecting the people in our community.

HONORING KINGSLEY OWUSU OTOO AND DORIS TOLEDO

HON. DOUG COLLINS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 2018

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Kingsley Owusu Otoo and Doris Toledo for becoming QuestBridge College Prep Scholars, which is a national award that is given to low income youth.

Gainesville High School selected Kingsley and Doris from their junior class in recognition of their academic achievements and strong character.

As QuestBridge College Prep Scholars, Kingsley and Doris can interact with and receive feedback from college admission officers at the QuestBridge National College Admission Conference. This award also gives the chance for these two students to apply for the Quest for Excellence Award, which covers expenses for laptops and reimburses students for their college applications.

Because of receiving this award, Kingsley was selected to attend a summer program at Emory University this August, and Doris was selected to receive tele-mentoring from an Amherst College student.

I am proud to honor Kingsley Owusu Otoo and Doris Toledo for their excellent academic achievements and wish them the best of luck as they further their academic careers.

HONORING HER HOLINESS YUGA NAYAKI KARUNAMAYI AMMA

HON. RAJA KRISHNAMOORTHI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 2018

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize Her Holiness Yuga Nayaki Karunamayi Amma, known simply as ''Amma'' to her many admirers, for her exemplary efforts in bringing peace and understanding not only to the people of India, but to all nations.

Born as Sri Vijayeshwari Devi in the Indian state of Andhra Pradesh, Amma was drawn to a spiritual existence and spent most of her young adult life absorbed in prayer and meditation. After a period of intense reflection, Amma began a life of advocacy for the poor and disenfranchised, publicly speaking throughout India on the issues of nonviolence, equality, and respect for all people regardless of gender, religion, race or social status. Her teachings have led her across the globe, speaking to countless followers and performing humanitarian work wherever the need is greatest.

To realize her vision of a more just world, Amma and her organization offer a host of services to underserved men, women and children in the United States, India and Africa. These services include organizing and providing, among other things, free medical care, clean water, free education, free food, leprosy care, and wheelchair distribution. Amma believes in pursuing sustainable development that enable families trapped in poverty to give a better future to their children.

Amma is beloved by many as a Hindu saint, and has a large following in my district. Her

humanitarian efforts have been recognized and celebrated by, among others, Congressman DANNY DAVIS, Congressman BILL FOSTER, Governor Pat Quinn, Cook County Board President Toni Preckwinkle, and President Jimmy Carter.

Mr. Speaker, I want to recognize Amma's selfless and compassionate devotion to all people, and her work to bring peace and understanding to our world.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF BLACK FAMILY DEVELOPMENT INC. DURING ITS 40TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. DEBBIE DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 2018

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Honorees of the Black Family Development Corporation's 2018 Community Champions Arise Detroit and Impact Detroit awards amid its 40th anniversary. The BFDI has played a critical role in helping empower families in Michigan by giving them the help they need.

Since its founding in 1978, the BFDI has promoted and provided excellent social services in Detroit that are suited to the particular cultural needs of communities. The Detroit Chapter of the National Association of Black Social Workers, which was the precursor to BFDI, was based on the community derived needs and resulted in a programmatic focus by BFDI on child abuse and neglect. The BFDI works on behalf of children and families in their own communities in a culturally competent and respectful manner. These services have improved the lives of both parents and children in Detroit for forty years, and the success of their programs suggests it has a very long and bright future ahead of it.

The BFDI's work has been indispensable in helping forgotten communities of color. Its efforts have increased graduation rates, improved the skills of parents, and set guidelines to develop positive behaviors in at-risk children. I am proud to recognize the outstanding efforts of the BFDI and its members, and it is my hope that they will continue to be an influential and positive voice for countless families.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the Black Family Development Inc and its 40 years of success. Its work on behalf of neglected communities in Detroit has played a key role in caring for American families.

HONORING OFFICER ALEXIS HALL

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 2018

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a remarkable community servant, Officer Alexis Hall. Officer Hall has shown what can be done through hard work, setting goals, and aiming high.

Officer Hall has been with the Vicksburg Police Department since September 2015. Officer Hall is following in the footsteps of law enforcement professionals in her family. Officer Hall's mother and uncle, Lt. Penny Jones and Captain Milton Moore, have served the Vicksburg Police Department since 1999.

Officer Hall has gone above and beyond her duties as a law enforcement officer on several occasions. Officer Hall's prompt reaction to provide medical attention proved to be lifesaving measures for the individuals involved. Hall's quick thinking was a commendable effort. Officer Hall received the 2017 Vicksburg Police Department Top Cop.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Officer Alexis Hall for her dedication to serving her community.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 150TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE RATIFICATION OF THE 14TH AMENDMENT

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 2018

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in recognition and celebration of the 150th anniversary of the ratification of the Fourteenth Amendment.

On July 9, 1868, 150 years ago, two great defects in the original Constitution were corrected.

First, Section 1 of the Fourteenth Amendment repealed the ''three-fifths'' provision in the original Constitution and declared that ''any and all persons born or naturalized in the United States would be guaranteed all the rights and privileges of citizenship.''

Second, the Fourteenth Amendment provided and guaranteed to all persons in the United States due process and the equal protection of the law.

I ask that we reflect upon the progress this nation has made in fulfilling its founding promise that ''we hold these truths to be self-evident that all men are created equal.''

This promise of liberty and equality has been withheld from far too many for far too long.

While life and liberty is enshrined in our documents, this was not true for all.

Contrary to the spirit of the American Revolution, the Southern slave population at the time increased to 1.1 million in 1810 and then to nearly 4 million in 1860; by 1860 in my state of Texas, over 30 percent of the population was comprised of slaves.

Our democratic institutions—instruments of modern, civil government founded to ensure that barbaric tyrannies against humanity would be consigned to history—repeatedly upheld such blatant oppression in the form of legislation and judicial decisions that justified the horrific practices.

Even after the Thirteenth Amendment and the defeat of the Confederacy, ''Black Codes,'' passed in numerous Southern States, continued to deny African Americans basic rights and privileges enjoyed by white citizens, such as the right to free travel, to own certain property, or to bring suit in court.

Therefore 150 years ago, the Fourteenth Amendment was ratified as an endeavor to reshape the fundamental fabric of race relations in America.

Let us remember, however, that the amendment is but a single mile marker in the arduous march of courageous Americans who sought to hold our nation accountable to its founding principles.

We must also remember that the Fourteenth Amendment, and the struggle and sacrifice that came thereafter, ultimately allowed this government to become a more diverse, dynamic body to better uphold the promise of America.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in this chamber on this occasion to reaffirm that I will not squander my hard-earned opportunity to fight for the rights of all Americans regardless of race, religion, ethnicity, national origin, sexual orientation, or gender identity.

And on the sesquicentennial of this very important moment for progress and equality, the current president plans to select a nominee to fill a seat on the highest court in the land.

I remind this body that the next jurist will replace a justice who recognized the importance of affirmative action as a necessary means to help heal the scars of segregation and Jim Crowe; the next jurist will further likely be required to calibrate the balance of power between labor unions and their employing entities.

Given the importance of these and other issues, like voting rights, reproductive rights, the rights of the LGBTQ community, and countless others, those who believe the Court is the arbiter of fair justice, are looking for a jurist who will dispense fair justice for all Americans as guaranteed by the Fourteenth Amendment.

I call upon my colleagues in the Senate to put aside partisanship to ensure that the blood and sweat of patriots who gave their lives to safeguard our civil liberties shall not be in vain.

Mr. Speaker, the America that the Fourteenth Amendment saw is a nation with infinite potential for progress: that despite our history, we must continue to look toward finally achieving that shining city upon a hill.

I urge my colleagues in Congress, our faithful public servants in the myriad of federal institutions across the nation, as well as our friends in the Supreme Court to join me in celebrating that vision in this critical time of our republic by bravely choosing to step into the future by expanding civil liberties in our nation, not fumble in the past for a purportedly greater bygone era.

IN HONOR OF MR. RALPH PAIGE

HON. SANFORD D. BISHOP, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 2018

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that I rise today to pay tribute to an outstanding leader and dear friend of longstanding, Mr. Ralph Paige. Sadly, Mr. Paige passed away on Thursday, June 28, 2018. A funeral service was held on Friday, July 6, 2018 at 11:00 a.m. at New Community Church in LaGrange, Georgia.

A LaGrange, Georgia native, Ralph Paige received his Bachelor's degree in Education in 1967 from what is now Fort Valley State University and attended graduate school at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

Ralph joined the Federation of Southern Cooperatives/Land Assistance Fund (the Federation) in 1969 as a Grassroots Organizer and

went on to serve as the Director of the Federation's Business Development Office in the 70's; Director of the Federation's VISTA Project from 1977 to 1981; and as the Federation's National Field Director from 1981 until 1985 when he was promoted to the role of Executive Director, where he served with great distinction until his retirement in 2015.

During his 46-year tenure with the Federation, it flourished immensely and was instrumental in the creation of housing projects, community credit unions, cooperatives, and training programs for African-American farmers throughout the South. Ralph led the effort to file suit against the United States Department of Agriculture for discrimination in credit, conservation and rural development. Out of this effort, the Pigford I and Pigford II class action lawsuit cases were born. This paved the way for one of the largest discrimination law suits in the history of the United States and resulted in $2.5 billion in payments to African American farm families. Furthermore, he also fought for settlements for Native American, Hispanic and Women Farmers who were also the victims of discrimination.

Ralph was a member of numerous local, state, and national boards to include: Nationwide Insurance Company, National Cooperative Business Association, Cooperative Development Foundation, Cooperative Business International, the President's (George Bush) Twenty First Century Agriculture Commission, and the Rural Policy Advisory Committee to President Barack Obama and many more. Among his acclamations were inductions into the George Washington Carver Public Service Hall of Fame and the Cooperative Hall of Fame; a Congressional Black Caucus Leadership Award; and a National Cooperative Business Association Co-op Month Leadership Award. Under Ralph's outstanding leadership, the Federation received several commendations including a Humanitarian Award from the Martin Luther King Jr. Center for Nonviolent Social Change and a United Nations Award for ''significant contribution of adequate shelter to the poorer segments of the community.''

Ralph accomplished much throughout his life, but it would not have been possible without his enduring faith in God and the love and support of his wife of 51 years, Bernice; his children, Bernard and Kenyatta; and the countless others who impacted his life over the years .

On a personal note, Ralph and the federation worked diligently to facilitate a business loan to establish my law firm in Columbus, Georgia. I represented the Federation as an Attorney and during my years as a member of the Georgia General Assembly, I worked with Ralph and the Federation to enhance and facilitate state resources for the work of the Federation and its Land Assistance Activities. As a member of Congress, serving on the House Agriculture Committee and the Subcommittee of the House Agriculture Appropriations Committee, I along with other Members of the Congressional Black Caucus collaborated with Ralph Paige, the Federation and other organizations to enhance the full participation of minority and disadvantaged farmers in the receipt of resources for Agriculture, Conservation and Rural Development from the United States Department of Agriculture.

The great agricultural chemist Dr. George Washington Carver once said, ''No individual has any right to come into the world and go out of it without leaving behind distinct and legitimate reasons for having passed through it.'' We are all so blessed that Ralph Paige passed this way and during his life's journey did so much for so many for so long. His leadership, his friendship, and his presence will be greatly missed.

Mr. Speaker, my wife Vivian and I, the 48 members of the Congressional Black Caucus, along with the more than 730,000 people of the Second Congressional District, extend our heartfelt condolences to Ralph's family and friends during this difficult time. May they be consoled and comforted by their abiding faith and the Holy Spirit in the days, weeks, and months ahead.

RECOGNIZING THE RECIPIENTS OF THE NORTHERN VIRGINIA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OUTSTANDING CORPORATE CITIZENSHIP AWARDS

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 2018

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the recipients of the Outstanding Corporate Citizenship Awards, presented by the Northern Virginia Chamber of Commerce. These awards, presented annually, are given to individuals, businesses and non-profits in Northern Virginia that have demonstrated exceptional dedication to business leadership, employee engagement, and corporate social responsibility.

In Northern Virginia, we are blessed to have a strong tradition of civic engagement, which extends not only to our neighborhoods, but to our thriving business community as well. Efforts like the ones exhibited by the recipients of these awards are among the many reasons why Fairfax County remains one of the best places in the country in which to live, work, raise a family, and start a business.

It is my honor to include in the RECORD the names of the 2018 Outstanding Corporate Citizenship Awards:

Non-Profit of the Year—Cornerstones.

Public Sector of the Year—Fairfax County Office of Public Private Partnerships.

Emerging Leader of the Year—Stephen Gillotte, President & CEO, Reinventing Geospatial, Inc.

Executive Leader of the Year—Timothy Lyden—Partner, Northern Virginia—Hogan Lovells.

Small Business—ThunderCat Technology.

Mid-Size Business—Acumen Solutions.

Large Business—Accenture.

Mr. Speaker, as a former member and Chairman of the Fairfax County Board of Supervisors, I have seen firsthand how the partnership between our public, private, and nonprofit sectors come together to improve the lives of innumerable members of our community and maintain our high quality of life. I thank the Northern Virginia Chamber for once again sponsoring these important awards and extend my congratulations to all of the award recipients. I ask my colleagues to join me in thanking them for their service to our community and in wishing them great success in their future endeavors.

RECOGNIZING THE GENEROSITY OF AMERIGROUP GEORGIA AND THE GEORGIA MOUNTAIN FOOD BANK

HON. DOUG COLLINS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 2018

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the generosity of Amerigroup Georgia and the Georgia Mountain Food Bank for their efforts to fight malnutrition through a customized food box program.

The food box program was started in 2016 by Georgia Mountain Food Bank and Good News Clinic to provide nutritious food boxes to food-insecure Northeast Georgians. Due to its success, the program began collaborating with the Long Street Clinic, through which it provided food boxes tailored to the needs of diabetics.

Through the faithful work of these organizations, North Georgians struggling with poverty and health challenges are getting the nutritional support they need. The recent receipt of grant money provided by Amerigroup Georgia, a health insurance and managed health care provider, will enable the Georgia Mountain Food Bank to reach more North Georgians in need.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Amerigroup Georgia and the Georgia Mountain Food Bank as they continue to forge local partnerships to serve members of our community.

HONORING SCOTT LINDBLOOM

HON. TOM O'HALLERAN

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 2018

Mr. O'HALLERAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge Mr. Scott Lindbloom of Show Low, Arizona. Scott dedicates a significant part of his life to improving the lives of people like himself who have an intellectual or developmental disability. This week, the National Association of Councils on Developmental Disabilities is honoring Scott for his work to empower people with intellectual and developmental disabilities. I would like to offer my congratulations to him.

I met Scott at the Arizona Developmental Disabilities Planning Council booth at ''Show Low Days'' in June 2017. We spoke about Scott's work to advocate for critical legislation to meet the needs of people with developmental disabilities in my district. Scott believes, as I do, that every person, regardless of ability, should be able to participate fully in their community.

Our initial meeting helped kickstart the Disability Advisory Council in my district, the aim of which is gathering information from my constituents about whether federal programs and proposed legislation meets the needs of rural Northern Arizona residents with disabilities. The group now meets quarterly in the Arizona White Mountains.

In addition to his participation in the Disability Advisory Council, Scott also volunteers at the Show Low Chamber of Commerce, where he has helped to create internships for

high school students with developmental disabilities so that they can gain workplace skills and experience.

I wholeheartedly congratulate Scott for receiving the Champion of Equal Opportunity Start Your Journey award and thank him for his work to improve the lives of people with intellectual and developmental disabilities.

HERALDING THE ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF PRIYANKA KUMAR

HON. PAUL TONKO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 2018

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to herald the achievements of a brilliant young constituent, Priyanka Kumar. As a volunteer at a medical research lab, Priyanka assisted in developing human skin grafts using 3D print technology that could be used to treat burn victims. Last week her exceptional spirit of volunteerism earned her a Congressional Award Gold Medal.

A resident of Latham, NY, Priyanka has also worked closely with her STEM peers to create a mental health awareness initiative and has tutored local children in an array of subjects. She has said working with other women in STEM is especially gratifying, and she takes great pride in her commitment to breaking stereotypes in this male-dominated field.

Priyanka also showed exceptional ingenuity in service of others by using computer programming tools to identify tweets from people requesting aid during natural disasters, to make hospitals safer by reminding doctors to use hand sanitizers, and to master machine-learning algorithms that detect cancer in the human genome.

Priyanka described receiving the Congressional Award as an amazing experience that taught her the importance of giving back to a community. Well done, Priyanka. Her future is incredibly bright, and her friends, family and all of us in her community are very proud of all that she has accomplished.

CASTLE ROCK PARKS AND RECREATION

HON. KEN BUCK

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 2018

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the exceptional work done by the Parks and Recreation Department of Castle Rock, Colorado.

This year, Castle Rock Parks and Recreation was named a finalist in the 2018 National Gold Medal Award Program for Excellence in Park and Recreation Management, hosted by the American Academy for Park and Recreation Administration (AAPRA).

AAPRA is an association of 120 national leaders in parks and recreation management. All the individuals in this exclusive group have at least 15 years of high-level park administration experience or currently manage an agency that serves a population over 550,000. This limited number of high-caliber members makes AAPRA a premier authority on parks and recreation administration.

When it gives out its gold medal awards, AAPRA reviews applications from parks and recreation departments of various sizes across the nation. For its population size, Castle Rock Parks and Recreation ranked as one of the top-five agencies in the nation.

Coloradans know that Castle Rock is synonymous with natural beauty. The town's parks and recreation department works tirelessly to preserve wild areas, make the outdoors accessible to all residents, and provide high-quality indoor facilities.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to honor Castle Rock Parks and Recreation in the Fourth Congressional District for its stellar work to strengthen our community and support our people.

HONORING BRIA CARBO

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 2018

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor an athletic young lady, Ms. Bria Carbo of Clinton, Mississippi.

Bria Carbo is the youngest child of Ron Carbo and Dana Carbo-Bryant. She is one of three siblings to Brent and Jolie Carbo. Currently, Bria is a Junior of Clinton High School in Clinton, MS.

Bria Carbo is a very outgoing and athletic young lady, who is carrying on a legacy of track athletes in her family. Bria began running track at the age of eight (8), participating on the Amos track team and the Mississippi Track Stars summer track program in the Jackson, MS area. She began her school track career at Byram Middle School, Byram, MS and continued on when she transferred to Clinton Middle School, Clinton, MS. In 8th grade, Bria started varsity cross country with Coach Marett and varsity track in 9th grade with Coach Perkins. She has had the privilege of being a part of the state championship winning Clinton track team, three out of their 5 wins.

Bria's family history in track is very valuable. Her father, Ron, had a successful varsity and Junior Olympic track career as a native of New Orleans, La. Her older siblings, Brent and Jolie, were sprinters for Terry High School, Terry, MS. Her sister, Jolie, is currently completing her senior year as a member of the track team for the University of Mississippi. All three (3) have participated in the Junior Olympics at some point in their track careers.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Ms. Bria Carbo for her hard work and dedication at Clinton High School and I wish her much success as she continues to pursue her track career and carry her family's legacy.

BOB DOLE! BOB DOLE! IN HONOR OF SENATOR ROBERT J. DOLE, A GREAT AMERICAN LEADER AND HERO FROM KANSAS ON HIS UPCOMING 95TH BIRTHDAY

HON. PETE SESSIONS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 2018

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor an American Icon and National Treasure. An American Hero, and a man for all seasons, former Senate Leader Robert J. Dole on his upcoming 95th birthday. I include in the RECORD this poem penned in his honor by Albert Carey Caswell.

BOB DOLE! BOB DOLE!

(By Albert Carey Caswell)

BOB DOLE! BOB DOLE!
An American Hero, Oh
America's soul
A fine story of courage and glory
To have and to hold

BOB DOLE! BOB DOLE!
Of someone all our children should know
When from out of The West,
came one of America's Best with a heart of gold.

BOB DOLE! BOB DOLE!
An American tale,
who against all odds showed us just how,
To accept God's Will,
no matter how dark to move onward still
Don't forget, in the Big One WWII he helped 'Save The World'
Almost dying for our boys and girls.
As a poor farm boy from Kansas, as an American Hero he now stands.

BOB DOLE! BOB DOLE!
Who while at death's door somehow courageously moved forth
Until, one day he became a giant upon The Senate floor
And with all his wit and charm and kindness touching hearts so very warm.

BOB DOLE! BOB DOLE!
And yea Bob you could have given Bob Hope a run for his money,
because just like him too Bob, you're so funny.

BOB DOLE! BOB DOLE!
Because, when you've looked at death and loss straight in the face
It's either get up and learn how to laugh or die in that place
As you kept up your courageous pace.

BOB DOLE! BOB DOLE!
With the kind of faith,
which brings tears to our Lord's eyes with all you faced
For you Bob were like the Clint Eastwood of the Senate,
as you could be so very tough in it
But, fair like The Great One Henry Clay
As you too used that great art of compromise day after day
'Get a piece here and then a piece there,
and before you know it you've got most of what you wanted in the first place there.'

BOB DOLE! BOB DOLE!
As Bob your word was always your bond,
why even across the aisle today of you they are still fond
And you and Alan Simpson,
were The Original Leadership Dream Team which will live on
Because, you guys have both touched so many hearts from dusk to dawn
And Elizabeth,
well you married up Bob, way, way, way past where you belong.

BOB DOLE! BOB DOLE!
As your life in our Nation's history is like a beautiful American Song
But, The True Measure of this Man,
is your treatment of your fellow woman and man,
And towards children your heart so warmly always ran.
BOB DOLE! BOB DOLE!
You're ninety-five years old,
but still you're ninety-five years young,
And you're our Great American Treasure,
worth far more than your weight in gold to all among.
BOB DOLE! BOB DOLE!
For you are A Man For All Seasons,
for so many reasons!
Hey Bob,
do you still think you've got another ninety-five left in your seasons?
BOB DOLE! BOB DOLE!
AN AMERICAN HERO!
AMERICA'S GOLD!
AMERICA'S SON, TO HAVE AND TO HOLD!
BOB DOLE! BOB DOLE!

TIBET ''FROM ALL ANGLES''

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 2018

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, we recently had a hearing on the egregious human rights violations in Tibet. This hearing, again, reminds us of the dire and worsening situation of the Tibetan people inside of China. We very robustly welcomed Dhondup Wangchen to the United States.

We were glad for him to join us and that he is finally reunited with his family. What an unbelievable irony that at a time when China is buying Hollywood, buying access to universities, and buying companies to influence product, that a man who speaks so eloquently about another product of the Chinese government—repression—would find himself so horribly mistreated.

As Chairman RUBIO said, Mr. Wangchen was one of the key focuses of this Commission for a very long time.

He is one in a long line of heroic dissidents and former prisoners of conscience who have testified before this Commission. The Chinese government may not like our efforts, and that is an understatement. They do not like light being shown on their human rights abuses, but nothing good happens in the dark. We need to accelerate what we are doing to bring focus and scrutiny to their abuses.

We are looking at Tibet from all angles, as a human rights issue, as a critical matter of diplomacy, and as a geostrategic concern. Too often human rights and human rights diplomacy are discounted or ignored as a secondary concern in bilateral relations. That has been a bipartisan failure by a number of White Houses and State Departments.

They are too often viewed as problems, and not of real interest to the United States. I believe that sells out the dissidents, and sells out the best and the bravest women and men in China and anywhere else where we practice that kind of subordination of human rights to other concerns.

It is abundantly clear that we are in direct link between China's domestic human rights problems and the security and the prosperity of the United States. There is a link.

The health of the U.S. economy and the environment, the safety of our food and drug supplies, the security of our investments and personal information in cyberspace, the academic freedom of our universities and the civility of a specific region will all depend on China complying with international law, allowing the free flow of news and information, complying with its WTO obligations and protecting the basic rights of Chinese citizens, including the fundamental freedoms of religious expression, assembly and association.

Losing sight of these facts leads to bad policy, bad diplomacy, and the needless juxtaposition of values and interests. It also sends the wrong message to those in China standing courageously for greater freedom, human rights, and the rule of law.

There is the issue of corporate capitulation referenced by our distinguished Chairman. As Mercedes Benz pulled an advertisement on Instagram with the Dalai Lama and a quote, ''Look at a situation from all angles and you will become more open.'' Like Delta and Marriott before it, Mercedes shamelessly apologized even though Instagram is blocked in China.

I remind my colleagues that back in 2006, I began a series of hearings where we had Google, Microsoft, Cisco and Yahoo. I had them take the stand and swear in. It was an eight-hour hearing. And they were not only censoring all things on their platforms, Google especially, but they were also aiding and abetting the propaganda of the Beijing dictatorship, all for profit—all for profit.

Now we see others following that terrible and dangerous precedent of years ago. It has been unabated, and now it's continuing even in a more shameless way towards Tibet.

The administration's national security strategy rightly identifies China's foreign influence operations as a strategic threat. It is imperative to counter China's global influence operations and efforts to export its authoritarian model, and globally.

I chair the Africa, Global Health, Global Human Rights, and International Organizations Subcommittee. We had a hearing in March on the influence of China in Africa. We have had these hearings before, but it is getting worse. The bad governance model of Beijing is being accepted by some, particularly dictatorships like Zimbabwe. So we need to bring a light there and compete with that influence that is being subjected, or imposed, I should say, on Africa.

As China increasingly flexes its economic muscle, the result will be more apologies, sadly, accommodation and self-censorship.

Corporate America needs to get more of a backbone. It needs to stand for fundamental freedoms. Yes, make a profit, but do so in a way that does not violate human rights. And it is not just companies that have capitulated, but universities and Hollywood, and nongovernmental organizations, and even whole countries.

As China's Belt and Road initiative expands, so will demands that countries be silent about human rights abuses, silent about religious persecution, and silent about the Chinese government's repeated failures to abide by its international obligations.

Where is the UN? I have raised it over and over again. The Human Rights Council, even at the Periodic Review, it is a very short look and scrutinizing—Israel gets unbelievable focus at the United Nations on all things related to human rights; China, not even a slap on the wrist.

We should not be silent about the abuses faced by the Tibetan people and religious leaders. The China Commission's political prisoner database contains records on 600 known Tibetan political and religious prisoners. Forty-three percent of those detained are monks, nuns and religious teachers. Almost all were imprisoned since 2008.

The Tibetan people have a right to practice their religion, preserve their wonderful culture, and speak their language. They have a right to do so without restriction or interference. The Chinese government, of course, does not agree. To them, their faith and culture are problems to be solved, not a heritage to be preserved and protected. To them, the Dalai Lama is an agitator and a revolutionary, not a world-renowned and respected voice for peace and harmony that we know him to be.

The Chinese government wants the Tibetan Buddhism that is attractive to tourists for photo-ops, and not one that is strongly embraced and revered by the Tibetan people. Allowing greater religious freedom is an essential part of dealing with the grievances of the Tibetan people, but China's answer is always the same: control, manage and repress, incarcerate, and torture. It is counterproductive and it violates China's international obligations.

Finally, in our dealings with the Chinese government and officials, Members of Congress and the administration should affirm the peaceful desires of the Tibetan people for greater autonomy and freedom within China. We should stress that China's policies create needless grievances and their repression of Tibet only hurts China's international prestige. It brings dishonor—dishonor to Beijing.

We should demand open access to Tibet by journalists and diplomats, and we should raise the cases of prisoners of conscience with Chinese officials. U.S. leadership on these issues is critical because our allies in Europe and Asia can often be bullied by Chinese threats of economic boycotts. We must demonstrate that Tibet matters, human rights matter, and that religious freedom matters to U.S.-China relations.

And, again, I thank Chairman RUBIO who has been a stalwart in speaking out on behalf of human rights all over the world, including and especially in Tibet.

IN HONOR OF MR. KALEB COOK

HON. ROD BLUM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 2018

Mr. BLUM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a remarkable student and citizen from Robins, Iowa. Mr. Kaleb Cook earned the title of a High School State Honoree granted by The Prudential Spirit of Community Awards for being part of Iowa's top youth volunteers of 2018.

Annually more than 29,000 students across the country participate in the Prudential Spirit of Community Awards program. Mr. Cook was recognized as a State Honoree. He will receive $1,000 in awards, an engraved silver medallion, and a trip to Washington, D.C. With students like Mr. Cook, communities in Iowa

and across the country will remain strong. We congratulate Mr. Cook on his accomplishment and look forward to inviting him to Washington, D.C.

HONORING DELORES GIBBS RANKIN

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 2018

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the tenancy and dedication of Mrs. Delores Gibbs Rankin.

Delores Gibbs Rankin was born in Jefferson County, Mississippi. She attended both elementary and high school in the same county. Delores attended Jackson State University receiving a Bachelors of Arts degree in Sociology in 1969 and a Masters in Sociology in 1980.

Delores started working as an Eligibility Worker with the State Department of Public Welfare in 1970. Five years later, she was appointed to Social Worker until 1980. Effective July 1, 1980, Delores was appointed the first African-American County Director for the Jefferson County Welfare Department. She faithfully kept the position of County Director until she retired in August 2010.

Delores considers it an honor to have served in various positions within the Department of Human Services. By putting God first and having a great and dedicated staff, services were provided for those in need.

During her forty years of her employment career, Delores was affiliated with the following community organizations: Jefferson County Chamber of Commerce; Jefferson County Extension Services Advisory Council; Jefferson County School District Federal Programs Advisory Committee; AJFC Community Action Board of Directors; Chairperson of Jefferson County Daycare Center; Medgar Evers Home Health Advisory Board; Chapter I Parent Advisory Council; FHA Agricultural Council; Headstart Policy Council; Jefferson County Vo-Tech Advisory Board; Mental Health Advisory Council; Vice President of State Employees Association of Mississippi; County and Regional Directors Association; Interagency Council for Jefferson County; Southwest Development and Planning District; Jefferson Comprehensive Health Center Advisory Council; Jefferson County Economic Development County; and Home Extension Services Advisory Council.

Delores is a devoted member of Mount Pleasant United Methodist Church in Fayette, Mississippi. Her church affiliations include being the Usher Board President, Finance Committee Chairperson, Senior Choir Treasurer, Sunday School Treasurer, United Methodist Women Treasurer, Building Fund Committee Secretary, and Adult Sunday School Teacher.

Delores has four beautiful children and eight gorgeous grandchildren. In her spare time, she likes to travel, shop, help others, spend time with family, and indulge in outdoor fishing.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Mrs. Delores Gibbs Rankin for her dedication to serving others.

RECOGNIZING MR. JULIAN BRYSON WILGUS ON THE OCCASION OF HIS 100TH BIRTHDAY

HON. MADELEINE Z. BORDALLO

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 2018

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Julian Bryson Wilgus on the occasion of his 100th birthday and commend him for his contributions to our community in Guam.

Julian was born on June 22, 1918 in Proctorville, Ohio, and is the son of Effie Bryson and William Harrison Wilgus. He currently resides in Talofofo, Guam after recently relocating to the island to live with his daughter Janna and her husband, Command Sergeant Major (retired) Martin Manglona.

Julian married Gleena Gamble on January 14, 1951. They were married for 48 years until Gleena's death in 1999. Julian's wife Gleena was a retired educator who earned nine master degrees. Together they raised two children, Julia Wilgus Mayo, a Regional Supervisor for School Psychologists in Lawrence County Ohio School District, and Dr. Janna Wilgus Manglona, Medical Director of the Department of Public Health and Social Services, Central Regional Health Center in Mangilao. He has been blessed with five grandchildren and one great-grandchild.

Julian attended Marshall University in West Virgina and and Case Western Reserve University in Ohio. He worked as a Detective in Huntington, West Virginia's Police Department for 23 years, as well as an engineer for the West Virginia State Highways for 21 years.

Julian is a talented craftsman. Over the years, he has built extraordinary furniture and has restored an entire household of antiques. Julian is also an avid gardener and in summer provided vegetables and canned goods for family and friends for the rest of the year.

Julian is proud of his family history as his grandfather, Charles Harrison Wilgus, a Veteran of the Civil War and prosperous plantation owner ran an underground railroad that smuggled escaped slaves to safety and freedom through a tunnel under his home leading to the Ohio River. The home became a historical site for his selfless efforts to protect the slaves while placing himself in harm's way.

I join Julian Bryson Wilgus, all his family and friends, and the people of Guam in celebrating his 100th birthday.

RECOGNIZING THE RECIPIENTS OF THE 2018 SOS INTERNATIONAL CHALLENGE AWARDS

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 2018

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize SOS International LLC (SOSi) and to congratulate its employees and leadership on another successful year. Founded in 1989 to provide specialized analytical services to the U.S. law enforcement community, SOSi has evolved into an international solutions provider with experience in 30 countries worldwide. SOSi provides intelligence, technology, and project-management solutions to large government and private-sector organizations and is known for its innovation, flexibility, and agility.

Every year, SOSi holds a company-wide meeting to review the accomplishments of the past year and to look ahead to the challenges of the future. A number of employees are also recognized as recipients of the Challenge Awards in recognition of their extraordinary contributions to the company and the safety of our nation and its communities. It is my honor to include in the RECORD the following names of the 2018 Challenge Award recipients:

Rising Star Award
Christine de Souza
Diana West
David Prattis
Steve Bartimus

Challenge Award
Rufus Parker
Abdulrazaq Almusawi
Billy Blake
Cindy French
Pauline Abraham
Heather Crampton

Excellence Award
Charika Kelly
Dan Alderman
John Billings

SOSi Teamwork Award
SEC Project Management Team
ISG DOJ LIS Team

Exemplary Leadership Award
Charles "OB" O'Brien

Mr. Speaker, these individuals are proof of the commitment to public service that exists throughout Northern Virginia. I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating each honoree on receiving a Challenge Award and thanking all of the employees and leadership of SOSi for their efforts to better our community and protect our country. I especially want to commend SOSi President and CEO, Julian Setian, for his leadership and vision. Under his guidance, SOSi has continued to grow and has become the standard bearer for progress and innovation in the government contracting industry. I thank them for their service and wish the SOSi Team continued success.

RESOLUTION ON IMMIGRANT FAMILIES BY THE CHILD SURVIVORS OF THE HOLOCAUST, LOS ANGELES

HON. ADAM B. SCHIFF

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 2018

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I rise to include in the RECORD the following resolution authored by the Board of Directors of the Child Survivors of the Holocaust, Los Angeles. The Child Survivors of the Holocaust is an organization dedicated to supporting those who survived the Holocaust as children, and who today raise awareness of human rights violations, particularly those affecting children. I urge Congress to heed their words of concern for the treatment of immigrant children and families through the policy of child separation.

We, the elected members of the Board of Directors of the Child Survivors of the Holocaust, Los Angeles (CSHLA), protest the inhumane mistreatment of innocent, immigrant children by our government officials.

The missions of the CSHLA include to:

(1) remember the Holocaust,

(2) educate our community and the public by telling our personal life-stories, and

(3) raise awareness and prevent such tragedies from happening to anyone today or in the future.

We who personally experienced the insecurity, anguish, and stress from cruel separation as victims of the Third Reich, are dismayed and outraged by the ruthless separation of infants, toddlers, and adolescents from their parents. The irreparable damage resulting from such actions has been scientifically and clinically proven to impair human development. Keeping the mission of our organization in mind, we reject these abusively tragic tactics or the racist prejudices underlying them.

HONORING ANDREW F. ATKINS

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 2018

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a remarkable public servant, the late Mr. Andrew F. Atkins.

Mr. Atkins was a native of St. Joseph, Louisiana. In 1911, Mr. Atkins' family moved to the Mississippi Delta. He attended Alcorn High School in Lorman, Mississippi, where he completed his education. He was a resident of Hollandale, Mississippi, most of his adult life. Mr. Atkins made sure it was possible that all of his six children got a college education.

Mr. Atkins was a strong minded and religious person. He was a loyal and noble character. He lived a beautiful, rewarding and spiritual life. Mr. Atkins was the longest serving member on the Board of Trustee and deacon board plus secretary/treasurer of the Little Rock Baptist Church of Hollandale, Mississippi. He also served as Superintendent of the Sunday School for a number of years.

Mr. Atkins began his career at the age of 21, where he was a Burial Insurance Agent for Dillon Funeral Home and Dillon Burial Association of Vicksburg and Leland, Mississippi for more than 70 years. Not only was he a successful insurance agent, he was also a successful Farmer. He owned and operated his farm for a number of years. At this time that same farm is being rented to another farmer in Hollandale, Mississippi. Mr. Atkins' life also included the involvement in the lives of school students. He was the first Black school bus driver to be hired in the Black Hollandale Consolidated School District. He drove the school bus for twenty-eight years where he played a positive role in the lives of the students that rode his bus. There was a good student/bus-driver relationship.

Mr. Atkins was an outstanding Mason F & AM. He was elected Worshipful Master where he served for 43 years. On the District level, he served as secretary/treasurer from 1949 to 2009. He was also a member of the third largest and one of the oldest African American Organization—The Knights and Daughters of Tabor of Mound Bayou, Mississippi.

Lastly, Mr. Atkins was a character member of the Darlove-Murphy, Mississippi Water Association. He was instrumental in getting running water to approximately 150 residents in the Darlove-Murphy communities. He had over 60 years of community/civic service in the Mississippi Delta and other Mississippi cities and towns.

During Mr. Atkins' spare time, he loved hunting rabbits, squirrels and raccoons. Mr. Atkins' departed this life at the age of 101.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the late Mr. Andrew F. Atkins for his dedication to serving others and giving back to the African American community.

CELEBRATING REV. CHUCK NATION'S 20TH ANNIVERSARY AT FIRST BAPTIST CHURCH OF FLOWERY BRANCH

HON. DOUG COLLINS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 2018

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in celebration of Rev. Chuck Nation's 40th year in ministry and his 20th anniversary as the church pastor at the First Baptist Church of Flowery Branch.

Rev. Chuck Nation grew up near Chickamauga, Georgia and later moved to Louisville, Kentucky, where he became a Christian and took an active role in church. This eventually led him to return to his Georgia home and join First Baptist Church of Flowery Branch as their pastor.

Rev. Nation has cared for the flock of nearly 700 at First Baptist Flowery Branch since 1998, making this year his 20th anniversary there. In honor of his commitment to this local body, the congregation presented him with an award and personalized gifts, including a memory jar filled with notes from church members.

I join the men and women of the First Baptist Church of Flowery Branch in recognizing this anniversary and look forward to hearing about how their church continues to thrive and celebrate faithful service.

EDWARDS MARKET AND FLOWERLAND

HON. KEN BUCK

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 2018

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Ron Edwards, Vicki Edwards and Angie Edwards-Aker on the 85th anniversary of Edwards Market and Edwards Flowerland.

Small businesses are crucial to supporting local communities and they contribute significantly to America's overall economy. Edwards Market's presence in Fort Morgan goes beyond their highly regarded reputation, but also includes their involvement in local churches, the FFA, and Colorado Proud Produce, as well as their animal purchases at the Morgan County Fair Livestock Sale. I commend their hard work and dedication to the community.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the 4th Congressional District of Colorado, I am proud to mark this momentous occasion and recognize Edwards Market and Edwards Flowerland's 85th anniversary. This business has been in the Edwards family for four generations and continues to serve as a model for small and family-run businesses across the state. I wish them continued success going forward.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 150TH ANNIVERSARY OF KANSAS CITY PUBLIC SCHOOLS

HON. EMANUEL CLEAVER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 2018

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I proudly rise today to recognize and celebrate the 150th Anniversary of Kansas City Public Schools (KCPS) and its many contributions to youth in Kansas City. As a cornerstone of the community, I am truly honored to have this institution in the Congressional District that I represent.

Kansas City Public Schools began humbly as the Kansas City Missouri School District in 1867, serving only 2,150 children in the Kansas City area. Since its formation, KCPS has faced and overcome many hurdles, from segregation and racial barriers in the 1960s, to funding and accreditation in the 1980s to the early 2000s. Throughout these challenges, KCPS has exemplified true resilience and shaped the future of education in Kansas City for the better. In its journey to gain full accreditation, KCPS turned times of struggle into opportunities for advancement, exploration, and innovation. The KCPS system launched mentor programs to conscientiously provide students with support and guidance. Recently, it spearheaded the Middle College Program that allows students who have dropped out of school to complete their high school education and prepare for technical school or a two-year degree program at no cost. Moreover, it fostered community partnerships with the public sector, private sector, business leaders, volunteers, and stakeholders to ensure the district has resources to meet the needs of every student and their family. KCPS has faced adversity, but never threw in the towel.

The KCPS system established itself as a source of stability for not only education, but also for families and the community. KCPS preserves its commitment to fostering a rich, diverse, and inclusive environment by providing services for English language learners, homeless students in transition, students with learning disabilities, and many others. This pledge to both student and family outreach demonstrates true assiduity and ensures that education is an equitable opportunity for all.

Today, the Kansas City Public School system employs 2,300 teachers and educates nearly 16,700 students annually. Of these, nearly 91 percent of students come from marginalized communities, and more than 50 languages are spoken in its 35 schools, centers, and programs. KCPS gives students the tools necessary to be college and career-ready, empowering them to achieve their dreams.

KCPS sets itself apart as an innovator, advocate, and champion. Undoubtedly, a century and a half of educating youth and serving the community is no easy feat. However, the spirit of the district, dedication of the administrators and teachers, and the commitment to growth is what allows the Kansas City Public School system to continue achieving its vision.

In our diverse city with students from all walks of life, the importance of having access to a quality public education is critical in ensuring doors of opportunity for the youth of Kansas City continue to open. It gives me

great hope for the future knowing that institutions like KCPS are devoted to a holistic support system for its scholars. I can say with confidence that the KCPS legacy will continue to shape the minds of students for generations to come.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in honoring the students and staff, both past and present, who made it possible for Kansas City Public Schools to achieve this monumental milestone.

HONORING COMRADE WILLIE L. LINDSEY, JR.

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 2018

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a remarkable public servant, Comrade Willie Lee Lindsey, Jr. who was born on February 23, 1936.

He enlisted into the United States Air Force on February 3, 1954 and was trained to be a Fire Fighter in the United States Air Force.

He obtained the rank of Airman 3rd Class (A/3C) during his 3 years and 10 months of service.

Comrade Willie L. Lindsey, Jr. served 1 year and 10 months under imminent danger and hazardous duty conditions on the Korean Peninsula of South Korea.

Comrade Willie L. Lindsey, Jr. was awarded the National Defense Medal along with the Korean Service Medal during his time of service in the Air Force.

Airman 3rd Class Willie L. Lindsey, Jr. was Honorably Discharged from the United States Air Force on January 7, 1958.

After serving his country as a Fire Fighter in the military, Comrade Willie L. Lindsey, Jr. transitioned into civilian life and worked and retired after 30 years of employment at Vickers Inc. in Jackson, Mississippi.

In December of 1985, Willie Lindsey joined the Brooks, William, Stewart, Veterans of Foreign Wars Post 9832, in Jackson, MS. He was elected VFW Post 9832 Commander in 1988 and served in that position from 1988 to 2008. He also served as VFW 5th District Commander during his time as VFW Post 9832 Commander.

In 2006 through 2007, Willie Lindsey became the first African American in the State of Mississippi to be elected and serve as State Commander of the Department of Mississippi's Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Comrade Willie L. Lindsey, Jr. was a member of Shady Grove Baptist Church in Jackson, Mississippi. He is survived by his son Roderick Odems.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Comrade Willie L. Lindsey, Jr. for his dedication to serving his country.

IN MEMORY OF THE LIFE OF LEILAS G. ''LES'' PAIR

HON. MIKE ROGERS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 2018

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the House's attention today to remember and celebrate the life of Les Pair who passed away on June 27, 2018.

Mr. Pair was born on March 23, 1923, and grew up in Albettville, Alabama. He received his B.S. degree in Agriculture Education in 1948 and Master's Degree in Agriculture Science in 1965 both from Auburn University. He worked for Auburn University in the Alabama Extension Service System for over 30 years.

He was married to Marjorie at Jasper First Methodist Church and later moved to Anniston, Alabama where his family joined Anniston First Methodist Church in 1957. Les served on almost every board, committee and long-range planning committee. He was part of the Carre Sunday School Class and served as President several times. He was also a Charter Board Member for Camp Lee.

He served in World War II in the Field Artillery 1st Infantry Division, landed in Normandy and fought in the Battle of the Bulge.

Les was a life member of the National Association of County Agriculture Agents, Auburn Agriculture Alumni Association, Epsilon Sigma Phi Fraternity, and Auburn University Alumni Association's Golden Eagles Club.

Les served in many organizations in Anniston including various boards and committees at American Red Cross, United Way of Alabama and Regional Medical Center volunteer organization. Les served as president of the Jasper and Anniston Kiwanis Clubs as well as secretary and treasurer for over 16 years. Les was awarded the Legion of Honor for his 70 years of service with the Kiwanis Club of Anniston as well as the George C. Hixson Award for his significant contribution to the club.

Les was a dedicated husband, father and grandfather.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in remembering Les Pair and celebrating a life well-lived.

BORN ON THE FOURTH OF JULY, IN HONOR OF AMERICA'S 242ND BIRTHDAY

HON. PETE SESSIONS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 2018

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in honor of America's 242nd birthday this Fourth of July, with a poetic tribute penned by Albert Carey Caswell to be included in the RECORD.

BORN ON THE FOURTH OF JULY

(By Albert Carey Caswell)

Born on The Fourth of July
As out towards Freedom and Independence a future Nation would cry
With its Founding Fathers casting their dye
With a Decoration of Independence, they all signed
Knowing full well it could mean death they would find
Declaring a Decoration of Independence was but their battle cry
As Thomas Jefferson created a work of art which now stands the test of time
And a Constitution so sublime
Sent out into a future for a world to remind
Of what hearts of courage full in search for Independence and Freedom can find
As a template,
to build the very bedrock upon which will stand the sands of time
And on this day with all of our families celebrating we must find
The cost of Freedom for all of us to remind
As we should stand with tear in eye
In our Nation's Pride
For all of our brave men and women,
who throughout the generations have fought and died,
Of such selfless sacrifice so fine
With hearts of courage full in our Lord's eyes so divine
Who one day a place in heaven would find
As now comes to mind
Are all of those families who are no longer together in time
Who together no longer can celebrate this Fourth of July
As its for them and their lost loved ones we cry
Who we should be worshiped on high,
So as we watch the rockets' red glare,
And all those fireworks exploding in air,
Holding our families close there,
Remember all of those who throughout the generations who've cared.
Those brave women and men like our Founding Forefathers who've dared
To stand tall and fight for our Freedoms and Independence we declared
And how the cost of Freedoms leaves these families hearts of the lost loved ones so bare
Who live with the kind of pain only Heaven can repair.
So, on this day give thanks and give prayer
For all the magnificent and their families who took up the battle who dared
And fight for our Freedom and Independence declare
As it all started 242 years ago
When the blossoms of Freedom were planted to bloom and grow
All planted by our Founding Fathers there so
Declaring a Declare ration of Independence for all the world to know
And nourished throughout the years,
by all of our braves sons and daughters here
Who have shed their blood and tears
And died here
In this Home of The Brave and Land of The Free that we endear
So, as you gaze into Old Glory,
that Red, White, and Blue
Let's remember our Forefathers Declaration of Independence and all those Patriots,
who are America's real Who's Who
And what was Born on The Fourth of July so true.

MCCARTER-CAISSE-VICE-HALE MEMORIAL OVERPASS

HON. JOHN SHIMKUS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 2018

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the McCarter-Caisse-Vice-Hale Memorial Overpass in Paxton, Illinois.

On April 7, 1979, Illinois State trooper Michael McCarter was attempting to stop four speeding vehicles on I–57 and Paxton patrolman William Caisse was dispatched to provide assistance. One of the suspects fled to the overpass and opened fire on the two officers, subsequently killing State Trooper McCarter and Donald Vice, McCarter's brother-in-law who was riding along with him on his shift.

Paxton patrolman Larry Hale arrived to the scene as gunfire continued. A second suspect drew a rifle from the back of his pickup truck and fatally shot Officer Caisse. Hale was then shot in the leg and chest, but despite his

wounds was able to subdue the second suspect and eventually recovered.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to send my gratitude to these men for their bravery and service to their community. Their heroism and sacrifice will never be forgotten. God bless them and their families.

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Senate insisted on its amendment to H.R. 5515, John S. McCain National Defense Authorization Act, agreed to the request from the House for a conference, and appointed conferees.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S4847–S4880

Measures Introduced: Five bills and three resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 3187–3191, S. Res. 570–571, and S. Con. Res. 41. **Page S4875**

Measures Reported:

S. 2202, to amend title 49, United States Code, to authorize appropriations for the National Transportation Safety Board, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute. (S. Rept. No. 115–293)

Report to accompany S. 2800, to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct various projects for improvements to rivers and harbors of the United States. (S. Rept. No. 115–294) **Page S4874**

Measures Passed:

100 Years of Mateship: Senate agreed to S. Con. Res. 41, recognizing 100 years of the United States-Australia relationship—100 years of Mateship. **Page S4880**

House Messages:

John S. McCain National Defense Authorization Act—Motions to Instruct Conferees: By 91 yeas to 8 nays (Vote No. 147), Senate insisted on its amendment to H.R. 5515, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2019 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, agreed to the request of the House for a conference, and authorized the Chair to appoint conferees on the part of the Senate, after taking action on the following motions to instruct conferees on the part of the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill to be instructed to insist on the inclusion in the final conference report the following motions proposed thereto: **Pages S4857–58, S4867–69**

Adopted:

By 97 yeas to 2 nays (Vote No. 148), Cornyn Motion to Instruct Conferees to insist that the conference report include language to maintain the position of the Senate regarding modernization of the Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States, as reflected in title XVII of the Senate amendment. **Page S4868**

By 97 yeas to 2 nays (Vote No. 149), Reed Motion to Instruct Conferees to (1) reaffirm the commitment of the United States to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) alliance as a community of freedom, peace, security, and shared values, including liberty, human rights, democracy, and the rule of law; (2) reaffirm the ironclad commitment of the United States to its obligations under Article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty to the collective self-defense of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization alliance; (3) establish as the policy of the United States pursuit of an integrated approach to strengthening the defense of allies and partners in Europe as part of a broader, long-term strategy using all elements of United States national power to deter and, if necessary, defeat Russian aggression; (4) call on the Administration to urgently prioritize the completion of a comprehensive whole-of-government strategy to counter malign activities of Russia that seek to undermine faith in democratic institutions in the United States and around the world, and to submit that strategy to Congress without delay; and (5) reflect the support of the United States for the rules-based international order that has ensured, and will continue to promote, an international system that benefits all nations, and for deepening and expanding alliances and partnerships to jointly work with

one another on shared challenges in Europe and the Indo-Pacific Region and throughout the world.

Pages S4868–69

The Chair appointed the following conferees on the part of the Senate: Senators McCain, Inhofe, Wicker, Fischer, Cotton, Rounds, Ernst, Tillis, Sullivan, Perdue, Cruz, Graham, Sasse, Scott, Crapo, Reed, Nelson, McCaskill, Shaheen, Gillibrand, Blumenthal, Donnelly, Hirono, Kaine, King, Heinrich, Warren, Peters, and Brown. **Page S4869**

Energy and Water, Legislative Branch, and Military Construction and Veterans Affairs Appropriations Act—Agreement: A unanimous-consent-time agreement was reached providing that notwithstanding Rule XXII, at 12 noon, on Wednesday, July 11, 2018, the Chair lay before the Senate the message to accompany H.R. 5895, making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019; that the Majority Leader, or his designee, be recognized the make a compound motion to go to conference, and that Senate immediately vote on the motion; and that if the motion is agreed to, Senators Cassidy and Corker each be recognized to offer a motion to instruct conferees, and Senate vote on the motions in the order listed, with no further action on the compound motion, and that there be two minutes of debate between each vote, equally divided in the usual form. **Page S4880**

Benczkowski Nomination—Agreement: Senate resumed consideration of the nomination of Brian Allen Benczkowski, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice.

Pages S4858–67, S4869–72

By 51 yeas to 48 nays (Vote No. 146), Senate agreed to the motion to close further debate on the nomination. **Page S4858**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that notwithstanding the provisions of Rule XXII, at 2 p.m., on Wednesday, July 11, 2018, all post-cloture time on the nomination be considered expired and Senate immediately vote on confirmation of the nomination; and that following disposition of the nomination, Senate vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the nomination of Paul C. Ney, Jr., of Tennessee, to be General Counsel of the Department of Defense. **Pages S4870–71**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for further consideration of the Benczkowski nomination, post-cloture, at approximately 10 a.m., on Wednesday, July 11, 2018; and that all time during adjournment, Leader remarks, and morning business count post-cloture on the nomination.

Page S4880

Nomination Confirmed: Senate confirmed the following nomination:

By 72 yeas to 27 nays (Vote No. EX. 145), Mark Jeremy Bennett, of Hawaii, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit.

Pages S4848–57, H4858, H4880

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:

Brett M. Kavanaugh, of Maryland, to be an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States.

39 Army nominations in the rank of general.

1 Navy nomination in the rank of admiral.

Page S4880

Messages from the House: **Pages S4872–73**

Enrolled Bills Presented: **Page S4873**

Executive Communications: **Pages S4873–74**

Executive Reports of Committees: **Pages S4874–75**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S4875–76**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Pages S4876–79**

Additional Statements: **Page S4872**

Amendments Submitted: **Pages S4879–80**

Authorities for Committees to Meet: **Page S4880**

Privileges of the Floor: **Page S4880**

Record Votes: Five record votes were taken today. (Total—149) **Page S4858, S4867–69**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 7:29 p.m., until 10 a.m. on Wednesday, July 11, 2018. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today's Record on page S4880.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:

S. 2497, to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 and the Arms Export Control Act to make improvements to certain defense and security assistance provisions and to authorize the appropriations of funds to Israel, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute; and

The nominations of Randy W. Berry, of Colorado, to be Ambassador to the Federal Democratic Republic of Nepal, Donald Lu, of California, to be Ambassador to the Kyrgyz Republic, and Alaina B. Teplitz, of Colorado, to be Ambassador to the Democratic

Socialist Republic of Sri Lanka, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador to the Republic of Maldives, all of the Department of State, and routine lists in the Foreign Service.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Committee ordered favorably reported the nomination of Robert L. Wilkie, of North Carolina, to be Secretary of Veterans Affairs.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 13 public bills, H.R. 6317–6329; and 1 resolution, H. Res. 986, were introduced. **Pages H6040–41**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H6041–42**

Reports Filed: Reports were filed today as follows:

H.R. 5953, to provide regulatory relief to charitable organizations that provide housing assistance, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 115–806);

H.R. 5877, to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to allow for the registration of venture exchanges, and for other purposes, with an amendment (H. Rept. 115–807);

H.R. 6139, to require the Securities and Exchange Commission to carry out a study to evaluate the issues affecting the provision of and reliance upon investment research into small issuers (H. Rept. 115–808);

H.R. 5793, to authorize the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to carry out a housing choice voucher mobility demonstration to encourage families receiving such voucher assistance to move to lower-poverty areas and expand access to opportunity areas (H. Rept. 115–809);

H.R. 5749, to require the appropriate Federal banking agencies to increase the risk-sensitivity of the capital treatment of certain centrally cleared options, and for other purposes, with an amendment (H. Rept. 115–810);

H.R. 5970, to require the Securities and Exchange Commission to implement rules simplifying the quarterly financial reporting regime, with amendments (H. Rept. 115–811);

H. Res. 985, providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 50) to provide for additional safeguards with respect to imposing Federal mandates, and for other purposes, and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3281) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to facilitate the transfer to non-Federal ownership of appropriate reclamation projects or facilities, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 115–812); and

H. Res. 938, resolution of inquiry directing the Attorney General to provide certain documents in the Attorney General's possession to the House of Representatives relating to the ongoing congressional investigation related to certain prosecutorial and investigatory decisions made by the Department of Justice and Federal Bureau of Investigation surrounding the 2016 election, with an amendment (H. Rept. 115–813). **Page H6040**

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Francis Rooney (FL) to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H5993**

Recess: The House recessed at 12:06 p.m. and reconvened at 2 p.m. **Page H5994**

Recess: The House recessed at 2:11 p.m. and reconvened at 2:30 p.m. **Page H5995**

Suspensions: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measures:

Transportation Worker Identification Credential Accountability Act of 2018: H.R. 5729, amended, to restrict the department in which the Coast Guard is operating from implementing any rule requiring the use of biometric readers for biometric transportation security cards until after submission to Congress of the results of an assessment of the effectiveness of the transportation security card program; **Pages H5996–97**

Requiring the Securities and Exchange Commission to carry out a study to evaluate the issues affecting the provision of and reliance upon investment research into small issuers: H.R. 6139, to require the Securities and Exchange Commission to carry out a study to evaluate the issues affecting the provision of and reliance upon investment research into small issuers; **Pages H5997–98**

Larry Doby Congressional Gold Medal Act: H.R. 1861, to award a Congressional Gold Medal in honor of Lawrence Eugene "Larry" Doby in recognition of his achievements and contributions to American major league athletics, civil rights, and the Armed Forces during World War II; **Pages H5998–H6000**

Options Markets Stability Act: H.R. 5749, amended, to require the appropriate Federal banking agencies to increase the risk-sensitivity of the capital treatment of certain centrally cleared options, by a ⅔ yea-and-nay vote of 385 yeas with none voting "nay", Roll No. 315; **Pages H6000–02, H6027–28**

Agreed to amend the title so as to read: "To require the appropriate Federal banking agencies to increase the risk-sensitivity of the capital treatment of certain centrally cleared exchange-listed options and derivatives, and for other purposes". **Page H6028**

Main Street Growth Act: H.R. 5877, amended, to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to allow for the registration of venture exchanges; **Pages H6003–05**

Building Up Independent Lives and Dreams Act: H.R. 5953, to provide regulatory relief to charitable organizations that provide housing assistance; **Pages H6005–07**

International Insurance Standards Act of 2018: H.R. 4537, amended, to preserve the State-based system of insurance regulation and provide greater oversight of and transparency on international insurance standards setting processes; **Pages H6007–10**

Housing Choice Voucher Mobility Demonstration Act of 2018: H.R. 5793, to authorize the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to carry out a housing choice voucher mobility demonstration to encourage families receiving such voucher assistance to move to lower-poverty areadigess and expand access to opportunity areas, by a ⅔ yea-and-nay vote of 368 yeas to 19 nays, Roll No. 314; **Pages H6010–13, H6025–26**

Simplifying Disclosures for Investors Act: H.R. 5970, amended, to require the Securities and Exchange Commission to implement rules simplifying the quarterly financial reporting regime; **Pages H6013–15**

Agreed to amend the title so as to read: "To require the Securities and Exchange Commission to carry out a cost benefit analysis of the use of Form 10–Q and for other purposes.". **Page H6015**

Intercountry Adoption Information Act of 2018: H.R. 5626, amended, to amend the Intercountry Adoption Act of 2000 to require the Secretary of State to report on intercountry adoptions from countries which have significantly reduced adoption rates involving immigration to the United States; **Pages H6015–17**

Strongly condemning the slave auctions of migrants and refugees in Libya: H. Res. 644, amended, strongly condemning the slave auctions of migrants and refugees in Libya; **Pages H6017–19**

Agreed to amend the title so as to read: "Strongly condemning slave auctions and the exploitation of migrants and refugees as forced laborers in Libya, and for other purposes.". **Page H6019**

Sam Farr Peace Corps Enhancement Act: H.R. 2259, amended, to amend the Peace Corps Act to expand services and benefits for volunteers; **Pages H6019–25**

SCORE for Small Business Act: H.R. 1700, amended, to amend the Small Business Act to reauthorize the SCORE program; and **Pages H6028–30**

Small Business Innovation Protection Act: H.R. 2655, to amend the Small Business Act to expand intellectual property education and training for small businesses. **Pages H6030–32**

Recess: The House recessed at 5:34 p.m. and reconvened at 6:29 p.m. **Page H6025**

Oath of Office—Twenty-Seventh Congressional District of Texas: Representative-elect Michael Cloud presented himself in the well of the House and was administered the Oath of Office by the Speaker. Earlier, the Clerk of the House transmitted a facsimile copy of a letter received from Mr. Keith Ingram, Director of Elections, Office of the Secretary of State of Texas, indicating that, at the Special Election held on June 30, 2018, the Honorable Michael Cloud was elected Representative to Congress for the 27th Congressional District, State of Texas. **Page H6026**

Whole Number of the House: The Speaker announced to the House that, in light of the administration of the oath to the gentleman from Texas, Mr. Cloud, the whole number of the House is 429. **Page H6027**

Permission to File Report: Agreed by unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to file a supplemental report on the resolution, House Resolution 928, of inquiry requesting the President and directing the Attorney General to transmit, respectively, certain documents to the House of Representatives relating to the President's use of the pardon power under article II, section 2 of the Constitution. **Page H6028**

Senate Message: Message received from the Senate by the Clerk and subsequently presented to the House today and appears on page H5995.

Quorum Calls—Votes: Two yea-and-nay votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H6026 and H6027–28. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 12 noon and adjourned at 8:31 p.m.

Committee Meetings

UNFUNDED MANDATES INFORMATION AND TRANSPARENCY ACT OF 2017; RECLAMATION TITLE TRANSFER AND NON-FEDERAL INFRASTRUCTURE INCENTIVIZATION ACT

Committee on Rules: Full Committee held a hearing on H.R. 50, the "Unfunded Mandates Information and Transparency Act of 2017"; and H.R. 3281, the "Reclamation Title Transfer and Non-Federal Infrastructure Incentivization Act". The Committee granted, by record vote of 6–3, a rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 50 under a structured rule. The rule provides one hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill. The rule provides that the amendment recommended by the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform now printed in the bill shall be considered as adopted and the bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. The rule waives all points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended. The rule makes in order only those further amendments printed in the Rules Committee report. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question. The rule waives all points of order against the amendments printed in the report. The rule provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions. In section 2, the rule provides for the consideration of H.R. 3281 under a closed rule. The rule provides one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill. The rule provides that the bill shall be considered as read. The rule waives all points of order against provisions in the bill. The rule provides one motion to recommit. Testimony was heard from Chairman Foxx and Representative Lamborn.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

NEW PUBLIC LAWS

(For last listing of Public Laws, see DAILY DIGEST, *p. D739)*

H.R. 931, to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to develop a voluntary registry to collect data on cancer incidence among firefighters. Signed on July 7, 2018. (Public Law 115–194)

H.R. 2229, to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide permanent authority for judicial review of certain Merit Systems Protection Board decisions relating to whistleblowers. Signed on July 7, 2018. (Public Law 115–195)

S. 1091, to establish a Federal Advisory Council to Support Grandparents Raising Grandchildren. Signed on July 7, 2018. (Public Law 115–196)

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR WEDNESDAY, JULY 11, 2018

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: to hold hearings to examine complex cybersecurity vulnerabilities, focusing on lessons learned from Spectre and Meltdown, 10 a.m., SR–253.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Subcommittee on National Parks, to hold hearings to examine S. 3172, 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, 3 p.m., SD–366.

Committee on Environment and Public Works: to hold hearings to examine the long-term value to United States taxpayers of low-cost Federal infrastructure loans, 10 a.m., SD–406.

Committee on Finance: Subcommittee on Social Security, Pensions, and Family Policy, to hold hearings to examine the importance of paid family leave for American working families, 3 p.m., SD–215.

Committee on Foreign Relations: business meeting to consider S. Res. 557, expressing the sense of the Senate regarding the strategic importance of NATO to the collective security of the transatlantic region and urging its member states to work together at the upcoming summit to strengthen the alliance, Time to be announced, S–116, Capitol.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Subcommittee on Federal Spending Oversight and Emergency Management, to hold hearings to examine warrantless smartphone searches at the border, 2:30 p.m., SD–342.

Committee on Indian Affairs: business meeting to consider H.R. 597, to take lands in Sonoma County, California, into trust as part of the reservation of the Lytton Rancheria of California; to be immediately followed by a hearing to examine S. 2599, to provide for the transfer of certain Federal land in the State of Minnesota for the

benefit of the Leech Lake Band of Ojibwe, 2:30 p.m., SD–628.

Committee on the Judiciary: to hold hearings to examine the nominations of Ryan Douglas Nelson, of Idaho, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit, Stephen R. Clark, Sr., to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Missouri, John M. O'Connor, to be United States District Judge for the Northern, Eastern and Western Districts of Oklahoma, Joshua Wolson, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, and James W. Carroll, Jr., of Virginia, to be Director of National Drug Control Policy, 10 a.m., SD–226.

Committee on Rules and Administration: to hold hearings to examine election security preparations, focusing on Federal and vendor perspectives, 10:30 a.m., SR–301.

Select Committee on Intelligence: closed business meeting to consider pending intelligence matters, Time to be announced, S–216, Capitol.

House

Committee on Appropriations, Full Committee, markup on FY 2019 Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill, 10 a.m., 2175 Rayburn.

Committee on Armed Services, Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities, hearing entitled ''Department of Defense's Role in Foreign Assistance'', 10 a.m., 2118 Rayburn.

Committee on Energy and Commerce, Subcommittee on Health, hearing entitled ''Opportunities to Improve the 340B Drug Pricing Program'', 10 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Communications and Technology, hearing entitled ''Protecting Customer Proprietary Network Information in the Internet Age'', 10:15 a.m., 2322 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Digital Commerce and Consumer Protection, hearing entitled ''Examining Drug-Impaired Driving'', 1 p.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Committee on Financial Services, Full Committee, markup on H.R. 1611, the ''Gender Diversity in Corporate Leadership Act of 2017''; H.R. 3555, the ''Exchange Regulatory Improvement Act''; H.R. 6021, the ''Small Business Audit Correction Act of 2018''; H.R. 6177, the ''Developing and Empowering our Aspiring Leaders Act''; legislation on the Expanding Investment in Small Businesses Act; legislation on the Enhancing Multi-Class Stock Disclosure Act; legislation on the Middle Market IPO Underwriting Cost Act; legislation on the Promoting Transparent Standards for Corporate Insiders Act; legislation on the Investment Adviser Regulatory Flexibility Improvement Act; and legislation on the National Senior Investor Initiative Act of 2018, 10 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Committee on Foreign Affairs, Full Committee, hearing entitled ''Advancing U.S. Interests in the Western Hemisphere'', 10 a.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Terrorism, Nonproliferation, and Trade; and Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific, joint hearing entitled ''China's Predatory Trade and Investment Strategy'', 2 p.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Committee on Homeland Security, Full Committee, hearing entitled ''DHS's Progress in Securing Election Systems and Other Critical Infrastructure'', 10:30 a.m., HVC–210.

Committee on Natural Resources, Full Committee, markup on H.R. 577, to designate a peak in the State of Nevada as Maude Frazier Mountain; H.R. 1482, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to maintain or replace certain facilities and structures for commercial recreation services at Smith Gulch in Idaho, and for other purposes; H.R. 3764, the ''Little Shell Tribe of Chippewa Indians Restoration Act of 2017''; H.R. 5613, the ''Quindaro Townsite National Historic Landmark Act''; H.R. 6077, the ''National Comedy Center Recognition Act''; and H.R. 6302, to enact as law certain regulations relating to the taking of double-crested cormorants, 10:15 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

Subcommittee on Water, Power and Oceans, hearing on H.R. 6038, to establish a procedure for the conveyance of certain Federal property around the Dickinson Reservoir in the State of North Dakota; H.R. 6039, to establish a procedure for the conveyance of certain Federal property around the Jamestown Reservoir in the State of North Dakota, and for other purposes; H.R. 6040, the ''Contra Costa Canal Transfer Act''; and H.R. 5556, the ''Environmental Compliance Cost Transparency Act of 2018'', 2 p.m., 1324 Longworth.

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Subcommittee on National Security, hearing entitled ''The Muslim Brotherhood's Global Threat'', 10 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Committee on Rules, Full Committee, hearing on H.R. 6237, the ''Matthew Young Pollard Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 2018 and 2019'', 3 p.m., H–313 Capitol.

Committee on Small Business, Full Committee, hearing entitled ''Innovation Nation: How Small Businesses in the Digital Technology Industry Use Intellectual Property'', 11 a.m., 2360 Rayburn.

Committee on Ways and Means, Full Committee, markup on H.R. 6301, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide high deductible health plans with first dollar coverage flexibility; legislation to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that direct primary care service arrangements do not disqualify deductible health savings account contributions, and for other purposes; H.R. 6305, the ''Bipartisan HSA Improvement Act of 2018''; H.R. 6312, the ''PHIT Act''; H.R. 6309, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow individuals entitled to Medicare Part A by reason of being over age 65 to contribute to health savings accounts; H.R. 6199, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to include certain over-the-counter medical products as qualified medical expenses; H.R. 6306, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the contribution limitation for health savings accounts, and for other purposes; H.R. 6313, the ''Responsible Additions and Increases to Sustain Employee Health Benefits Act of 2018''; H.R. 4616, to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to provide for a temporary moratorium on the employer mandate and to provide for a delay

in the implementation of the excise tax on high cost employer-sponsored health coverage; H.R. 6314, the ''Health Savings Act of 2018''; and H.R. 6311, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to modify the definition of qualified health plan for purposes of the health insurance premium tax credit and to allow individuals purchasing health insurance in the individual market to purchase a lower premium copper plan, 2 p.m., 1100 Longworth.

Next Meeting of the **SENATE**

10 a.m., Wednesday, July 11

Senate Chamber

Program for Wednesday: Senate will continue consideration of the nomination of Brian Allen Benczkowski, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, post-cloture.

At approximately 12 noon, Senate will vote on a compound motion to go to conference on H.R. 5895, Energy and Water, Legislative Branch, and Military Construction and Veterans Affairs Appropriations Act, to be followed by votes on or in relation to motions to instruct conferees.

At 2 p.m., Senate will vote on confirmation of the Benczkowski nomination. Following disposition of the Benczkowski nomination, Senate will vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the nomination of Paul C. Ney, Jr., of Tennessee, to be General Counsel of the Department of Defense.

Next Meeting of the **HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**

10 a.m., Wednesday, July 11

House Chamber

Program for Wednesday: Consideration of H.R. 200—Strengthening Fishing Communities and Increasing Flexibility in Fisheries Management Act (Subject to a Rule). Begin consideration of H.R. 3281—Reclamation Title Transfer and Non-Federal Infrastructure Incentivization Act (Subject to a Rule) and H.R. 50—Unfunded Mandates Information and Transparency Act (Subject to a Rule). Consideration of the following measure under suspension of the Rules: H.R. 2075—Crooked River Ranch Fire Protection Act.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Congressional Record The *Congressional Record* (USPS 087–390). The Periodicals postage is paid at Washington, D.C. The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through the U.S. Government Publishing Office, at *www.govinfo.gov*, free of charge to the user. The information is updated online each day the *Congressional Record* is published. For more information, contact the GPO Customer Contact Center, U.S. Government Publishing Office. Phone 202–512–1800, or 866–512–1800 (toll-free). E-Mail, *contactcenter@gpo.gov*. ¶To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 979050, St. Louis, MO 63197–9000, or phone orders to 866–512–1800 (toll-free), 202–512–1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202–512–2104. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.
POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Publishing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.