



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 165

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 13, 2019

No. 28

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
February 13, 2019.

I hereby appoint the Honorable ADRIANO ESPAILLAT to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

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

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

STAND BESIDE ISRAEL

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

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call upon all Members of Congress to stand beside Israel and confront anti-Semitism, ethnic hatred, and prejudice-driven boycotts, whether at home, abroad, and certainly for Members of this Chamber.

We, as a country, cannot tolerate this behavior, and certainly this Chamber has no room for bigotry. Furthermore, I must warn the general public

that despite the warranted outcry we saw in response to the Representative from Minnesota's irresponsible comments, this is the new normal for the liberal base in America.

To be clear, anti-Semitism has become an all-too-common occurrence in politics among the Democrat base and the far left who see Israel as nothing more than an extension of phantom corruption and colonialism.

Politicians who appeal to this type of ignorance are simply shoring up a new Democratic constituency. That is the ethos that primed the Minnesota Representative's ludicrous and insulting accusation of "bought-and-paid-for" politicians who stand with Israel.

It is that type of loose, cheap, anti-Semitic rhetoric that led to the rise of the Third Reich. It is clear to all of us, there are a couple of our new colleagues across the aisle that need to be reminded. In fact, they need to admit that the brutal regime of Iran continues to be the chief obstacle to peace and security in the Middle East, and thus, the root of most all terrorism that threatens our homeland.

For decades, Iran's funding of terrorism and extremist groups in the region has fueled violence, civil war, and bloodshed. The Iranian Parliament literally burned the U.S. flag on their parliament floor and chants, "death to Israel," and "death to America" in their streets.

At home, all Americans must oppose the radical and xenophobic boycott, divestment, and sanctions movement which are promulgated by the left. This BDS campaign is peddled by intellectually dishonest anti-Semites whose sole purpose is to attack Israel, attempting to delegitimize and isolate it from the rest of the world.

Any Member of this congressional body with ties to the BDS movement should renounce them immediately. We must hold our elected officials accountable. Whether on Twitter or in

the Halls of Congress, disgusting insinuations and bigotry must be condemned in all forms. Those who continue the use of anti-Semitic rhetoric should be held accountable for their actions.

The Democrats should follow the high standards and the high bar that the Republican leader has taken when it comes to committee assignments to those who make bigoted remarks.

America must continue to stand together in support of Israel and in support of peace in the Middle East and the world. We must build upon our unbreakable alliance with Israel and overcome the challenges that come with building a better, safer world.

THE TIME IS ALWAYS RIGHT TO DO THAT WHICH IS RIGHT

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

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, still I rise, and I rise because I love my country. I rise because it is Black History Month, and I am always, during Black History Month, amazed at what Dr. King called to our attention in his letter from the Birmingham jail. It is one of the great masterpieces of written word in the history of our country. I encourage all people to read his letter from the Birmingham jail.

But I think that as important as it is, it is equally as important to read the letter that Dr. King was responding to, because if you don't read the letter he is responding to in his letter, then you cannot totally appreciate the letter from the Birmingham jail.

I am not going to read the letter in its entirety. I will just tell you a little bit about it. This letter—I hold a copy of it in my hand—was signed by eight of the leading citizens in the area, members of the clergy, all. These leading citizens were admonishing persons to proceed with caution.

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

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



Printed on recycled paper.

H1527

Dr. King reminds us, however, that the time is always right to do what is right.

They said in their letter, "But we are convinced that these demonstrations are unwise and untimely." The time is always right to do what is right.

And I would also add—this is not in Dr. King's retort, but that we should not allow political expediency to trump the moral imperative to do what is right. The time is always right to do what is right.

People are saying today: We should wait. We don't have to move now. Let's wait. Let's let something else happen before we take any position.

They go on to say in their letter, "We agree rather with certain local Negro leadership, which has called for honest and open negotiation of racial issues in our area." To the many who say, let's have a dialogue, let's have a discussion about the race question; we need to talk about the race question.

I say to my dear brothers and sisters, dear friends, and dear Members, this was written April 12, 1963. We have been talking about the race question long before this and since this. The time is always right to do that which is right.

Dr. King reminded us that injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere. He said that in his letter. That means that if we allow injustice to exist in the White House as it relates to bigotry, and xenophobia, and homophobia, and Islamophobia, if we allow it to exist in the White House, I say to my dear brothers and sisters, it is a threat to every house in this country. Injustice anywhere is still a threat to justice everywhere.

So I happen to be one who is willing to accept all of the criticisms, and all of the slings and arrows. Send them my way. I will do what is right.

The Constitution allows it, in fact, my constituents demand it. It is time for us to take the issue up again. It is going to happen, I say to my dear brothers and sisters. I believe that we cannot allow bigotry and policy emanating from the Presidency to go unchecked.

So I can only say to you, impeachment is the solution, and the place for that solution to be properly addressed is the United States House of Representatives. Right here in this well. Impeachment is not dead.

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

CAREER AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION MONTH

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, February is Career and Technical Education Month. As co-chair of the bipartisan Career and

Technical Education Caucus, and a senior member of the Education and Labor Committee, I have long been aware of the importance of CTE programs that provides learners of all ages with career-ready skills.

From agriculture to the arts, from marketing to manufacturing, CTE programs work to develop America's most valuable resource: its people.

Together with my friend and colleague, Congressman JIM LANGEVIN, co-chairman of the Career and Technical Education Caucus, we introduced a resolution officially designating February as CTE month. I encourage all of my colleagues to sign on as cosponsors because CTE truly benefits all Americans.

CTE is taught in a range of settings: from high school and area technical centers, to technical and 2-year community colleges. Millions of high school and college students are enrolled in CTE programs across the Nation, bringing CTE to every community in the country.

Fortunately, in July 2018, President Trump signed into law the Strengthening Career and Technical Education for the 21st Century Act. I authored this bill with Representative RAJA KRISHNAMOORTHY and it aims to close the skills gap by modernizing Federal investment in CTE programs, and connecting educators with industry stakeholders.

It marks the first major overhaul to the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act since 2006. The Perkins Act is important for educational institutions as well as local businesses. Small business owners rely upon Perkins programs to increase the number of skilled candidates in emerging sectors. Future workers in fields such as manufacturing, information technology, healthcare, and agriculture also rely on career and technical education programs to obtain the skills necessary for high-skill, high-wage, family-sustaining jobs and careers.

Essentially, Mr. Speaker, we are providing the education and tools to equip a 21st century workforce for this Nation. For students who pursue a career in technical education, it isn't some kind of plan B option. CTE has established itself as a path that many high-achieving students choose in pursuit of industry certification and hands-on skills that they can use right away out of high school in skills-based education programs or in college.

By modernizing the Federal investment in CTE programs, we can connect more educators with industry stakeholders and close the skills gap in this country. There are good jobs out there, but people need to be qualified to get them. A career in technical education is a pathway forward for each and every one of these people.

CTE gives people from all walks of life an opportunity to succeed. During CTE month, we celebrate the achievements of students and spread aware-

ness that there is no one-size-fits-all plan for success in life. I thank Congressman LANGEVIN for his dedication to this issue, and urge all of my colleagues to support this important resolution.

CONFLICT IN YEMEN

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

Mr. BROWN of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, today the House is asserting its constitutional responsibility by cutting off U.S. involvement with the Saudi-led coalition in the devastating conflict in Yemen. I thank Representative KHANNA for leading on this issue.

This brutal war has caused mass starvation and cut off humanitarian aid from reaching those most in need. The number of casualties has exceeded half a million men, women, and children. We don't know if this legislation will reach the President's desk or whether he will sign it, but with reporting that Saudi coalition members have transferred U.S. weapons to terrorist groups in Yemen, and the Trump administration choosing to ignore a deadline last week to report on whether Saudi Crown Prince Mohammed bin Salman is responsible for the death of journalist Khashoggi, we must keep up the pressure to end U.S. involvement in hostilities in Yemen.

At the end of the day, U.S. participation in this war is illegal, having never been authorized by Congress.

□ 1015

When the United States became involved with the Saudi-led war, this action was not covered by the Authorization for Use of Military Force issued by Congress in the wake of 9/11. The Houthis, against whom the Saudi coalition is engaged, are not affiliated with al-Qaida. But because of the 60-word 2001 AUMF, three Presidents have warped that limited authorization into enabling a global-spanning war, broad enough to cover airstrikes in the Khyber Pass and to boots on the ground in Niger. This AUMF contains no time limits, no geographic constraints, and no need for congressional consent or oversight.

In the last 17 years, the 2001 AUMF has been cited as statutory authority for unclassified military actions in more than 18 countries, and Congress has been left in the dark about many of these operations. Our men and women in uniform have deployed time and again, shouldering a heavy burden while at the same time the public is becoming more removed from the conflicts in which we are engaged.

Today, less than 20 percent of the Members of the 116th Congress were present when this vote was taken in 2001. But after more than a decade of putting more and more war-making power in the hands of the President and greater burden on the shoulders of our troops, Congress must take a

stand. We cannot continue to be sidelined from the decisions critical to our national security.

The Constitution is clear. Congress, not the President, has the power to declare war. The President can respond to an imminent threat to the homeland or to U.S. personnel abroad, or if we are attacked, but this is the only situation in which he may dispense with congressional approval, because as current law dictates, once the President initiates hostilities against a new enemy, Congress, not the President, dictates whether hostilities can continue.

It would be wrong for Congress to allow any President solely on his or her own authority and aside from an imminent, clear threat to sustain our involvement in any conflict, especially one so fraught as the conflict in Yemen. The United States cannot enter any conflict in the Middle East, East Asia, or Africa with no clear strategy, no clear objectives, and no authorization from Congress.

The American people need answers, and our troops and their families deserve a public debate over the sacrifices we ask them to make. I understand that for many Members, after close to two decades of war in Iraq and Afghanistan, the idea of debating, let alone authorizing, new military action is not going to be popular, even if warranted. But we were not elected to pass the buck or abdicate our constitutional responsibility. We must debate these issues.

Mr. Speaker, as a combat veteran and a Member of Congress, I know it is one of our most important and solemn responsibilities to decide when and how we send Americans into harm's way. We cannot shirk that responsibility because of its gravity. We must embrace the tough decisions our role requires us to carry out.

I hope today is the beginning of our long-overdue debate over the AUMF and the true costs of war on our country and the men and women who fight and die serving it.

ROCKEFELLER CANCER INSTITUTE

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

Mr. HILL of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of National Cancer Prevention Month and to highlight the long-term, exceptional work of the Winthrop P. Rockefeller Cancer Institute at the University of Arkansas in Little Rock.

The Rockefeller Cancer Institute opened in 1989 and serves as Arkansas' only comprehensive cancer treatment and research facility. Now in its 30th year, the Rockefeller Cancer Institute is in the process of pursuing designation as a National Cancer Institute.

In 2018, approximately 44 Arkansans a day were diagnosed with some form of cancer, and 6,910 Arkansans lost their lives to this terrible disease. NCI

grant funding would increase Arkansans' access to clinical trials and new therapies, expand services for patients, and create more healthcare jobs in central Arkansas.

With 70 NCI-designated cancer centers across the country, not one is in Arkansas, and therefore, this is a vitally important mission.

I applaud the Rockefeller Institute's objective.

RECOGNIZING BILL HOLMES

Mr. HILL of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize my friend, Bill Holmes, who passed away peacefully late last year. He left an indelible impact on the Arkansas business community.

Bill dedicated over four decades of his life to financial services, community banking, and government policy, most recently as CEO of the Arkansas Bankers Association. I was fortunate to work with him throughout my business career in Arkansas.

Among his friends, Bill was known for his quick wit, mischievous smile, and ability to connect with others. Bill's contributions to our State and our community banks will not be forgotten. I join all Arkansans in recognizing Bill for his remarkable career and his life well-lived.

I extend my respect, affection, and prayers to his wife, Rita, and their family and friends.

RECOGNIZING SYBIL JORDAN HAMPTON

Mr. HILL of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize my friend, Sybil Jordan Hampton, who was recently awarded the alumni award from the University of Chicago for providing leadership in advancing social justice and equity in our society.

Sybil grew up in Little Rock, Arkansas, and in 1962, in the aftermath of the Little Rock Nine integration of Central High in 1957, Sybil became the first African American student to complete her entire education at Little Rock Central High School.

She went on to earn her bachelor's degree from Earlham College, a master's degree in elementary education from the University of Chicago, and a second master's degree and doctorate from Columbia University.

After working as a higher education administrator and philanthropist, Sybil returned to Little Rock to become president of the Winthrop Rockefeller Foundation, focusing on building a better Arkansas. She continues to be involved in many local community service organizations and is a life member of the Girl Scouts of America.

As a local educator and civic and community leader, Arkansas has been an enriched place to live and work due to the outstanding accomplishments of Sybil Jordan Hampton.

RECOGNIZING JIM HINKLE

Mr. HILL of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the achievements of Mr. Jim Hinkle, who was inducted into the Arkansas Outdoor Hall of Fame last year by the Arkansas Game and Fish Commission.

Born and raised in Mountain View, Arkansas, Jim graduated from the University of Central Arkansas before pursuing a lifelong career in community service and the outdoors. He served as commissioner of the Arkansas Game and Fish Commission before transitioning to 14 years on the board of the National Wild Turkey Federation, ultimately serving as president of the national chapter.

Jim's leadership helped lead toward the expansion and improvement of habitat throughout the United States, Mexico, and Canada. His service to the State of Arkansas and to wildlife and conservation causes will not be forgotten, and I join all Arkansans in congratulating Jim on this achievement and wish him much continued success.

RECOGNIZING THURMAN BOOTH'S RETIREMENT

Mr. HILL of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the life of Thurman Booth. Thurman retired earlier this year after serving more than 52 years in wildlife services, most recently as the Arkansas director of Wildlife Services for the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Thurman's journey began at Louisiana State University. He quickly joined the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife as a trainee and then became assistant State supervisor in the Division of Wildlife Services. He served as the Wildlife Services lead in Arkansas since 1968.

We appreciate his service to conservation and to the Game and Fish Commission, and I wish him a great retirement.

GUN VIOLENCE

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

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, I don't know what it is like to lose a child to gun violence. My words are not sufficient to describe that pain.

These are the words of Patricia Oliver, the mother of Joaquin Oliver. Joaquin was killed 1 year ago tomorrow at Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School in Parkland, Florida.

Dear Representative DEUTCH: I am writing to you to plead with you to ensure that other mothers and fathers do not have to endure this gut-wrenching pain, the senseless and unnecessary loss of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness for my family.

My name is Patricia Oliver. My beautiful son, Joaquin, was one of the 17 who lost their lives at Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School last year. Words cannot express the devastation wrought on the families of the victims, the shattering of families, friends, and those who survived.

After the avoidable mass shooting, many said we were in their thoughts and prayers. How many of you in this Chamber uttered just those words?

I thank you for your prayers, but are you actually thinking about your constituents, about those you have sworn an oath to serve, and about those you know and love? If you were thinking, you would do something.

It is in your power to enact commonsense gun laws, commonsense mental health support, and appropriate support and guidance

to law enforcement. If we have the courage to stand up and do this, then never again will thoughts and prayers be needed in the aftermath of a mass shooting.

This country is at a crossroads. We need your leadership. We need your love, your compassion. We need your serious thought unmarred by lobbyists.

I implore you to think about the kids. Think about how you would feel if it were your son, your daughter, your granddaughter, or your grandson, because it could be.

Had we—had the Members of this body—learned the lessons of Columbine and of Sandy Hook, Joaquin would still be here. The lives of hundreds would not have been ripped to pieces. This was preventable.

Something you can do, and urge your colleagues to do right this moment, is support the recently introduced universal background checks bill.

It is now my mission in life to do whatever I can to ensure that no mother and no father have to endure the pain I have, that no shining beacon of light, hope, and love like my Joaquin is snuffed out too soon in a preventable mass shooting.

We know that he didn't have to die if our leaders had done enough. Other countries have solved this problem. The roadmap exists. Please follow it.

Sincerely, Patricia Oliver, Parkland, Florida.

Mr. Speaker, Patricia and Manuel, Joaquin's father, have not allowed Joaquin to remain a victim. He is an advocate.

Last month, the Olivers visited Capitol Hill with a statue of Joaquin to deliver this letter and to call for change. It is time to listen to them, Patricia, Manuel, and Joaquin. We shouldn't have to know the pain that Patricia and Manny know, that 16 other families in Parkland know, and that families in every corner of this country know, to do something about gun violence.

The time to act is now.

DISASTER RELIEF

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

Ms. PLASKETT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remind you and my colleagues that Congress appropriated billions for disaster relief for Hurricanes Irma and Maria. In the latest effort, however, to find funding to build a wall, the White House and top budget officials continue to discuss shifting disaster funding to pay for a wall that a foreign nation was to pay for and now must be borne by people still recovering from disaster.

The 2017 hurricane season was one of the worst on record. Among the hardest places hit were Puerto Rico and my home, the Virgin Islands of the United States, which not only lost power across the islands, but many vital pieces of infrastructure were heavily damaged and destroyed, and, most tragically, lives were lost.

This disaster significantly impacted the Virgin Islands, destroying the island's infrastructure, with the loss of our only two hospitals, multiple

schools, thousands of homes, and it left residents without electricity for a period of 9 months.

The total damage to the Virgin Islands is estimated at \$10.8 billion—\$10.8 billion in a place that only has a \$1 billion budget—\$6.9 billion for infrastructure, \$2.3 billion for housing, and \$1.5 million for the economy.

Diverting disaster funds from this community would create a security risk and make them even more vulnerable.

Mr. Speaker, shifting disaster relief funds appropriated by this body from my district and others impaired by the 2017–2018 natural disasters would create a catastrophic economic disaster.

□ 1030

Disaster funding from the Army Corps was critical to disaster recovery, including power restoration, studies, repairs, and construction projects in the Virgin Islands and other territories and States impacted by the national disasters.

The Army Corps of Engineers, however, has barged more than 25,000 cubic yards of construction and demolition debris from the territory. However, approximately more than 6,000, almost 7,000, cubic yards remain on the island, still to be removed.

There is still so much work left undone. Individuals are still without roofs. After extensive debate and discussion with FEMA, the roof repair program is just now, a year and a half later, repairing the thousands of roofs and homes destroyed.

The STEP roof program has been extended to March 1. The STEP program debris removal is still in progress throughout the territory.

The hurricanes left not one but two hospitals overwhelmed with debris and destroyed—our only two hospitals—and, now, worksheets still have not been approved by FEMA for the rebuilding of those hospitals. The modular hospital is still not in place.

Students have only recently, in this month, moved into the modular classrooms. Can you imagine?

School reconstruction has not begun. Our communities still have a long way to go to get in the disaster recovery and rebuilding process.

Mr. Speaker, nowhere else in this country would this be allowed. This would not be allowed in any of your colleagues' homes.

However, before and after the storm, Virgin Islanders put their heads down and did the work. They pitched in and helped one another because that is all we had at that time, and the benevolence of other people, until you, Congress, until you, colleagues, gave them the disaster funding that was needed to rebuild.

Mr. Speaker, unlike other places, the Virgin Islands doesn't have five or six Members of the House or millions of constituents living in your own districts. The Virgin Islands didn't have thousands of people on the news media

or chefs or playwrights bringing musicals to our island to draw attention to the devastation in our home.

The Virgin Islands had me, and I pray they have you—they have you, Mr. Speaker; they have you, colleagues—to continue the fight for them, for these Americans, to tell the White House that they should not shift disaster funding to build a wall away from Americans living in territories for something that a foreign country was to pay for in the beginning.

NATIONAL CHILDREN'S DENTAL HEALTH MONTH

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

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize February as National Children's Dental Health Month and to raise awareness around the critically important issue of access to quality dental care for our Nation's children.

The most prevalent chronic infectious disease among children in the United States is tooth decay. This disease is responsible for countless health problems in children and more than 51 million hours lost at school every year.

However, this disease is preventable with basic dental care. Sadly, even with improvements in recent years, too many children are not able to access the quality dental care they need to simply stay healthy.

I have a long history of advocating for increased access to dental care for all, particularly our Nation's young people. I have often said that our children are the living messengers we send to a future we will never see. That means that we must do everything in our power to ensure that they are healthy and given every opportunity to succeed.

Today, I also rise to share the story of a young Maryland boy named Deamonte Driver. He died because of a lack of access to basic dental care.

In February of 2007, 12-year-old Deamonte Driver came home from school with a simple headache, which had started as a toothache. His mother worked hard to make ends meet with all kinds of low-paying jobs. She searched for a dentist who would accept Medicaid for her children, but she found no dentist who would care for children's teeth.

Deamonte's mother took him to the emergency room, where he received medication for pain, a sinus infection, and a dental abscess. Unfortunately, that was not enough. The bacteria from Deamonte's cavity spread to his brain, and, at 12 years old, Deamonte Driver died—12 years old. Deamonte could be alive today if it were not for the lack of a simple procedure and the early removal of one tooth.

Deamonte's story is one we must never, ever forget. We must imprint it in the DNA of every cell of our brains.

Fortunately, we have made great strides in access to dental care, particularly for children, since Deamonte's death in 2007. Passage of the Children's Health Insurance Program Reauthorization Act and the Affordable Care Act have filled the gaps in dental care for children who are eligible for these programs. This has given many children across this great Nation access to dental care and many families greater peace of mind regarding their children's health.

Maryland has also made significant progress in access to dental healthcare over the last several years and now stands as a national model thanks, sadly, to Deamonte Driver.

Through the work of many groups and organizations, more Maryland children are visiting a dentist, and dental health is a priority in our great State. In 2017, almost 70 percent of the Maryland children enrolled in Medicaid received at least one dental care service.

The Maryland Department of Health also funds specific programs, such as the Oral Disease and Injury Prevention Program and the Dental Sealants Program, that cares for and educates thousands of children, including right there at the schools.

Yet, even with these improvements in access to education, there is more that must be done to protect dental health in honor of that little boy, Deamonte Driver. That is why I am proud to rise in support of dental care during Children's Dental Health Month and encourage everyone to take advantage of oral health education, screenings, preventive care, and restorative services in their community.

It is also why I plan to reintroduce my Comprehensive Dental Reform Act this Congress, which, among other things, would provide comprehensive dental coverage to all Medicare, Medicaid, and VA beneficiaries and make dental care an essential health benefit for adults under the Affordable Care Act.

Dental services must no longer be thought of as an optional health benefit for children or adults.

BLACK HISTORY MONTH

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

Mrs. TORRES of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate Black History Month and to honor countless African American leaders throughout our history who have pushed relentlessly to make our Union one that is more just and more equitable for all people.

We recognize the incredible progress that they made possible and the work that we still need to do to ensure that opportunity isn't something that is determined by the color of our skin.

We honor the courageous and determined everyday men and women, like Medgar Evers and Fannie Lou Hamer, who challenged every barrier in our so-

ciety and set a path for the activists of today, like Patricia Nickols-Butler, the CEO of Community Action Partnership. She has dedicated her entire life to making sure that not one single family in San Bernardino County is left behind by providing them with the resources they need to succeed.

We honor educators like Maxine Smith, who fought discrimination in our classrooms to give every child an equal opportunity to learn, and leaders in the Inland Empire like Dr. Soraya M. Coley, the president of Cal Poly Pomona, who is committed to helping every student reach his and her full potential; trailblazers like San Bernardino County's first Black schoolteacher, Dorothy Inghram, who taught every child to reach for the stars and never give up, or Dr. Eric Bishop, the vice president of student services at Chaffey College, who has been a guiding force for every student when the going got tough.

We honor the countless Black veterans who fought for our freedoms in every war, from the Revolutionary War to our current conflicts in the Middle East, and law enforcement officers who put their own lives on the line every single day to keep our communities safe. We salute Chief Derek Williams of the Ontario Police Department, whose commitment to service began in the Air Force.

We honor the public servants like Congresswoman Shirley Chisholm, the first African American woman elected to Congress, who showed us what it meant to be "unbought and unbossed" and made way for the historic number of women running for office today; and Wilmer Amina Carter, the first African American woman to represent San Bernardino County in the California State Assembly. Throughout her time in office, she worked to improve the lives of people in her community by passing laws to strengthen healthcare, safety, transportation, and help create jobs.

We honor the moral leadership of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., who made America listen—listen—to its conscience and sacrificed his life to advance civil rights for each and every one of us.

And we honor Pastor Chuck Singleton of Loveland Church in Ontario and Rialto, whose words provide comfort and healing here at home and abroad through his humanitarian work.

The successes of African American leaders reach far and wide and are deeply entrenched in each of our lives. May we all take the time to uplift the immeasurable contributions that African American leaders have made to our country this month and every single day of the year. May we renew our commitment and join them to pick up the fight for equality, opportunity, and justice for all Americans.

HOLOCAUST REMEMBRANCE

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

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, last month we commemorated Holocaust Remembrance Day. It is important that we always take note because, sadly, genocide and anti-Semitism continues to exist in the 21st century. As the philosopher George Santayana once explained: Those who do not learn history are doomed to repeat it.

Yes. An important episode in the history of the Holocaust is the story of Aristides de Sousa Mendes, a Portuguese diplomat, who was the consular general in Bordeaux, France, in the late 1930s, 1940, and 1941. As a Portuguese diplomat in Bordeaux, France, at the outset of the Second World War, Sousa Mendes is credited with saving the lives of tens of thousands of European Jews fleeing the Holocaust.

As a proud Portuguese American and the co-chair of the Congressional Portuguese Caucus, I am glad that later this year we will be hosting a screening of the film, "Disobedience: The Sousa Mendes Story," in partnership with the Sousa Mendes Foundation.

□ 1045

We must learn from our history so that the atrocities of the past are never repeated in the future. We remember, and we pledge to never, ever forget.

Speaking of atrocities, sadly, they do continue to exist around the world. This week, we will have an opportunity, as Congress, to go on record to discuss the challenges of the civil war going on in Yemen and America's participation in that effort.

It is high time Congress reassert itself in terms of our checks and balances. We have abdicated our role far too often in terms of declaring what America's actions and interventions will be like around the world. This week, we will have an opportunity to go on record on the atrocities that are taking place in Yemen and, hopefully, be a positive force for change.

In addition to our efforts this week, a looming deadline on February 15 is before us, and that is whether we will reach an agreement on proposed border security and continue to fund this government to the end of our fiscal year. It is wrong, and it is irresponsible to ever shut down government.

In the 14 years that I have been a Member of Congress, I have never voted to shut down government. It is not just the hundreds and thousands of Federal employees who are at risk, who have home payments, car payments, and other obligations, but all the other contractors and people who do business with the Federal Government or who are indirectly impacted.

We have held hearings throughout my district. I hope that before the end of this week, we will reach a bipartisan agreement on border security. I hope that we will continue to ensure that

government is not shut down and that we go about the business of working on this year's budget, hopefully, reaching an agreement to reduce the cost of prescription drugs; to reduce the cost of healthcare; to protect people's insurance for preexisting conditions; and maybe, just maybe, reach an agreement on a bipartisan infrastructure package. That is the business at hand, and that is what we ought to be focused on.

CONGRATULATING UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA,
MERCED

Mr. COSTA. Finally, on an upbeat note, Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the University of California at Merced in my district being named one of the country's universities of the year by Education Dive, which honors education's top innovators.

One of the newest research universities in the entire country, it is a testament to UC Merced's forward-thinking approach, which has been integral in increasing opportunity to improve the quality of education for California's San Joaquin Valley and the entire system of the University of California.

UC Merced prides itself in having the largest share of low-income, first-generation, and underrepresented students among all the University of California's campuses. It is the first minority-majority campus in California, with over 8,000 students.

It has been a pleasure to watch the university grow over the last 13 years and an honor to meet its educators, students, and alumni who make up a tight, close-knit community.

Go Bobcats.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 49 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

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

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer: Loving God, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

As we meditate on all the blessings of life, our fervent prayer, O God, is that people will learn to live together in reconciliation and respect so that the terrors of war and of dictatorial abuse will be no more.

May Your special blessings be upon the Members of this assembly in the important, sometimes difficult, work they do. We thank You for having in-

spired those who fashioned a bipartisan agreement earlier this week. Continue to give all Members wisdom and charity that they might work together for the common good.

May all that is done this day in the people's House be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

Mr. DELGADO. Madam Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. ALLEN led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

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

HONORING SOJOURNER TRUTH

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

Mr. DELGADO. Madam Speaker, today I rise to honor Sojourner Truth. Born a slave in Ulster County in 1797, she ran away to freedom with her infant daughter in 1827. She then challenged the illegal sale of her son to a slave owner and was the first Black woman to win such a case against a White man. She spent the rest of her life as a national leader in the abolitionist movement, challenging the norms of her time by advocating for gender and racial equality and for the right to vote.

Her bust is displayed here in the Capitol in Emancipation Hall, the first sculpture here to honor an African American woman.

It is an unbelievable honor as well as incredibly humbling to stand here dur-

ing this Black History Month, as the first African American Congressman from Upstate New York, to recognize the life of a true American hero.

I hope and pray that we as a nation continue to honor her legacy and so many others who have committed their lives to ensuring America live up to the promise of true equality for all.

RAISING THE MINIMUM WAGE

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

Mr. ALLEN. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to legislation that my Democratic colleagues are pushing to raise the Federal minimum wage to \$15 an hour—more than double its current level.

As a member of the House Education and Labor Committee, I participated in a hearing last week to speak against this radical proposal that will hurt low-skilled workers and small businesses the most. I am a proud small business owner, and I know for a fact that businesses pay wages according to their employees' skill set. In a free enterprise environment, a growing economy grows jobs which grows opportunities which grows wages.

I believe you reward a good day's work, but my Democratic colleagues don't want to believe that we can produce economic opportunity in concert with growing wages without the government interfering.

Signing the front of the paycheck and providing folks with a good job has been one of the greatest privileges of my life. That is why I oppose the Raise the Wage Act. This one-size-fits-all, top-down government regulation will destroy millions of hard-earned jobs and restrain our growing economy.

Democrats should focus on economic growth and getting the American people back to work, not an unpopular, progressive agenda.

HONORING THE FAMILIES OF VETERANS

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Madam Speaker, last year, veterans from northern California brought an issue to our attention. Due to a flaw in the current law, the Department of Veterans' Affairs cannot include almost any information about the spouse of a veteran on a VA-provided tombstone at a non-VA cemetery.

That is why last week I introduced the Honoring Veterans' Families Act to rectify this issue and allow the spouse of a veteran to be included on the veteran's grave marker on their death.

With all that veterans and their families sacrifice for this country, is that too much to ask?

Every veteran should have the opportunity to include their spouse on their own tombstone should they wish to do so.

I would like to thank my colleague from California (Mr. PANETTA), a veteran himself, for joining with me to correct this oversight in a bipartisan effort. Honoring the families of our veterans is something that everyone can and should support.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, February 13, 2019.

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

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on February 13, 2019, at 11:40 a.m.:

That the Senate passed S. 47.
That the Senate passed S. 461.
With best wishes, I am
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

BORDER SECURITY

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

Mr. HARRIS. Madam Speaker, in the next few days, we are going to be asked to take another step on our journey to securing our border.

The Congress has to take this very seriously because we have tens of thousands of people dying every year from drug overdoses with a lot of those drugs crossing our southern border. Just a few weeks ago we seized hundreds of pounds of fentanyl, a drug that can kill millions of people and, in fact, has taken tens of thousands of lives.

We know our border is unsecured. We have to do whatever we can to give the President and the Department of Homeland Security the ability to protect our southern border.

MARJORY STONEMAN DOUGLAS HIGH SCHOOL

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

Mr. CROW. Madam Speaker, I rise in memory of the 17 students killed nearly 1 year ago today at Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School. They deserve more than our remembrance, though. They deserve action and the promise that we as a country will do better. I speak today as a father, as a soldier, as a sportsman, and as a resident of Aurora, Colorado.

I respect the Second Amendment and our heritage of responsible gun owner-

ship, but I learned while serving our country that citizenship comes with duties to our fellow Americans. One of those duties is to ensure that our fellow citizens can live without fear and safely pursue their dreams and ambitions. I was sent here to speak the truth, and the truth is we are not fulfilling that duty to one another.

So let us be the generation who has the courage to stand up to the gun lobby and to the special interests. Let us be the generation that recognizes that citizenship comes with responsibility. I know we can be that generation.

The question is: Can we be that Congress?

I call on my colleagues to pass H.R. 8 and reinstitute the ban on assault weapons to keep our kids and our communities safe.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE REPUBLICAN LEADER

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable KEVIN MCCARTHY, Republican Leader:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, February 8, 2019.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to H. Res. 6 Sec. 104(a), I am pleased to appoint the following Member to the House Democracy Partnership to serve as the Ranking Republican Member:

The Honorable Vern Buchanan of Florida
Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

KEVIN MCCARTHY,
Republican Leader.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 37, REMOVAL OF UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES FROM HOSTILITIES IN YEMEN THAT HAVE NOT BEEN AUTHORIZED BY CONGRESS; WAIVING A REQUIREMENT OF CLAUSE 6(a) OF RULE XIII WITH RESPECT TO CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS REPORTED FROM THE COMMITTEE ON RULES; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 122 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 122

Resolved, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 37) directing the removal of United States Armed Forces from hostilities in the Republic of Yemen that have not been authorized by Congress. The first reading of the joint resolution shall be dispensed with. All

points of order against consideration of the joint resolution are waived. General debate shall be confined to the joint resolution and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. After general debate the joint resolution shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original joint resolution for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 116-4. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. 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 in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the joint resolution for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the joint resolution to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the joint resolution or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. The requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII for a two-thirds vote to consider a report from the Committee on Rules on the same day it is presented to the House is waived with respect to any resolution reported through the legislative day of February 17, 2019, relating to a measure making or continuing appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019.

SEC. 3. It shall be in order at any time through the calendar day of February 17, 2019, for the Speaker to entertain motions that the House suspend the rules as though under clause 1 of rule XV. The Speaker or her designee shall consult with the Minority Leader or his designee on the designation of any matter for consideration pursuant to this section.

SEC. 4. The chair of the Committee on Appropriations may insert in the Congressional Record not later than February 17, 2019, such material as she may deem explanatory of measures making or continuing appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE), my good friend, who is the ranking member of the Rules Committee, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

□ 1215

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, on Monday the Rules Committee met and reported a rule, House Resolution 122, providing for consideration of H.J. Res. 37, under a structured rule.

The rule provides 1 hour of debate, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. It also provides same-day authority for fiscal year 2019 appropriations measures, suspension authority, and authority for the Appropriations chair to insert explanatory language into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, all through February 17.

Madam Speaker, the Constitution specifically empowers Congress with the responsibility to declare war; and for more than 4 years, there has been a Saudi-led, U.S.-supported conflict happening in Yemen that is a war by any logical definition.

Nearly all of the bombs that have fallen say the same thing: "Made in the United States of America." They fall on weddings. They fall on hospitals and on homes. They fall on funerals, refugee camps, and school buses. It is an aerial bombing campaign that hammers children, families, and civilian neighborhoods every single day.

The U.S. military has supported this reign of terror with logistics, intelligence, ground support, midair refueling of bombers, and the sale of bombs and munitions dropped on Yemen.

The Armed Conflict Location and Event Data Project estimates that more than 60,000 civilians and combatants have been killed in Yemen over the last 2 years. This total is increasing by more than 2,000 people every single month.

Madam Speaker, 85,000 children under the age of 5 have died from hunger and disease; 18 million people there are food insecure; and 75 percent of Yemen's population is in need of humanitarian assistance.

The United Nations has said Yemen is suffering from the fastest growing cholera epidemic ever recorded, as well as the world's biggest food emergency.

These are not abstract numbers. These are human lives—tens of thousands of children lost.

Given all of this, Americans would be forgiven for believing that Congress actually declared our involvement in this war, but we have not. We abdicated our responsibility to the executive branch instead, across multiple Presidents, Democratic and Republican alike.

Some may dance around this fact by calling what is happening there a conflict, but let's call it what it is. It is a

war. And our involvement in this war is unconstitutional.

Despite being one of the world's worst humanitarian crises, others, like the President, don't mention Yemen at all. In his State of the Union Address last week, President Trump, right here in this Chamber, discussed his ineffective wall with Mexico, encouraged Congress to stop upholding our oversight responsibilities over his administration, and highlighted how Americans will once again be sent into space.

It was the longest State of the Union Address in nearly 20 years, but the President didn't utter the word "Yemen"—not once. He couldn't even spare 2 minutes to update this Congress and the American people on our involvement there. Are you kidding me?

The President may not want to talk about it, but a free press has been delivering the grisly details day after day, in spite of the roadblocks the Saudis have thrown up to limit media access to Yemen.

Perhaps none spoke more vocally than the late Saudi dissident and Washington Post reporter Jamal Khashoggi. He called for an end to this conflict in a column titled: "Saudi Arabia's Crown Prince Must Restore Dignity to His Country—By Ending Yemen's Cruel War." That was published in The Washington Post just weeks before his death.

Let's be honest. What happened to Jamal Khashoggi was a murder. All evidence makes it clear that it was likely at the behest of Saudi Crown Prince Mohammad bin Salman. A recent New York Times article even revealed that American intelligence agencies intercepted a conversation where bin Salman threatened to use a bullet on Mr. Khashoggi if he didn't end his criticism of Saudi Arabia and this conflict.

Madam Speaker, is this really the kind of regime Congress wants as our Nation's partner?

There was even a report that Saudis and the UAE are transferring American-made weapons to al-Qaida fighters and other rebels. This would expose sensitive national security technology that could endanger the lives of our military.

President Trump has said of Saudi Arabia: They have been a great ally.

Really? Really? This is a country that is responsible for killing and dismembering a Washington Post reporter.

Madam Speaker, if this is what the President considers a friend, then I would hate to see what he considers a foe.

Even Republicans are angry with this administration's apparent affinity towards Saudi Arabia. Politico reported: "Senate Republicans are fuming at President Donald Trump for telling lawmakers that he would disregard a law requiring a report to Congress determining who is responsible for the murder of Saudi journalist Jamal Khashoggi."

No Member of Congress should be okay with a President showing such disregard for the laws that we pass, and we certainly shouldn't look the other way when it comes to the murder of a resident of the United States.

I say to all my friends on the other side of the aisle: If you want to send a message that United States foreign policy respects human rights, join with us on this resolution.

Prior Republican Congresses have used every legislative trick in the book to prevent this debate. They even took the unprecedented step of stripping war powers resolutions related to our involvement in Yemen of their privileged status—not once but twice.

These tactics may have delayed us, but they did not deter us. Speaker Boehner may have been content ceding our constitutional duties to the executive branch. Speaker Ryan may also have been happy to do so. Thankfully, Speaker PELOSI is not. She is empowering this Congress to do its job.

I am glad that, under her leadership, this Congress has strengthened its political will and is reasserting our Article I constitutional responsibilities. This is the system our Founders intended, and it is what our constituents expect of all of us.

This Congress is not turning a blind eye to U.S. involvement in Yemen. This Congress is not looking away from the civil war the world sees unfolding on its television screens.

I want to thank the Congressional Progressive Caucus and, especially, Congressman KHANNA for leading this matter. Congressman KHANNA has been the conscience of Congress when it comes to our involvement in Yemen. He has pushed us again and again and again to do something as these atrocities mount.

We not only have a constitutional responsibility to pass the underlying resolution, we have a moral responsibility.

No Congress should be complicit in the bombing of children or the bombing of water treatment plants during a cholera outbreak or the decimation of hospitals during a humanitarian catastrophe or the creation of a blockade that leads thousands of people to die by starvation.

Considering this measure in the opening weeks of this Congress represents a clear break from the old ways of doing business, where matters of war and peace were routinely swept under the rug.

I am proud that this is a structured rule that makes in order a bipartisan amendment and a minority amendment. The bipartisan amendment is mine, and, among other things, it says that nothing in this resolution may be considered as authorizing the use of military force and nothing may alter the 2001 AUMF because, as important as this measure is, it is also targeted specifically to our involvement only in and affecting the war in Yemen.

It is something Republicans and Democrats agree on. Members ranging

from conservative Republican TOM MASSIE to progressive Congresswoman BARBARA LEE have signed on as cosponsors. It should not be controversial.

Madam Speaker, there is bipartisan agreement that the U.S. involvement in Yemen needs to end, so I urge all my colleagues to seize this opportunity that we have fought for for so long. Vote “yes” on this rule and the underlying joint resolution. Let’s finally end our Nation’s complicity in the greatest humanitarian crisis taking place on our planet today.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I want to thank my good friend, Chairman MCGOVERN, for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Normally, Madam Speaker, I would be agreeing with my good friend, Mr. MCGOVERN, on the issue of congressional war powers, and, frankly, I want to applaud his efforts over the years to reassert congressional war powers.

It is a responsibility, in my view and, I know, my friend’s view, that Congress has abdicated and one which we must work to reclaim in the weeks and months ahead. I commit to work with my friend, as I have in the past, to do just that in the future. But, in my view, this particular issue is not about congressional war powers.

Madam Speaker, we had a spirited debate on this joint resolution in the Rules Committee Monday night, and I expect that today’s debate will be just as spirited. The reason is because this measure concerns one of the most important of Congress’ powers: the power under Article I of the Constitution to declare war and to say when, where, and with whom the American Armed Forces will be committed to combat.

In 1973, Congress passed the War Powers Resolution, which is intended to give Congress and the President procedures to follow when committing U.S. Armed Forces into hostilities and to give Congress a method to instruct the President to remove U.S. forces from hostilities.

Today, the majority is bringing up H.J. Res. 37, a resolution ostensibly arising under Congress’ powers under the War Powers Resolution, to instruct the President to remove United States Armed Forces from hostilities in Yemen. Specifically, this refers to United States support for key allies, a coalition led by Saudi Arabia in their intervention in the civil war in Yemen against the Iranian-backed Houthis rebels.

Unfortunately, Madam Speaker, I believe this resolution is fatally flawed, misstates the facts, and will not accomplish what the majority is promising. For that reason, I oppose this rule and oppose this joint resolution.

Let’s start with the text of the resolution.

Section 2 of the resolution directs the President to “remove United States Armed Forces from hostilities

in or affecting the Republic of Yemen except United States Armed Forces engaged in operations directed at al-Qaida or associated forces.”

Of course, the problem with this resolution is that, under the terms of the War Powers Resolution, American Armed Forces are not currently engaged in hostilities. Hostilities, under the War Powers Resolution, means firing weapons or dropping bombs.

As we heard on Monday night at rules, the United States is presently providing assistance to the Saudi-led coalition that falls short of actual hostilities. We are providing intelligence and logistics support to an ally, but that is a far cry from the threshold necessary to be considered hostilities for the purposes of the War Powers Resolution.

This came up during Monday night’s Rules Committee debate. I note that even Representative CONNOLLY, who spoke in favor of this resolution at the Foreign Affairs Committee a few weeks ago, stated that “the United States is not technically involved on the ground in hostilities.”

If we are not “technically involved” in hostilities—we don’t have troops on the ground, we don’t have flights in the air, and we are not engaging in combat missions of any kind against the Houthis in Yemen—then what does this resolution actually accomplish?

The majority attempts to get around this by redefining hostilities to mean “in-flight refueling non-United States aircraft conducting missions as part of the ongoing civil war in Yemen.”

Even if I did accept, for the sake of argument, that this is a legitimate definition—and I don’t—this is still a false statement. The United States is not currently providing Saudi Arabia with in-flight refueling assistance and has not since early November of last year. That fact is just one of the many problems with the resolution.

I do point out the last administration certainly did that. It is actually this administration that canceled that procedure, which it inherited from the Obama administration.

But even if the statement, again, were accurate, I believe the majority’s resolution raises significant questions that should give us pause.

Across the globe, the United States has security agreements with 117 countries, including Saudi Arabia and other countries in the Saudi-led coalition. We as a nation and the President of the United States have obligations under those security agreements, including to provide them with support when they find themselves in combat situations. The resolution the majority is asking us to consider today is putting all of those security agreements—all 117 of them—into jeopardy.

When the President provides assistance short of hostilities to allies and to countries with whom the United States has a security agreement, the President is generally well within his or her rights as Commander in Chief to do so

and well within his or her statutory authority to do so.

It is only when American troops enter hostilities that the War Powers Resolution applies, and today, in Yemen, American forces are not involved in hostilities.

I think that the majority should sit back and think about the possible consequences of this resolution. For allies around the globe, this resolution should give them pause; and, for our adversaries, this resolution should give them hope.

For the first time, the United States Congress would be saying that the President of the United States no longer has the authority to provide assistance short of hostilities that we have agreed to under our security agreements with these countries. For our allies and NATO, this would put in jeopardy our commitment to the collective defense of Europe.

□ 1230

For our allies in the Pacific, like South Korea and Japan, it would put into question our ability to continue to provide support in the event of a conflict with North Korea.

For potential adversaries like Russia or Iran, this resolution provides the hope that America will not live up to its security commitments and will not support our allies during their time of need.

Perhaps most disturbingly, it would put our ongoing security arrangements with the state of Israel in question. In 1973, shortly before the War Powers Resolution was passed, Israel was subject to a surprise attack. During the resulting Yom Kippur War, while Israel was fighting for its survival, the United States launched an effort to resupply Israel. The United States military airlifted supplies, ammunition, and vehicles to Israel, helping to ensure their continued survival. However, we were never engaged in hostilities. We never committed forces to combat.

If the majority has its say, U.S. assistance to Israel under similar circumstances could be put in jeopardy. Under the type of resolution the majority is putting forward today, Israel would have good cause to question the U.S. commitment to that nation and to question our commitment to providing Israel with support in the future.

Should the United States provide Israel with the support it needs, our allies would have good reason to fear that a portion of the House of Representatives would try to shut off the tap by putting forward a resolution like this. I suggest to my friends that they rethink whether the War Powers Resolution should or even can be used in this way.

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

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

Just so there is no misunderstanding, in this resolution, it is written, Section

3: "Nothing in this joint resolution may be construed to influence or disrupt any military operations and cooperation with Israel." I mean, it is written here for everybody to see.

Secondly, my good friend talked about the consequences of moving this legislation forward. Let me tell you what the consequences of not moving this resolution forward are. It means that we are totally content to sit back and say nothing and not admit that our government has its fingerprints all over one of the worst humanitarian crises in the world. It means that we will be complicit in the continuing destruction and murder in Yemen.

If this country stands for anything, if the United States of America stands for anything, we need to stand out loud and foursquare for human rights. For too long, especially under this administration, human rights have become an afterthought.

What makes us great is the fact that we do have a high standard when it comes to human rights, that we are there to speak up for those who are being persecuted and those who are being murdered.

This is a statement, this is a signal, to the administration and to the Saudi Government that when it comes to human rights, there are people in this Congress—hopefully, a bipartisan group of people in this Congress—who are not going to be silent, who are going to demand that things change.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts and the gentleman from California for their leadership on this matter. They have discussed this over the months, and I have been pleased to join them in this effort.

Madam Speaker, U.S. bombs are bombing school buses of 40 children. U.S. bombs are bombing those in Yemen who are innocent citizens. The violence through bombing has been facilitated with U.S. resources. This is a demand that is without parallel of its necessity.

The question is whether we are engaged without the authorization of the United States Congress, whether we have declared war against Yemen. If the answer is no, then this resolution is appropriate.

Yemen is the poorest or one of the poorest countries in the world. This resolution clearly says that we should stop the hostilities against the Houthis forces. More importantly, we should stop being used by the Saudi forces.

By the way, having gone to Yemen, I know that at least a decade ago, Saudi closed its doors to the Yemen young men, who could find no work in Yemen because of its poverty, to go into Saudi to work there. Without that opportunity, all we ceded was poverty and violence. Now, because of the conflict, we have been bombing Yemen citizens for many years.

This is a constructive resolution. It does not violate the 2001 Authorization for Use of Military Force. It is one that says that we must take our forces and impact out of Yemen.

Let me also say that I know that we will discuss this further, but I do want to add that it is crucial to take note that we have an agreement on border security and funding the different agencies, so that we do not hold our Federal employees hostage and we don't shut the government.

This resolution, coming back to this resolution dealing with directing the removal of Armed Forces from Yemen, is constructive work of the Democratic Caucus and Democratic Members. We hope our Republican Members will join us in doing the right thing in removing the impact of the United States forces in Yemen.

Stop bombing children.

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

My friends talked a great deal about human rights, and I just want to make the point that I don't believe—I surely don't believe they think that the Houthi rebels in Yemen are great defenders of human rights or that the Iranian forces who are on the ground in Yemen are actually there to advance human rights and are defending them.

Frankly, I think this issue has more to do with whether or not we are involved in hostilities, which we clearly are not.

Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL), my good friend, a distinguished member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I don't know if you have ever tuned in the Rules Committee when my chairman and my ranking member up there are having a conversation. You get a very different look at what goes on in Congress then, because it is not everybody poking each other with sharp sticks. It is thoughtful, deliberate public servants who are really very close to finding a common way forward that is going to make all Americans proud.

That is my frustration with this resolution today and why I hope my colleagues will reject it.

My friend from Massachusetts, the chairman of the Rules Committee, is working very hard to open up the Rules Committee, add more voices, bring more of a constructive process to the House of Representatives. I admire him for it. I appreciate his effort, and I support him every step of the way.

But we are in some bad habits here on the floor of the House, and we are in the habit of finding ways to make important distinctions instead of making important agreements.

My friend from Massachusetts said just a few moments ago that not to do this resolution is to do nothing, and that is a false choice. There is unanimity on the floor of this House that we must stand up for Article I, that we must stand up against an overreaching

Article II executive branch, that we must speak with one voice on issues of international affairs.

Instead of bringing a bill to the floor that would have brought us together so that we do speak with one voice on behalf of 330 million Americans, we are bringing a bill to the floor that is going to pass on a largely party-line vote. We have done that time and time again in these first 45 days.

We did that with veteran housing last week. We took a bill that passed unanimously in the last Congress to both provide childcare for our veterans and pay for that childcare and, instead, this year, we brought it back where we are going to have to cut some veteran accounts in order to fund that childcare going forward. It made that motion to recommit a party-line vote.

We did that with recognition of Federal employees, Madam Speaker, where we are trying to recognize their service and their sacrifice. Instead of bringing a bill that we would have agreed on unanimously, we brought a bill that divided this institution and made us speak with two voices.

This is another missed opportunity today. My friend from Massachusetts doesn't have control over this entire institution. He can't work his will on this entire institution. He is doing what he can on the House Rules Committee to open up the process and lead to a better product.

Flawed processes produce flawed products. Divided bills on the floor of this House do nothing to unify a divided nation.

We have opportunities. There are plenty of things on which we disagree. When we have things like this on which we agree, I think we need to work harder, Madam Speaker, to bring ourselves together, put our divisions behind us, rather than highlight those divisions in the name of political gain.

This could have been a unifying moment, not just for this Congress, but for the global political entirety as they see America speak with one voice to say, when troops are in harm's way, the United States Congress, not Article II, controls that destiny. I hope we will get to that point sooner rather than later. We only get so many chances, and each time we waste one, it becomes harder.

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

I thank my good friend, the gentleman from Georgia, for his kind words. I have a great deal of respect for him, as I do for the ranking member, Mr. COLE. I am hoping that this week maybe we will have a bipartisan moment where we all stand together and keep the government open and prevent another shutdown.

But on this bill in particular, the bill that we are taking up here today is virtually identical to the bill that passed the United States Senate last year with a bipartisan vote. That bill that

passed the Senate last year was prevented by the then-Republican majority from even being considered on this House floor on at least two occasions. So I can appreciate the fact the gentleman may not agree with the statement we are trying to make today or the bill that we are putting forward here today, but the process, I think, has been pretty good.

It just had a hearing in the committee of jurisdiction. It had a markup. We had a long hearing in the Rules Committee. All the germane amendments were made in order, a bipartisan amendment and a Republican amendment, and we are going to debate it here today under regular order. So the process has been very, very, very good.

I think, for many of us, we are bringing this forward in large part because we believe that this institution has been silent for too long.

I am not here to defend the Houthis rebels or, certainly, to cover up for any Iranian meddling here, but I will say this: We know that 85,000 children under the age of 5 have died of hunger and disease since 2015. Eighty percent of all children in Yemen require humanitarian assistance, according to UNICEF, the U.N.'s children's agency.

We need to do everything in our power to encourage a political solution to this terrible humanitarian crisis. I mean, this is unbelievable. Every person who cares about human rights should be outraged by what is going on.

We are having this debate here today to say that enough is enough and to let the Saudi Government hear loud and clear that we will no longer be complicit in this.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. GABBARD).

Ms. GABBARD. Madam Speaker, I thank the chairman and the sponsor of this important legislation for the incredible leadership and continuing to be a resolute voice.

The United States support for Saudi Arabia's genocidal war in Yemen, with no authorization from Congress, has resulted in the deaths of tens of thousands of Yemeni civilians. The U.S.-Saudi coalition has dropped bombs on children in school buses, on people in markets, and on families who are celebrating weddings.

They have left millions of Yemeni people on the brink of death from famine, disease, starvation, a lack of access to clean water, sanitation, and healthcare. This has created the worst humanitarian crisis in a generation.

Earlier this week, the Trump administration threatened to veto this critical legislation should it pass Congress, this legislation that would end U.S. support for the Saudi-led war in Yemen, by spreading blatant lies. They have said that this legislation draws "constitutional concerns," and they say it would "affect our ability to prevent the spread of violent extremist organizations."

But here is the truth. First, the United States' support for this war in

Yemen is unconstitutional. Congress has not authorized it. Second, Saudi Arabia is not our ally, and continued U.S. support for this war in Yemen is strengthening terrorist groups like al-Qaida.

A recent CNN report documented how Saudi Arabia is literally taking the U.S. weapons that have been provided to them in this war in Yemen and handing them off to al-Qaida on the ground in Yemen, the very same terrorist group that attacked us on 9/11.

Or to speak of the fact that Saudi Arabia is continuing to spend billions of dollars spreading their Wahhabi-Salafist ideology that is fueling terrorist organizations like ISIS and al-Qaida, causing them to grow stronger.

Congress must take action today. We must reclaim our constitutional responsibility and pass this legislation to stop supporting Saudi Arabia's genocidal war in Yemen and strengthening these terrorist groups that threaten us.

□ 1245

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

Madam Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up the text of H.R. 336, the Strengthening America's Security in the Middle East Act of 2019. One of the four constituent parts of this bill has already passed the House by voice vote in this Congress, and three of the four constituent parts passed the House by voice vote last Congress.

The four parts of this bill authorize assistance and weapons transfers to Israel, extend defense cooperation with Jordan, establish additional sanctions related to the conflict in Syria, and allows States to divest from entities boycotting Israel. On the whole, unlike the resolution on the floor today, it will preserve and strengthen our relationship with our allies and reaffirm America's commitment to a peaceful and more secure Middle East.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Ms. CHENEY), my distinguished colleague and the chair of the Republican Conference.

Ms. CHENEY. Madam Speaker, I thank very much my colleague, Mr. COLE, for his tremendous leadership on this issue and all others as the leading Republican on the Rules Committee.

Madam Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, we will move to bring up H.R. 336, the Strengthening America's Security in the Middle East Act of 2019. I urge the House to vote on this bill, whose companion passed the Sen-

ate with bipartisan support this month.

Bringing this legislation to the floor, Madam Speaker, is not a partisan maneuver; it is an urgent matter of national security that requires action by this House.

H.R. 336 includes two bills that enhance our security cooperation with Israel and Jordan, key U.S. allies in the Middle East that are active in the fight against terrorist organizations in the region.

H.R. 336 also reaffirms America's unwavering support for Israel with the Combating BDS Act, a bill that empowers State and local governments to counter discriminatory anti-Israel boycotts.

There should be no doubt, Madam Speaker, about the bipartisan nature of each of these bills. The Israel security assistance legislation passed the House by voice vote in September. The Jordan defense cooperation bill passed the House by voice vote last February. The Syria sanctions bill passed the House by voice vote just last month. And last Congress, Senator MARCO RUBIO's Combating BDS Act gained the support of Minority Leader CHUCK SCHUMER and a number of other Democrats on the Senate side.

Most Democratic Members continue to stand with Republicans in rejecting the Boycott, Divestment, and Sanctions, BDS, campaign. These Members understand, as the Republicans do, that this is a campaign that too often seeks to delegitimize and demonize Israel. So, Madam Speaker, why not hold a vote on H.R. 336 that contains a bill called the Combating BDS Act?

BDS is a campaign whose adherents have time and time again revealed their anti-Semitic motives. This is a campaign that directs its followers to avoid certain products merely because they are made in Israel. Armed with economic warfare tactics, supporters of BDS seek to isolate and punish the only Jewish state. That, Madam Speaker, is the dictionary definition of discrimination.

Opponents of the Combating BDS Act often cite First Amendment objections to this legislation, but the truth is, this bill would not prohibit individuals or companies from speaking out in support of the BDS movement, nor would it prohibit them from boycotting Israel. The Combating BDS Act applies to entities, such as companies, and their conduct.

This bill cements what should be an obvious point: States have the right not to contract with companies that engage in discriminatory conduct against Israel.

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

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Wyoming.

Ms. CHENEY. In fact, many States already have laws on the books that promote that right. At its core, the Combating BDS Act protects and empowers States in their efforts to

counter a hateful anti-Israel movement.

There is no reason not to hold a vote on H.R. 336, which also includes legislation that authorizes security assistance to Israel and extends our defense partnership with Jordan. Helping our key allies in the Middle East ensure their security should not be controversial.

Madam Speaker, we are now at a moment in this House, at a moment in this body where we are facing real anti-Semitism from the other side of the aisle. It is time that we all come together as a body in a bipartisan manner to stand against anti-Semitism, to condemn it, to ensure that everyone understands it has no place in this House, in this body, or in our public discourse.

These bills that we are offering today, if the previous question is defeated, are those bills that will recognize and symbolize American leadership and define American leadership. I hope Democrats will choose our security and our closest allies over partisanship and bring H.R. 336 to a vote.

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

First, on process, just so everybody understands, we are bringing a bill to the floor today under a structured rule that has a bipartisan amendment and a Republican amendment.

What my Republican friends are suggesting is that they want to bring up a bill, and all amendments are blocked, with the exception of one if offered by a Republican, sight unseen.

Boy, old habits die hard. This is the way they were in the majority. And thank God they are no longer in the majority, but, wow, what a lousy process this is.

Then secondly, I want to say that we are having a debate about Yemen, about one of the worst humanitarian crises in the world, where the Saudi Government is bombing weddings and funerals and school buses, where thousands and thousands, tens of thousands of people are on the verge of starvation, where children are dying every day.

The previous question has nothing to do with Yemen. I mean, it is as if this entire horrific catastrophe that is now unfolding in Yemen doesn't even exist. I mean, how sad.

This is an important issue, and we have a responsibility to debate and to vote on this issue, because we have been involved in supplying so much assistance to the Saudi Government, and not even a mention, not even a mention of this.

Maybe this doesn't matter to my Republican friends. Maybe they are perfectly fine turning a blind eye to this horrific horror show that is happening in Yemen. But I am going to tell you, I think most people in this country, when they are made aware of what is going on and they are made aware of our involvement, are horrified. This is

not what the United States Government is about.

So, in any event, it is a little bit disappointing.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. KHANNA), the author of H.J. Res. 37, and I want to thank him for his leadership on this.

Mr. KHANNA. Madam Speaker, I want to echo Representative COLE's praise for Chairman MCGOVERN for leading for years in this body in helping Congress reassert its role on matters of war and peace.

I want to just note the difference procedurally of what happened. Every time we introduced this in the last Congress, Speaker Ryan didn't allow a vote. He tied a vote on Yemen with a vote on endangered wolves.

In contrast, Chairman MCGOVERN, not only is he allowing a vote on the resolution of Yemen, he is allowing a vote on an amendment that Representative BUCK has offered that I oppose vehemently, that I went to him and I said, "This is going to gut the entire resolution."

What did Chairman MCGOVERN do? Did he say, "Oh, we will go behind closed doors. Don't worry. We won't allow a vote?" No. He said, "We are going to bring it to a vote on this floor."

I said, "Do we have the votes?"

He said, "I don't know."

Why are we bringing it to the floor? Because that is a democracy. That is what we are supposed to do in a democracy.

We will have the votes. You know how I know we are going to have the votes and it is going to be a bipartisan vote? Because when LINDSAY GRAHAM is quoted saying he may vote in support of the resolution, you know there is going to be an overwhelming vote.

I want to just address one point, because Representative COLE is one of the more thoughtful Members here and I take what he says very seriously, but on the War Powers Act, we just disagree. When you read the plain reading of the War Powers, it says that the United States Armed Forces cannot be assigned to coordinate, participate, or accompany any foreign government's military when they are in hostilities.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. KHANNA. Madam Speaker, our forces are coordinating with the Saudi forces. I concede to Members we don't have troops there, but the War Powers Resolution was written broadly, precisely because we wanted Congress to have a say.

And, Representative COLE, I am convinced if one of our allies, like Israel or another country, were attacked; I have enough confidence in this body that we would make the right decision. This is a matter of the Congress' right to have a say on matters of war and peace, and I thank Chairman MCGOVERN for bringing this for a vote.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to direct their comments to the Chair.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and then I will turn to my friend from Texas.

Madam Speaker, I want to thank my friend for his comments. And we do; we just disagree. I do not see this as appropriate for the War Powers Resolution, because we don't have troops in common; we have not committed anybody to hostilities. But the Commander in Chief historically has had broad authority to assist countries that we have agreements and arrangements with that he thinks are important in our own security, short of committing troops into combat. I think that is precisely what he is doing.

Frankly, that is what his predecessor did. It would have been nice if our friends were as equally concerned when President Obama actually was committing us to the kinds of activities we are talking about. I don't recall hearing a lot about it then, but I am happy to discuss it now.

Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MCCAUL), the former chairman of the Homeland Security Committee and the current ranking member of the Foreign Relations Committee.

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Speaker, I want to thank Ranking Member COLE for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the previous question so that we can consider H.R. 336, the Strengthening America's Security in the Middle East Act, under a rule that would allow an amendment to add a section recognizing the dangers of a precipitous withdrawal from Syria and Afghanistan. This amendment would change H.R. 336 to mirror the text of the Senate companion bill S. 1.

S. 1 passed the Senate just last week by an overwhelming bipartisan vote of 77-23.

I introduced this House companion in January.

This package of bipartisan bills from last Congress bolsters the security of America and our allies in the Middle East.

This bill authorizes U.S. security assistance to Israel over a 10-year period and updates key elements of our security cooperation to ensure that Israel can respond to the significant threats it faces from its neighbors.

It also reauthorizes the United States-Jordan Defense Cooperation Act, allowing Jordan to remain eligible to receive special treatment for the transfer of U.S. defense articles and services.

Jordan is a critical ally in the fight against ISIS and other extremist groups. We need to make sure that they are adequately equipped to help maintain stability in the Middle East.

H.R. 336 also contains the Caesar Syria Civilian Protection Act. This bill passed the House earlier this year. It should have been law a long time ago.

This act will impose long-overdue sanctions against Syria's Assad regime and its backers, including Iran and Russia, for their egregious human rights abuses.

Finally, this bill empowers State and local governments in the United States to counter the anti-Israel Boycott, Divestment, and Sanctions, otherwise known as BDS, movement's discriminatory economic warfare against Israel.

These provisions have already passed the Senate with bipartisan support. I urge all my colleagues to join me in voting "no" on the previous question in order to consider this important bill to shore up U.S. interests and allies in the Middle East and take action against Assad's murderous regime.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman, the distinguished ranking member on the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for his comments. I just would inform the gentleman that, you know, another bill that passed the Senate with a bipartisan vote is the bill that we are discussing here today on Yemen.

□ 1300

The other thing I would say to my friends on the other side of the aisle, one of the things that we are trying to do is return to regular order, something that I think a lot of people don't know what it looks like. A number of the bills that the gentleman is referring to had no markup. Let's go through the committee process. Let's do markups, and let's do this the way we are supposed to do it.

I appreciate that my friends don't want to talk about the horrific situation in Yemen, but that is what we are going to do here today because it is horrific, and it is about time that this body take a stand.

Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

Mr. CICILLINE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I want to begin by acknowledging the extraordinary leadership of the chairman of the Rules Committee and this very transparent and open process.

I stand to support, strongly, H.J. Res. 37, which directs the President to remove American troops from their role in hostilities in Yemen.

By taking up this War Powers Resolution, the House is, finally, reasserting our constitutional authority and responsibility over American military actions and sending an important message both to the Saudi-led coalition and to the Trump administration.

The Iranian-backed Houthis have acted with complete disregard for civilian lives in Yemen, blocking humanitarian aid and mounting attacks into Saudi Arabian cities. There is no question that they bear much of the blame for the current humanitarian crisis.

However, for nearly 4 years, the Saudi and Emirati-backed coalition

has used American bombs, American planes with American logistical support, and, until recently, American refueling to further a conflict that has cost thousands of civilian lives and led to a humanitarian crisis in the country. There is no question in my mind that American involvement, to date, has exceeded the congressional authorization that exists to combat terrorists in the region. For too long, the United States has been directly involved in this war without proper congressional authorization or oversight.

This bill, which passed the Senate last year with bipartisan support, specifically exempts actions that target al-Qaida and any other terrorist activity.

My colleagues opposing this effort seem to forget that we have a responsibility under the Constitution to exercise our oversight authority over American military engagement. Nothing in this legislation prevents the administration from coming to Congress and presenting a strategy and asking for authorization to involve our military in Yemen. That is not something I would support, but they did not even try to make the case.

Instead, we have become embroiled in a humanitarian nightmare and backed a flawed military engagement with no end in sight, all without proper authorization or oversight. It seems pretty obvious that it is time to exert our proper role as Congress.

H.J. Res. 37 is an important first step of what I hope will be a concerted effort to bring the war in Yemen to an end and to reestablish Congress' role in overseeing our military's engagements overseas. Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the rule and to support this resolution.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ZELDIN), my good friend.

Mr. ZELDIN. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of Mr. COLE's amendment so that the House may take up H.R. 336.

The House should immediately bring this legislation up, which is a bipartisan legislative package that would help others fight back against the BDS movement, protect U.S. security in the Middle East by strengthening our alliances with Israel and Jordan, and sanction bad actors like Assad.

The Senate version of this bill, S. 1, passed with strong bipartisan support, 77-23.

The major point of contention for some, regarding this package, is the Combating BDS Act of 2019, a bipartisan bill with over 100 cosponsors last Congress, that would help stop the BDS movement.

It is okay to have a reasonable, legitimate concern with any government, including Israel, as well as our own, but, keep in mind, the founder of BDS was blatantly anti-Semitic, and, on college campuses all across our entire country, we have college students who are being targeted by blatant anti-Semitism in the name of BDS.

The founder of the BDS movement was a raging anti-Semite, who once said: "We are witnessing the rapid demise of Zionism, and nothing can be done to save it, for Zionism is intent on killing itself. I, for one, support euthanasia." That is not all he has said.

This bill would simply allow State and local governments to have the right to counter the BDS movement by ending contracts with companies that boycott Israel. This bill does not impede the right of any American to boycott or criticize Israel. Instead, this bill protects States' rights to divest from countries that boycott Israel and from lawsuits driven by the ACLU.

The BDS movement is designed to hurt Israel by encouraging companies to boycott Israeli goods. The BDS movement is consumed by efforts to delegitimize and demonize Israel.

Numerous incidents are highlighted in my resolution, H. Res. 72, condemning this behavior. For example, at NYU, after the student government passed a resolution supporting BDS, they had to close the Center for Jewish Life in response to threatening Twitter posts by a student who expressed "a desire for Zionists to die."

There are so many other examples on college campuses all across our country. Where the BDS grows, anti-Semitism follows. Yet some Members in the House openly support this movement. House Democrats are holding up this major bipartisan legislation.

This bill would provide \$3.3 billion in security assistance to Israel and authorize the 2016 MOU to guarantee Israel's security for the next 10 years by providing advanced capabilities to protect our greatest ally.

This bill strengthens Jordan's ability to promote regional security and stability by enhancing Jordan's military capacity in the sale of defense articles.

This bill also sanctions those who provide financial assistance or support to prop up the Assad regime, which is responsible for chemical weapon attacks in Syria.

Madam Speaker, I thank, again, Mr. COLE for bringing this amendment, and I encourage all of my colleagues to support it.

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

Madam Speaker, let me say to the gentleman from New York that I appreciate his comments, but that is not what we are talking about here today.

I would just say to him, while we appreciate the cooperation of the minority in the Rules Committee and trying to facilitate a process dedicated more to regular order—and we are going to continue to work that way—that he should make sure that these bills have hearings and markups and that the Members of the House have an opportunity to be able to deliberate on them, and then bring them to the Rules Committee and we can have that debate.

But I am going to say to the gentleman, this is a new day. We, hopefully, will discuss process less and ideas more.

I would also say that we have an emergency right now when it comes to Yemen. It is one of the worst humanitarian crises in the world. I am a little bit struck by the fact that the last couple of speakers haven't even used the word "Yemen" once.

So, in any event, there is a right way to bring legislation to the floor. We want to have regular order. We want to do this the right way. We did this bill the right way. It did pass the Senate. We had a hearing, we had a markup. It came to the Rules Committee. We made in order a bipartisan amendment, a Republican amendment, one that I strongly disagree with; but, nonetheless, we hope we can defeat it on the floor. If not, that is the way it goes.

That is the process we ought to adhere to. And I would say that, if we adhered to a better process, we are going to end up with better legislation and more, hopefully, bipartisan legislation.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the remainder of my time to close.

Madam Speaker, I urge opposition to this rule and the underlying measure.

The majority has brought up a resolution under the War Powers Resolution instructing the President to remove the United States Armed Forces from hostilities in Yemen. Unfortunately, this resolution is misguided. United States Armed Forces are not currently involved in hostilities in Yemen, and it is unclear exactly what this resolution will accomplish.

Further, passage of this resolution would likely damage our relationships with our allies, who would have reason to question our commitments to them, and embolden our potential adversaries in the future.

I want to take just a moment to, frankly, reaffirm and thank my friend for his strong assertion of Congress' powers under war powers. I think he has absolutely been a leader in this area, and I have tried to work with him on many occasions.

I want to state for the RECORD, I look forward to working with him in this area again, because I think this body, under both Republicans and Democrats, has far too often abdicated its responsibilities and simply left it to the executive branch to determine when we were at war.

Frankly, when President Bush 41 went to war in the Gulf, he came to Congress and asked for its permission; when President Bush 43 went to war, he came to Congress and asked for its permission in both Afghanistan and Iraq—and they received it.

President Obama never bothered to do that. Whether it was in Libya or whether it was extending the mission, in many cases, he simply did not choose to do that. And, frankly, it was President Obama who began the actions that concerned my friends in Yemen.

So, again, my friend has appropriately tried to pursue, over the

course of his career, the reassertion of congressional war powers, and I commend him for that. This case is not one of those cases.

The President of the United States does have legitimate powers as Commander in Chief to support friends and allies short of war without congressional approval. That has happened time and time and time again in American history.

We have 117 security agreements with various countries around the world. Some of those are with countries we have formal alliances with, some of them are not. They do not commit the United States to hostilities, but they do say, in certain situations, we will be there to render support.

I agree with my friend that there have been atrocities in Yemen. I think he is absolutely right about that. I think, unfortunately, we didn't talk very much about the Iranian role in that. We didn't talk very much about the Houthi role in that. We didn't talk very much about who overthrew a legitimate government and what other countries were involved in that. This is a lot more complex than that.

But, in this case, unlike Libya, for instance, where President Obama did commit us to military activity without coming to this Chamber and asking permission, somehow stretched the NATO alliance to cover our participation in a conflict within a country that had not attacked any member of NATO, let alone the United States of America, that was a time we should have done something like this.

Right now, in my view, whether you agree with him or not, the President is exercising his legitimate authority as Commander in Chief. And it is worth noting for the RECORD, he is actually doing less than his predecessor, President Obama, did. He actually is the person, President Trump, who ordered the cessation of aerial refueling operations with the Saudi Air Force.

Again, there is room for disagreement here. I know, on the underlying issue of congressional war powers, my friend and I agree. I look forward to working with him on that issue as we go forward, as I know we will. But, in my opinion, this is the wrong place and the wrong time to have this debate.

I think the President is operating well within his rights. He has made it clear he will veto this legislation should it pass the United States Senate. None of us know whether it will. But I can assure you this: that veto will have more than enough votes to sustain it.

So, again, I thank my friend for the spirited debate and discussion. It is always thoughtful.

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

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

Madam Speaker, I want to recognize the work of Ranking Member COLE on

these issues. We may not agree on this specific bill, but we have worked together on matters like the Authorization for Use of Military Force for many years. He is always thoughtful in urging Congress to reclaim authority on matters of war and peace, and I do look forward to working with him in the months ahead.

Let me just remind my colleagues about how this bill came to the floor.

It was introduced in January. There was a hearing in the Foreign Affairs Committee. They held a markup, and the Rules Committee did a hearing and made amendments in order.

Some of my Republican friends may not agree with the underlying bill, but there shouldn't be much disagreement about the process, because this is how the process should work. We even made in order a Republican amendment from Congressman BUCK that I strongly oppose. That amendment would allow the President to maintain unfettered intelligence sharing with any foreign country, even when the sole objective is to help determine which targets to bomb in offensive airstrikes not authorized by Congress.

I don't believe we should preemptively cede our own purview over intelligence sharing, and certainly not as part of a resolution designed to reassert Congress' constitutional war authority.

Maybe this amendment passes—I hope it doesn't—but it will be debated, voted upon, and this House will decide.

Let me say to my colleagues what is happening in Yemen is horrific. It should shake every Member of this institution to their core: bombings of weddings, funerals, and school buses; thousands dead; children starving—a humanitarian nightmare.

I don't know what is going to happen over in the Senate, but I know what this institution should do, and that is reclaim our responsibilities and make clear that the Constitution matters, that human rights matter; the lives of people in Yemen and the children in Yemen, they matter. This Chamber, under this majority, is going to provide a consequence for the actions of the Saudi Government.

□ 1315

And I hope that this resolution is just our first step in responding to the humanitarian issues across the region. I look forward to the Foreign Affairs Committee holding more hearings and markups and bringing more bills to the Rules Committee.

I have introduced a bipartisan bill with 20 colleagues that will immediately stop all military aid and armed sales to the Government of Saudi Arabia. I think it is the right thing to do when our democratic values are on the line. I would like to see that come up for a vote, but I want to have a hearing and a markup before it comes to this floor.

But, Madam Speaker, this Congress needs to start somewhere so we can step up our response as a country.

I urge a “yes” vote on the previous question. I urge a “yes” vote on this rule and the underlying resolution.

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

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

Sec. 5. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution, the House shall proceed to the consideration in the House of the bill (H.R. 336) to make improvements to certain defense and security assistance provisions and to authorize the appropriation of funds to Israel, to reauthorize the United States-Jordan Defense Cooperation Act of 2015, and to halt the wholesale slaughter of the Syrian people, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any further amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs; (2) one amendment if offered by Representative McCaul of Texas or his designee, which shall be in order without intervention of any point of order or demand for division of the question and shall be separately debatable for 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent; and (3) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Sec. 6. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 336.

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on:

Adoption of House Resolution 122, if ordered; and

Agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 227, nays 195, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 78]

YEAS—227

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

Doyle, Michael	Lawson (FL)
F.	Lee (CA)
Engel	Lee (NV)
Escobar	Levin (CA)
Eshoo	Levin (MI)
Espallat	Lewis
Evans	Lieu, Ted
Finkenauer	Lipinski
Fletcher	Loeb sack
Foster	Lofgren
Frankel	Lowenthal
Fudge	Lowe y
Gabbard	Lujan
Gallego	Luria
Garamendi	Lynch
Garcia (IL)	Malinowski
Garcia (TX)	Maloney,
Golden	Carolyn B.
Gomez	Maloney, Sean
Gonzalez (TX)	Matsui
Gottheimer	McAdams
Green (TX)	McBath
Grijalva	McCollum
Haaland	McEachin
Harder (CA)	McGovern
Hastings	McNerney
Hayes	Meeks
Heck	Meng
Higgins (NY)	Moore
Hill (CA)	Morelle
Himes	Moulton
Horn, Kendra S.	Mucarsel-Powell
Horsford	Murphy
Houlahan	Nadler
Hoyer	Napolitano
Huffman	Neal
Jackson Lee	Neguse
Jayapal	Norcross
Jeffries	O'Halleran
Johnson (GA)	Ocasio-Cortez
Johnson (TX)	Omar
Kaptur	Pallone
Keating	Panetta
Kelly (IL)	Pappas
Kennedy	Pascrell
Khanna	Payne
Kildee	Perlmutter
Kilmer	Peters
Kim	Peterson
Kind	Phillips
Kirkpatrick	Pocan
Krishnamoorthi	Porter
Kuster (NH)	Pressley
Lamb	Price (NC)
Langevin	Raskin
Larsen (WA)	Rice (NY)
Larson (CT)	Richmond
Lawrence	Rose (NY)

NAYS—195

Abraham	Conaway	Hartzler
Aderholt	Cook	Hern, Kevin
Allen	Crawford	Herrera Beutler
Amash	Crenshaw	Hice (GA)
Amodei	Curtis	Higgins (LA)
Armstrong	Davidson (OH)	Hill (AR)
Arrington	Davis, Rodney	Holding
Babin	DesJarlais	Hollingsworth
Bacon	Diaz-Balart	Hudson
Baird	Duffy	Huizenga
Balderson	Duncan	Hunter
Banks	Dunn	Hurd (TX)
Barr	Emmer	Johnson (LA)
Bergman	Estes	Johnson (OH)
Biggs	Ferguson	Johnson (SD)
Bilirakis	Fitzpatrick	Jordan
Bishop (UT)	Fleischmann	Joyce (OH)
Bost	Flores	Joyce (PA)
Brady	Fortenberry	Katko
Brooks (AL)	Fox (NC)	Kelly (MS)
Brooks (IN)	Fulcher	Kelly (PA)
Buchanan	Gaetz	King (IA)
Buck	Gallagher	King (NY)
Bucshon	Gianforte	Kustoff (TN)
Budd	Gibbs	LaHood
Burchett	Gohmert	LaMalfa
Burgess	Gonzalez (OH)	Lamborn
Byrne	Gooden	Latta
Calvert	Gosar	Lesko
Carter (GA)	Graves (GA)	Long
Carter (TX)	Graves (LA)	Loudermilk
Chabot	Graves (MO)	Lucas
Cheney	Green (TN)	Luetkemeyer
Cline	Griffith	Marchant
Cloud	Grothman	Marshall
Cole	Guest	Masie
Collins (GA)	Guthrie	Mast
Collins (NY)	Hagedorn	McCarthy
Comer	Harris	McCaul

McClintock	Roe, David P.	Thompson (PA)
McHenry	Rogers (AL)	Thornberry
McKinley	Rogers (KY)	Timmons
Meadows	Rooney (FL)	Tipton
Meuser	Rose, John W.	Turner
Miller	Rouzer	Upton
Mitchell	Roy	Wagner
Moolenaar	Rutherford	Walberg
Mooney (WV)	Scalise	Walden
Mullin	Schweikert	Walker
Newhouse	Scott, Austin	Walorski
Norman	Sensenbrenner	Waltz
Nunes	Shinkus	Watkins
Olson	Simpson	Weber (TX)
Palazzo	Smith (MO)	Webster (FL)
Palmer	Smith (NE)	Wenstrup
Pence	Smith (NJ)	Westerman
Perry	Smucker	Williams
Posey	Spano	Wilson (SC)
Ratcliffe	Stauber	Wittman
Reed	Stefanik	Womack
Reschenthaler	Steil	Woodall
Rice (SC)	Steube	Wright
Riggleman	Stewart	Yoho
Roby	Stivers	Young
Rodgers (WA)	Taylor	Zeldin

NOT VOTING—9

Allred	Dingell	Pingree
Castor (FL)	Granger	Quigley
Connolly	Kinzinger	Ryan

□ 1342

Messrs. HIGGINS of Louisiana and HUDSON changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. NADLER, TAKANO, SARBANES, Ms. BASS, and Mr. NORCROSS changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 228, nays 193, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 79]

YEAS—228

Adams	Cleaver	Evans
Aguilar	Clyburn	Finkenauer
Axne	Cohen	Fletcher
Barragán	Cooper	Foster
Bass	Correa	Frankel
Beatty	Costa	Fudge
Bera	Courtney	Gabbard
Beyer	Cox (CA)	Gallego
Bishop (GA)	Craig	Garamendi
Blumenauer	Crist	Garcia (IL)
Blunt Rochester	Crow	Garcia (TX)
Bonamici	Cuellar	Golden
Boyle, Brendan	Cummings	Gomez
F.	Cunningham	Gonzalez (TX)
Brindisi	Davids (KS)	Gottheimer
Brown (MD)	Davis (CA)	Green (TX)
Brownley (CA)	Davis, Danny K.	Grijalva
Bustos	Dean	Haaland
Butterfield	DeFazio	Harder (CA)
Carbajal	DeGette	Hastings
Cárdenas	DeLauro	Hayes
Carson (IN)	DeBene	Heck
Cartwright	Delgado	Higgins (NY)
Case	Demings	Hill (CA)
Casten (IL)	DeSaulnier	Himes
Castro (TX)	Deutch	Horn, Kendra S.
Chu, Judy	Doggett	Horsford
Ciциlline	Doyle, Michael	Houlahan
Cisneros	F.	Hoyer
Clark (MA)	Engel	Huffman
Clarke (NY)	Escobar	Jackson Lee
Clay	Eshoo	Jayapal
	Espallat	Jeffries

Johnson (GA) Meeks
 Johnson (TX) Meng
 Kaptur Moore
 Keating Morelle
 Kelly (IL) Moulton
 Kennedy Mucarsel-Powell
 Khanna Murphy
 Kildee Nadler
 Kilmer Napolitano
 Kim Neal
 Kind Neguse
 Kirkpatrick Norcross
 Krishnamoorthi O'Halleran
 Kuster (NH) Ocasio-Cortez
 Lamb Omar
 Langevin Pallone
 Larsen (WA) Panetta
 Larson (CT) Pappas
 Lawrence Pascrell
 Lawson (FL) Payne
 Lee (CA) Perlmutter
 Lee (NV) Peters
 Levin (CA) Peterson
 Levin (MI) Phillips
 Lewis Pocan
 Lieu, Ted Porter
 Lipinski Pressley
 Loeb sack Price (NC)
 Lofgren Raskin
 Lowenthal Rice (NY)
 Lowey Richmond
 Luján Rose (NY)
 Luria Rouda
 Lynch Roybal-Allard
 Malinowski Ruiz
 Maloney, Carolyn B. Ruppertsberger
 Maloney, Sean Rush
 Matsui Sánchez
 McAdams Sarbanes
 McBath Scanlon
 McCollum Schakowsky
 McEachin Schiff
 McGovern Schneider
 McNerney Schrader
 Schrier

NAYS—193

Abraham
 Aderholt
 Allen
 Amash
 Amodei
 Armstrong
 Arrington
 Babin
 Bacon
 Baird
 Balderson
 Banks
 Barr
 Bergman
 Biggs
 Bilirakis
 Bishop (UT)
 Bost
 Brady
 Brooks (AL)
 Brooks (IN)
 Buchanan
 Buck
 Bucshon
 Budd
 Burchett
 Burgess
 Byrne
 Calvert
 Carter (GA)
 Carter (TX)
 Chabot
 Cheney
 Cline
 Cloud
 Cole
 Collins (GA)
 Collins (NY)
 Comer
 Conaway
 Cook
 Crawford
 Crenshaw
 Curtis
 Davidson (OH)
 Davis, Rodney
 DesJarlais
 Diaz-Balart
 Duffy
 Duncan
 Dunn
 Emmer

Estes
 Ferguson
 Fitzpatrick
 Fleischmann
 Flores
 Fortenberry
 Foss (NC)
 Fulcher
 Gaetz
 Gallagher
 Gianforte
 Gibbs
 Gohmert
 Gonzalez (OH)
 Gooden
 Gosar
 Graves (GA)
 Graves (LA)
 Graves (MO)
 Green (TN)
 Griffith
 Grothman
 Guest
 Guthrie
 Hagedorn
 Harris
 Hartzler
 Hern, Kevin
 Herrera Beutler
 Hice (GA)
 Higgins (LA)
 Hill (AR)
 Holding
 Hollingsworth
 Hudson
 Huizenga
 Hunter
 Hurd (TX)
 Johnson (LA)
 Johnson (OH)
 Johnson (SD)
 Jordan
 Joyce (OH)
 Joyce (PA)
 Katko
 Kelly (MS)
 Kelly (PA)
 King (IA)
 King (NY)
 Kustoff (TN)
 LaHood
 LaMalfa

Lamborn
 Latta
 Lesko
 Long
 Loudermill
 Lucas
 Luetkemeyer
 Marchant
 Marshall
 Massie
 Mast
 McCarthy
 McCaul
 McClintock
 McHenry
 McKinley
 Meadows
 Meuser
 Miller
 Mitchell
 Moolenaar
 Mooney (WV)
 Mullin
 Newhouse
 Numan
 Nunes
 Olson
 Palazzo
 Palmer
 Pence
 Perry
 Posey
 Ratcliffe
 Reed
 Reschenthaler
 Rice (SC)
 Riggleman
 Roby
 Rodgers (WA)
 Roe, David P.
 Rogers (AL)
 Rogers (KY)
 Rooney (FL)
 Rose, John W.
 Rouzer
 Roy
 Rutherford
 Scalise
 Schweikert
 Scott, Austin
 Sensenbrenner
 Shimkus

Simpson
 Smith (MO)
 Smith (NE)
 Smith (NJ)
 Smucker
 Spano
 Stauber
 Stefanik
 Steil
 Steube
 Stewart
 Stivers
 Thompson (PA)

Thornberry
 Timmons
 Tipton
 Turner
 Upton
 Walberg
 Walden
 Walker
 Walorski
 Waltz
 Watkins
 Weber (TX)
 Webster (FL)

Wenstrup
 Westerman
 Williams
 Wilson (SC)
 Wittman
 Womack
 Woodall
 Wright
 Yoho
 Young
 Zeldin

NOT VOTING—10

Allred
 Connolly
 Dingell
 Granger

Kinzing
 Pingree
 Quigley
 Ryan

Taylor
 Wagner

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1350

So the resolution was agreed to.
 The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MOMENT OF SILENCE HONORING VICTIMS OF MARJORY STONEMAN DOUGLAS HIGH SCHOOL SHOOTING

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

Mr. DEUTCH. One year ago, Madam Speaker, on February 14, 2018, 17 people were killed in a senseless and horrific act of gun violence at Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School in Parkland, Florida.

I ask the Members of the House of Representatives to use this time to center their thoughts on the 17 who were killed, the 17 who were injured, the healing of the Parkland community, and the 40,000 lives lost to gun violence in every corner of this Nation each year.

I ask that we work together, not as Democrats or Republicans, but as Americans to end this silence with action to make all our communities safer from gun violence.

I ask that this moment of silence not be in vain, and I ask my colleagues to please rise and bow your heads as we remember Alyssa Alhadeff, Scott Beigel, Martin Duque Anguiano, Nicholas Dworet, Aaron Feis, Jaime Guttenberg, Chris Hixon, Luke Hoyer, Cara Loughran, Gina Montalto, Joaquin Oliver, Alaina Petty, Meadow Pollack, Helena Ramsay, Alex Schachter, Carmen Schentrup, and Peter Wang.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. MCBATH). All present will rise for a moment of silence.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 215, nays 199, answered “present” 1, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 80]

YEAS—215

Adams
 Armstrong
 Arrington
 Axne
 Bacon
 Banks
 Barr
 Barragán
 Bass
 Beatty
 Bergman
 Beyer
 Bishop (GA)
 Blunt Rochester
 Bonamici
 Boyle, Brendan
 F.
 Brady
 Brown (MD)
 Buck
 Bucshon
 Budd
 Bustos
 Butterfield
 Carbajal
 Cárdenas
 Carson (IN)
 Cartwright
 Case
 Casten (IL)
 Castor (FL)
 Castro (TX)
 Chu, Judy
 Clark (MA)
 Clarke (NY)
 Clay
 Cleaver
 Cohen
 Collins (GA)
 Cooper
 Courtney
 Cox (CA)
 Cuellar
 Cummings
 Davidson (OH)
 Davis (CA)
 Davis, Danny K.
 Dean
 DeFazio
 DeGette
 DeLauro
 DelBene
 Delgado
 Demings
 DeSaulnier
 Deutch
 Doggett
 Doyle, Michael
 F.
 Engel
 Escobar
 Eshoo
 Espallat
 Evans
 Finkenauer
 Fleischmann
 Fletcher
 Fortenberry
 Foster
 Frankel
 Gabbard
 Gallego
 Garamendi

Garcia (IL)
 Garcia (TX)
 Gomez
 Gonzalez (TX)
 Granger
 Green (TX)
 Grijalva
 Grothman
 Haaland
 Hastings
 Hayes
 Heck
 Higgins (LA)
 Higgins (NY)
 Hill (CA)
 Hollingsworth
 Horn, Kendra S.
 Horsford
 Houlihan
 Hoyer
 Huffman
 Jackson Lee
 Jayapal
 Jeffries
 Johnson (GA)
 Johnson (TX)
 Kaptur
 Katko
 Kelly (IL)
 Kennedy
 Khanna
 Kildee
 King (IA)
 Kuster (NH)
 Lamb
 Langevin
 Larsen (WA)
 Larson (CT)
 Lawrence
 Lee (CA)
 Lee (NV)
 Levin (CA)
 Levin (MI)
 Lewis
 Lieu, Ted
 Lipinski
 Loeb sack
 Lofgren
 Long
 Lowenthal
 Lowey
 Luetkemeyer
 Luján
 Luria
 Lynch
 Malinowski
 Maloney,
 Carolyn B.
 Maloney, Sean
 McBath
 McCarthy
 McClintock
 McCollum
 McEachin
 McGovern
 McNerney
 Meeks
 Moore
 Morelle
 Moulton
 Murphy
 Nadler
 Napolitano

Neal
 Neguse
 Newhouse
 Norcross
 Ocasio-Cortez
 Omar
 Pallone
 Panetta
 Pappas
 Pascrell
 Payne
 Perlmutter
 Perry
 Phillips
 Pocan
 Pressley
 Raskin
 Reed
 Richmond
 Rodgers (WA)
 Roybal-Allard
 Ruppertsberger
 Rush
 Sánchez
 Sarbanes
 Schakowsky
 Schiff
 Schneider
 Schrier
 Schweikert
 Scott (VA)
 Scott, David
 Serrano
 Sewell (AL)
 Shalala
 Sherman
 Sherrill
 Simpson
 Sires
 Smith (NJ)
 Smith (WA)
 Soto
 Speier
 Stanton
 Stauber
 Stefanik
 Steil
 Stevens
 Stivers
 Swalwell (CA)
 Takano
 Taylor
 Thompson (MS)
 Thornberry
 Titus
 Tlaib
 Torres (CA)
 Trahan
 Trone
 Underwood
 Vargas
 Veasey
 Velázquez
 Visclosky
 Wasserman
 Schultz
 Waters
 Watson Coleman
 Welch
 Wexton
 Wild
 Wilson (FL)
 Yarmuth
 Yoho

NAYS—199

Abraham
 Aderholt
 Aguilar
 Allen
 Amash
 Amodei
 Babin
 Baird
 Balderson
 Bera
 Bilirakis
 Bishop (UT)

Bost
 Brindisi
 Brooks (AL)
 Brooks (IN)
 Brownley (CA)
 Buchanan
 Burchett
 Burgess
 Byrne
 Calvert
 Carter (GA)
 Carter (TX)

Chabot
 Cheney
 Cicilline
 Cisneros
 Cline
 Cloud
 Clyburn
 Cole
 Collins (NY)
 Comer
 Conaway
 Connolly

Cook	Johnson (OH)	Roby
Correa	Johnson (SD)	Roe, David P.
Costa	Jordan	Rogers (AL)
Craig	Joyce (OH)	Rogers (KY)
Crawford	Joyce (PA)	Rooney (FL)
Crenshaw	Kelly (MS)	Rose (NY)
Crist	Kelly (PA)	Rose, John W.
Crow	Kilmer	Rouda
Cunningham	Kim	Rouzer
Curtis	Kind	Roy
Davids (KS)	King (NY)	Ruiz
Davis, Rodney	Kirkpatrick	Rutherford
DesJarlais	Krishnamoorthi	Scalise
Diaz-Balart	Kustoff (TN)	Schrader
Duffy	LaHood	Scott, Austin
Duncan	LaMalfa	Sensenbrenner
Dunn	Lamborn	Shimkus
Emmer	Latta	Slotkin
Estes	Lawson (FL)	Smith (MO)
Ferguson	Lesko	Smith (NE)
Fitzpatrick	Loudermilk	Snucker
Flores	Lucas	Spanberger
Foxx (NC)	Marchant	Spano
Fudge	Marshall	Steube
Fulcher	Massie	Stewart
Gaetz	Mast	Suozi
Gallagher	Matsui	Thompson (CA)
Gianforte	McAdams	Thompson (PA)
Gibbs	McCauley	Timmons
Golden	McHenry	Tipton
Gonzalez (OH)	McKinley	Torres Small
Gooden	Meadows	(NM)
Gosar	Meng	Turner
Gottheimer	Meuser	Upton
Graves (GA)	Miller	Van Drew
Graves (LA)	Mitchell	Walberg
Graves (MO)	Moolenaar	Walden
Green (TN)	Mooney (WV)	Walker
Griffith	Mucarsel-Powell	Walorski
Guest	Mullin	Waltz
Guthrie	Norman	Waters
Hagedorn	Nunes	Watson Coleman
Harder (CA)	O'Halleran	Weber (TX)
Harris	Olson	Webster (FL)
Hartzler	Palmer	Westerman
Hern, Kevin	Pence	Wild
Herrera Beutler	Peters	Williams
Hice (GA)	Peterson	Wilson (SC)
Hill (AR)	Porter	Wittman
Himes	Posey	Womack
Holding	Ratcliffe	Woodall
Hudson	Reschenthaler	Wright
Huizenga	Rice (NY)	Young
Hunter	Rice (SC)	Zeldin
Johnson (LA)	Riggleman	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Tonko

NOT VOTING—16

Allred	Keating	Ryan
Biggs	Kinzinger	Scanlon
Blumenauer	Palazzo	Wagner
Dingell	Pingree	Wenstrup
Gohmert	Price (NC)	
Hurd (TX)	Quigley	

□ 1403

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Ms. SCANLON. Madam Speaker, my vote did not record. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 80.

REMOVAL OF UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES FROM HOSTILITIES IN YEMEN THAT HAVE NOT BEEN AUTHORIZED BY CONGRESS

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to insert extraneous material on H.J. Res. 37.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 122 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the joint resolution, H.J. Res. 37.

The Chair appoints the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Ms. PLASKETT) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1407

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 37) directing the removal of United States Armed Forces from hostilities in the Republic of Yemen that have not been authorized by Congress, with Ms. PLASKETT in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

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

General debate shall not exceed 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

The gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MCCAUL) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

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

This is an important moment for the House, Madam Chair. For years, under administrations of both parties, the Congress has handed away our authority and abrogated our responsibility when it comes to foreign policy, particularly the questions of how and where our military is engaged around the world.

Article I of the Constitution gives Congress the responsibility to declare war, yet we have given Presidents of both parties a virtual blank check to send our brave servicemembers into harm's way while we have stood on the sidelines.

With the measure we are considering today, we take some of that power back, and we do so to restore a sense of American values and American leadership to the worst humanitarian catastrophe in the world.

For the last few years, we have all seen horrific images of the civilian casualties in the Yemen war: starving children, millions displaced, outbreaks of deadly disease.

Madam Chair, 85,000 children have starved to death. Fourteen million are on the brink of famine. More than a million suffer from cholera. And the ongoing military operations are bringing us no closer to a resolution. The only way out of this mess is for parties to sit down and work toward a political solution.

The United States can and should play a role pushing for that solution, pushing parties to make a commitment to negotiations. This measure, introduced by Mr. KHANNA, will help us do exactly that.

Let me explain why this is so important and why I support passing this resolution right now.

In the last few years, the Saudi-led coalition has carried out 18,000 airstrikes. A full one-third of those strikes hit nonmilitary targets. This is absolutely reckless.

I am not naive, Madam Chair. I know we have critical strategic interests in that region. The Houthis are a problem. They get support from Iran. They launch missiles into Saudi territory and international waterways, threatening Saudi civilians. They are starving the Yemeni people, diverting assistance, and holding civilians hostage to their political demands. But we cannot just give the coalition a blank check when so many innocent lives are being lost. And if the administration won't demand any sort of accountability from the Saudis and Emiratis, it is time for Congress to act.

I want to acknowledge my friend from Texas, the ranking member on the Foreign Affairs Committee, Mr. MCCAUL. I believe that he also wants to see Congress reclaim our prerogatives on foreign policy, though I understand we have an honest difference of opinion on the approach we are dealing with today.

I am glad that we moved this measure through regular order, that we had a hearing with experts and a markup, and that the gentleman from Texas and I could make our cases before the Rules Committee. It allowed me to hear the arguments from all perspectives on this issue.

I think, during this debate, we will hear my friends on the other side call this resolution misguided. I think because this resolution has to do with our security agreements with the Saudis and Emiratis, we will hear them question what impact this may have on other security agreements.

It is a fair question, to be honest. That is why this measure is tailored so specifically to deal with just this situation. This is not a broad, blanket policy that is going to tie the hands of the executive branch. There is no dangerous precedent being set here, just an attempt to stop a war that is costing far too many innocent lives.

I think we will hear my friends question whether this measure would even do anything because this measure withdraws American forces engaged in hostilities, and the Pentagon says "hostilities" only applies to situations where American troops are firing weapons at an enemy. I have two reactions to that.

First of all, this measure would specifically define "hostilities" to include aerial refueling of warplanes carrying out airstrikes against Houthi militants. Now, I understand the Defense

Department has stopped refueling as a matter of policy, but policies can be reversed, so this resolution would cut off refueling as a matter of law.

My second point is broader and gets at the heart of today's debate. This body is not subject to the definitions conjured up by the Defense Department. We don't ask permission to exercise our Article I authority. Of course, the Pentagon will try to define things in a way that consolidates the power of the executive branch, but Congress, with authority over war powers, need not accept that definition.

The Congress has lost its grip on foreign policy, in my opinion, by granting too much deference to the executive branch, by failing to examine the decisions, determinations, and definitions that are used to justify sending Americans into harm's way. Our job is to keep that branch in check, not to shrug our shoulders when they tell us to mind our own business.

Lastly, I think we will hear my colleagues on the other side ask: Isn't this just all politics? No, Madam Chair. Politics is what the former majority did to this resolution twice during the last Congress. Politics is stifling debate on national security issues because we are uncomfortable with the message it might send or we don't want to take a tough vote.

□ 1415

Politics is walking away from our constitutional responsibilities, as Congress has done for far too long; and frankly, we have done it for far too long, Congresses in both parties with a majority and Presidents in both parties.

Our Article I responsibilities are things that we cannot just simply turn the other way. We are a coequal branch of government, and we have not had a declaration of war, for instance, since 1941. We are content to just tell whatever administration is in, go ahead, you handle it. We don't have any responsibility. I hope that that stops this afternoon.

The other body has already weighed in on this measure. It passed with bipartisan support. Today, the Members of the House get our chance to go on record finally and say where we stand.

I joined this resolution as an original cosponsor because I think it will lead to a sort of reckoning for our government.

What is our role in the conflict in Yemen?

What is Congress' voice in our foreign policy?

How will we exercise American leadership and American power?

What will we provide and what will we withhold to push warring parties toward peace?

I want to thank Mr. KHANNA for his hard work and for his leadership in shining the light on this issue.

I want to thank our members of the House Foreign Affairs Committee who have contributed so far to a valuable debate.

I want to thank Mr. McCAUL, who has made his opposition to this about the policy, not about the politics or the personalities. We are going to have a lot more debates; sometimes we will be on the same side and sometimes not, but I hope we can always grapple with these challenges in a substantive way.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Let me just begin by extending my appreciation for the chairman. I know his arguments are well-intentioned, as are mine. I believe that we both completely agree and completely support Congress' solemn duty under Article I of the Constitution, to authorize the commitment of U.S. troops to foreign hostilities; and perhaps there will be another example where we can join forces in that. But that is not the issue here.

Allow me to quote the actual War Powers Act, from Title 50 of the United States Code. This procedure applies to "the removal of United States Armed Forces engaged in hostilities outside the territory of the United States."

This has always meant, historically, and today, U.S. troops being directly involved in live-fire combat. As the Department of Defense has repeatedly confirmed, U.S. Armed Forces are not engaged in hostilities against the Houthi forces in Yemen.

This resolution is directing us to remove troops that simply, Madam Chair, are not there. Even the aerial refueling of coalition jets, which does not constitute traditional hostilities, ended last November.

This resolution, in my judgment, misuses the tool to try to get at the different issue of security assistance to third countries. It provides no clear decisions on which forms of assistance are cut off. It does not address the humanitarian catastrophe inside Yemen and, alarmingly, it completely ignores the destabilization role that Iran is playing in Yemen and the region.

This irresponsible measure is trying to hammer a square peg in a round hole.

This resolution really stretches the definition of "hostilities" to cover non-U.S. military operations by other countries. It reinterprets U.S. support to those countries as "engagement in hostilities."

This overreach has dangerous implications far beyond Saudi Arabia. This approach will now allow any single Member to use this privileged mechanism to second-guess U.S. security cooperation relationships with more than 100 countries throughout the world.

Under this model, if one Member doesn't like something that any of our security partners does overseas, that Member can force quick consideration of a resolution directing the removal of U.S. forces from hostilities "in or affecting" that situation. It no longer matters that U.S. forces are not actually conducting those hostilities.

This could impact our assistance to Israel. It could affect our cooperation with our NATO allies. It could impact counterterrorism cooperation with African nations in the Sahel. We could recklessly undo critical security relationships that we have spent decades building.

That is not what the War Powers Resolution has ever meant, and I don't think that is what Congress designed it to do, and it should not be used in this way now.

No one is saying that U.S. security assistance to Saudi Arabia, or anyone else, is beyond congressional scrutiny. Congress has many tools at its disposal. Our committee receives regular arms sales notifications. Congress can condition or cut off security assistance through targeted legislation or the annual appropriations process.

But this resolution is the wrong tool. It is vague and irresponsible. It will create new doubts for our partners and allies around the world.

For those reasons, Madam Chair, I strongly oppose this measure, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. KHANNA), the author of this joint resolution.

Mr. KHANNA. Madam Chair, I thank Chairman ENGEL for his extraordinary leadership to help bring a war in Yemen to an end. I want to thank him and Chairman MCGOVERN, Speaker PELOSI, and Majority Leader HOYER, for finally speaking up for the millions of Yemenis who are on the brink of starvation.

This is not a complex issue. For the last 2 years, we have been assisting the Saudis in bombing Yemeni civilians; and the reports say there are 14 million Yemenis who face starvation; 14 million.

Let's put that in context: 800,000 people died in Rwanda; 100,000 in Bosnia, and 14 million face famine in Yemen. And it is not because the world doesn't have enough food or medicine to get in there. It is because there is a systematic bombing preventing the food and medicine to get in.

We want to send the food. We want to send medicine, but the Saudis aren't allowing that food and medicine to get in.

And what do we know about Saudi Arabia? We know that they were responsible for the murder of Khashoggi. We know recently, that MBS admitted that he wanted Khashoggi dead.

We know that they, the Saudis, are supplying arms to al-Qaida in Yemen who are fighting our troops. The Saudis are giving arms to the very people who are fighting our troops. This is why Senator LINDSEY GRAHAM has said he may support this resolution.

The only patriotic thing, if you care about our troops, if you care about American interests, if you care about the outrage that the Saudis are inflicting on Americans, and on the world, the only patriotic thing to do is to vote

for this resolution. I am convinced it will pass with a bipartisan majority.

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY), ranking member of the House Armed Services Committee.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Madam Chair, I appreciate the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Chair, this resolution is misguided, and let me take a few moments to illustrate some of the reasons.

Number 1, as the ranking member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, Mr. MCCAUL, has described, this is a misuse of the War Powers Resolution. It conflates two different sections. It has definitional problems. I am not going to repeat all the arguments he has used.

My point is that, if we use that powerful law, it should be clear, direct, and applicable. To misuse it in this way actually weakens the authority of Congress, the exact opposite of what the chairman of the committee was talking about.

Secondly, the message coming from this resolution is, Iran, you can do whatever you want to.

Now, it is clear we do not have troops in the fight against the Houthis. We do, however, want other countries to join in trying to constrain Iran's aggression in various parts of the world. But with this resolution, we are saying, Okay, you are on your own. We are not going to assist you in any way. And that message reverberates throughout the Middle East. It will have lasting consequences.

Third, if anything, this resolution will make our military more cautious when targeting ISIS and al-Qaida.

Now there is a section in here that says, Well, it doesn't really apply when you are going against terrorists. But Yemen is a messy place. You have individuals commingled in the same location. Sometimes the same individual can have multiple loyalties.

Our military will be overly cautious in interpreting this resolution. They will be less likely to target ISIS and al-Qaida.

Mr. Chairman, don't forget. It wasn't very long ago the most serious threats coming to our homeland, to Americans emanated from Yemen. This adds danger to the world.

Fourth, I think this resolution makes a humanitarian situation worse. As long as rockets are fired from Yemen into Riyadh, there will be a military response.

Now, the U.S. has been assisting the Saudis in targeting, so that it is narrower; so that they are only targeting military targets and minimizing civilian casualties. And yet, this resolution says, No, you can't offer that sort of help.

So what is the result? It is going to, unfortunately, be less specific targeting, and I am afraid that the humanitarian situation will only grow worse.

Fifth, and finally, if this passes and signs into law, it will not help the peo-

ple of Yemen one iota. There are lots of things we just heard from the author of the resolution, why he does not approve of some of the actions going on with Saudi Arabia. This does not help any of that.

It is an attempt to make us feel better, that we have at least done something. And yet, the result is, we reduce our influence in the Middle East; we encourage and enhance the position of Iran; and we lead to a more dangerous world for us. That is quite an after-noon's work.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. BERA), the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee's Oversight and Investigations Subcommittee, a very valued member of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. BERA. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.J. Res. 37, and applaud Chairman ENGEL, as well as my colleague from California, Mr. KHANNA, on their leadership.

This joint resolution would direct the removal of U.S. forces from supporting the Saudi and Emirati that campaign in Yemen. We will still be supporting our fight against ISIS and al-Qaida in the Arabian Peninsula, which Congress has specifically authorized. We are not debating that.

We are also not debating, as some might suggest, setting a precedent when it comes to cooperating with our allies. This is about hostilities we are engaged in because we are supporting a coalition in war.

We have not authorized our military to act in the Yemeni civil war. This is about reclaiming the jurisdiction of Congress in making a war. That is our job. That is what we were elected to do. I would say that if there were a Democrat or a Republican in the White House.

Now, if the administration wants to be involved there, they need to come to Congress and make a compelling case. But let's have that discussion.

For that reason, I support this resolution, and I urge my colleagues to join me in helping to move this resolution out of the House.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON), the ranking member on the Middle East and North Africa Subcommittee.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Chair, I urge opposition to H.J. Res. 37, directing the removal of U.S. Armed Forces from the hostilities in Yemen. Actually, the U.S. is not directly engaged in any hostilities in Yemen. This is not my independent assessment, but the determination of the Department of Defense.

The U.S. is currently supporting the Saudi-led coalition in Yemen by providing targeting assistance, intelligence sharing, and joint planning to defeat the Houthi rebels who are armed by Iran, with missiles that they have directed at civilian airports in Saudi Arabia.

There is no doubt that the Saudi-led coalition in Yemen has made terrible targeting mistakes. But what would happen if the U.S. were to pull the plug on our intelligence-sharing and targeting cooperation?

□ 1430

Would this improve the coalition's targeting or possibly make it worse, increasing the chances for collateral damage and civilian casualties?

I am concerned that, if we walk away now, these terrible tragedies will simply multiply.

The United States must be at the table so that we can insist on and respect international law. This does not mean that the coalition will always do the right thing, but it does mean that we will have leverage and influence to promote the right direction.

Instead of this resolution, I hope that our colleagues, Foreign Affairs Committee Chairman ELIOT ENGEL and Ranking Member, Republican leader, MIKE MCCAUL, will work together on a bipartisan initiative that can address these important concerns in Yemen.

We can all agree that the humanitarian crisis in Yemen must be addressed and that the ongoing conflict must come to an end. Let's work together as we have always done on the Foreign Affairs Committee to address this issue and end the suffering of the Yemeni people.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), a new member on the House Foreign Affairs Committee who is already making his mark.

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Mr. Chair, I thank Chairman ENGEL for his incredible leadership on this issue.

Mr. Chair, I am proud to be an original cosponsor of Congressman KHANNA's resolution.

The Saudi-led war in Yemen has led to a staggering crisis, and it is happening on our watch. This bombing campaign would not be happening without the active involvement of the United States military with the Saudis.

More than 75 percent of Yemen's population needs humanitarian assistance. Yemen has one of the highest maternal death rates in the region. Its health infrastructure has crumbled, and tens of thousands of pregnant women are at risk of serious complications. The list goes on and on.

It is long past time to bring U.S. involvement in this calamity to an end.

Mr. Chair, I want to thank Congressman KHANNA for his leadership and Chairman ENGEL for making this a top priority.

We have a responsibility not just as Members of Congress, but as human beings not just to talk about these horrors, but to do everything in our power to end them.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. PANETTA). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chair, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding the additional time.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. McCAUL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOHIO), the ranking member on the Asia, the Pacific, and Nonproliferation Subcommittee.

Mr. YOHIO. Mr. Chair, I think the chairman for yielding. I appreciate it.

Mr. Chair, this is something that we do need to get resolved, but I cannot support H.J. Res. 37.

Mr. Chair, I rise today in opposition to this resolution, which I could not support as it was pushed through the Foreign Affairs Committee over strong objection from me and my 16 colleagues.

The Foreign Affairs Committee has a proud tradition of bipartisanship, but that was thrown out the window with this bill.

Among my objections to this bill is the basic premise of the bill, which is flawed. U.S. Forces are not engaged in hostilities between the Saudi-led coalition and the Houthi forces in Yemen.

This bill distorts the definition of hostilities to cover non-U.S. military operations by third countries. It then reinterprets U.S. activities in support of those countries as U.S. engagement in those hostilities.

I have been well documented throughout my time in Congress as opposing the misuse of the War Powers Act. That is really what needs to be addressed: the misapplication of the 2001 and 2002 AUMFs.

While I wholeheartedly believe that the U.S. Forces put into combat roles must be approved by Congress, I cannot stand by as those firm beliefs in the Constitution are twisted around to make a political messaging point.

Keep in mind, my colleagues from the other side talk about the humanitarian crisis in Yemen, yet they fail to mention the Houthi rebel fighters overthrew the legitimate government of President Hadi, and this overthrow was sponsored by Iran, which Iran is the largest sponsor of state terrorism. That is really where the problem is in this. We are there in a different capacity.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues not to vote for this partisan bill because, if we break this agreement, we have got over 100 other agreements that we would have to negotiate with our allies, and this would be bad for America's foreign policy.

Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman for sponsoring this.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), our majority leader.

(Mr. HOYER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chair, I want to thank Chairman ENGEL, Chairman SMITH, Representative KHANNA, and others for ensuring that the House ex-

presses its views on the humanitarian catastrophe in Yemen.

After the Republican leader declined to allow this resolution to come to the floor in December, I promised to bring it to the floor.

Here we are, and now the House will have an opportunity to express its views to the President and to the country that he ought to end his administration's support of the Saudi coalition's military campaign in Yemen. It is a campaign that has led to tremendous human suffering, with minimal military gains. After 4 years, it is time for a change in policy.

Let me be clear: The Houthi rebels in Yemen are bad actors, engaging in brutal actions against civilians, and they are sponsored by Iran. The Houthis commit human rights abuses, prevent humanitarian assistance to starving civilians, and exercise a brute form of governance in the areas they control. We should have no illusion that there are two parties responsible for this humanitarian catastrophe; however, we are supporting one of them.

The result of the coalition campaign thus far has been an unmitigated humanitarian disaster as well as a military stalemate.

Using military force to pressure the Houthi rebels into accepting coalition demands has demonstrably not worked. It is time, therefore, for Congress to make clear to the Trump administration and to our country and to the international community that it cannot simply keep our Yemen policy on autopilot while the situation not only has not improved, but deteriorates.

With the United States supporting one party to this conflict, the best way we promote a peaceful and positive solution is by focusing our efforts on the variables that we can affect. It is time that we set a new course forward on Yemen and that the House and Senate need to demand that the administration uphold basic American values in its exercise of our foreign policy. That means ending our support for the Saudi-led coalition in Yemen.

Although not the focus of this resolution, I am mindful that this debate is taking place a day after the President disregarded the law and failed to report to Congress who was responsible for the murder of journalist Jamal Khashoggi. The more the President tries to sweep this heinous incident under the rug, the more incumbent upon Congress it is to act.

This resolution is bipartisan. A similar resolution passed the United States Senate. It was not brought to this floor. I hope it will receive the strong support of both sides of the aisle.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. McCAUL. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY), a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding.

I am opposed to H.J. Res. 37, Mr. Chair. This resolution is poor policy

and will not achieve the aims of those who support it. That is really the crux of the issue here.

My colleagues are using this resolution to express their concerns with the actions of Saudi Arabia and the status of the war in Yemen, disregarding the dangerous precedent this resolution will send.

The joint resolution improperly expands the definition of hostilities to include non-U.S. military operations by third countries. This bill then reinterprets the U.S. activities in support of those countries as U.S. engagements in said hostilities.

The Department of Defense and the White House have both correctly stated that, under the longstanding definition of hostilities, the United States is not engaged in such in Yemen.

In order to force a privileged measure in the Senate, my colleagues had to expand and distort the definitions in the War Powers Resolution to achieve their goals. This is absolutely poor policy, and we cannot support such a measure.

The misuse of this privileged tool endangers U.S. security cooperation with over 100 partners around the world, to include Israel, NATO, and many antiterror allies.

Now, I understand my colleagues on both sides of the aisle are unhappy with the actions taken by Saudi Arabia. Frankly, I am as well. Unfortunately, we live in an imperfect world, Mr. Chairman, with imperfect actors. We must deal with the reality of geopolitics in the way that they are and not the way that we wish they would be.

We and I find many of the things the Saudis to be doing horrific, including the murder of Muslim Brotherhood member Khashoggi. I was one of the first people to go on the record demanding the declassification of the 9/11 report concerning Saudi Arabia, but this will not be the first action Saudi Arabia takes that is counter to our beliefs here in the United States. During the first 4 months of 2017, Saudi Arabia beheaded 48 people.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. McCAUL. Mr. Chair, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chair, according to the reports, half of those deaths were for nonviolent drug charges. The Saudi Kingdom executes its citizens for blasphemy and crimes against the state, actions that are protected under the First Amendment of the U.S. Constitution.

I understand that we are dissatisfied—I am, too—but using poor policy to terminate U.S. assistance will not improve conditions in Yemen. Iran's own IRGC commander openly admitted that Iran provides military assistance to the Houthis in Yemen.

In this body, we can choose to stand with Iran or the Houthis or, as I suggest, to stand with Israel and Saudi Arabia.

Mr. Chair, this resolution is not the right step. It is poor policy. I encourage my colleagues to vote “no.”

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. TED LIEU), a very well-respected member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. TED LIEU of California. Mr. Chair, I thank Chairman ENGEL for his leadership.

Mr. Chair, I rise in support of this resolution. I want to commend Congressman KHANNA for offering it. It is another step in years of pressure that Congress has put on the executive branch to get us out of this bloody war in Yemen.

In 2015, I wrote a letter to the Pentagon about what was then a little-known war in Yemen, asking why the U.S. was involved in war crimes committed by the Saudis in Yemen.

I previously served in Active Duty in the military. It was clear to me that what the Saudi jets were doing in dropping bombs on innocent civilians was a war crime.

In 2016, I introduced legislation to limit the transfer of air-to-ground munitions from the U.S. to Saudi Arabia. And then, working with other Members such as Representatives Pocan and Welch and others, we were able to cause the Obama administration to stop a shipment of air-to-ground munitions to Saudi Arabia.

In 2017, I worked with Representative TED YOHO, and we helped insert language into the NDAA requesting the administration to certify what the heck it was doing in Yemen.

And then last August, I wrote a letter to the Pentagon inspector general asking for an investigation of whether U.S. personnel were aiding and abetting Saudi war crimes in Yemen.

I am very pleased that a few months later, in November of last year, the Trump administration announced it was going to stop the U.S. refueling of Saudi jets in Yemen.

Now we need to pass this resolution as another step in increasing the pressure on the administration to get us out of the war in Yemen.

It is not a partisan issue. This started under Obama's watch, continues under Trump's, and at the end of the day, war crimes and humanitarian catastrophes are not partisan issues. Every Member of Congress should vote for this.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ZELDIN), the ranking member of the Oversight and Investigations Subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Chair, I thank Chairman MCCAUL for yielding. I have great respect for him, as well as our committee chair, ELIOT ENGEL.

Mr. Chair, I rise today in opposition to H.J. Res. 37, directing the removal of U.S. Armed Forces from unauthorized hostilities in Yemen. One of the reasons why is because we aren't even engaged in hostilities in Yemen.

□ 1445

The United States is not involved in any direct live fire exchanges. Last November, the U.S. stopped aerial refueling of Saudi jets.

According to the Department of Defense, U.S. support to the coalition is for defensive purposes only. It focuses only on helping minimize civilian casualties, which means that this resolution, if passed and implemented, will actually result in less food and medicine getting into Yemen and more civilians dying, and the war will not end.

If anyone wants to propose a bill and pass one cutting off or conditioning specified U.S. security assistance to Saudi Arabia, they have the ability to do so. That is not this bill.

What is also important is that there are a lot of freshman Members here in this Chamber, and the fact that we are rushing this to the floor so quickly without having a classified briefing for all of those Members is also deeply unfortunate. That should take place before passing this resolution.

Congress has many other ways to engage in oversight efforts for U.S. security assistance with Saudi Arabia, including approving arms sales and through appropriations.

Our assistance for Saudi Arabia started in 2015, when the Houthis overthrew a legitimate government, backed by Iran. The Houthis fired missiles against Saudi Arabia with support from Iran, and the U.S. provided intelligence and logistical support in compliance with the law of armed conflict.

Iran poses a massive geostrategic threat to Yemen and to the United States and many of our allies. Iran is providing training and support to the Houthi rebels, including supplying ballistic missiles that have been fired into Saudi Arabia. In 2016, missiles were fired by Iranian-backed Houthi rebels at a U.S. Navy warship near the Bab el-Mandeb. If Iran has the ability to cut off global shipping through the Strait of Hormuz and el-Mandeb, it would have disastrous consequences.

If this resolution passes, we are emboldening Iran to continue their nefarious ambitions in the region without restraint.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose H.J. Res. 37. I think Iran would endorse it.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ESPAILLAT), another very valuable member of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. ESPAILLAT. Mr. Chairman, I thank Chairman ENGEL for allowing me this opportunity.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.J. Res. 37, in which Congress will finally reclaim its constitutional authority over the power to declare war and will finally address the terrible suffering happening in Yemen.

For 4 years, we have aided the Saudi-led campaign in Yemen, which has contributed to the gravest humanitarian crisis in the world, a man-made crisis that we could help alleviate, rather

than contribute to. This is 4 years too long.

The Trump administration has cozied up to the Saudis, ignoring the harm they cause in Yemen and their egregious violations of human rights. The President has expressed his personal affirmation for the Saudi Kingdom on several occasions, saying, “They give us a lot of business,” and, “They’ve been a great ally to me.”

Trump and those opposed to this resolution have argued that our ties to Saudi Arabia are too precious and that our cooperation on counterterrorism and countering Iran would be jeopardized by this resolution. But in December, when discussing an earlier version of this resolution, Senator LINDSEY GRAHAM wrote the following: “The fear that the Saudis will stop cooperating with the U.S. on terrorism or Iran isn’t rational. Those threats pose as much of a danger to the Saudis as they do to America. Demanding better from allies isn’t downgrading the relationship; it’s a sign that Americans take our principles seriously and won’t be taken advantage of by anyone, friend or foe.”

Mr. Chairman, I urge Congress to reassert its constitutional authority to work to end the suffering of millions and to pass this war powers resolution. This is what it is.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Kansas (Mr. WATKINS), a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. Chairman, I thank my Republican leader, Mr. MCCAUL, for his leadership on this issue.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition of H.J. Res. 37, and I encourage my colleagues to do the same.

As a combat veteran, with many years of experience in conflict and postconflict environments, I am particularly concerned about this resolution. Passing it would pose a threat to many other important bilateral agreements that help keep us and our allies safe and make the world a better place.

Even the resolution is misleading. Our Armed Forces are not engaged in hostilities in the Yemen conflict. Outside of Yemen, the U.S. Armed Forces support an ally, through intelligence sharing, threat analysis, and logistical support.

The strength of our international relations lies on the numerous global relationships that we hold. We help each other understand, forecast, and eliminate threats. This is especially true in the Arabian Peninsula, where ISIS and al-Qaida have been notoriously active.

Furthermore, pertinent facts relating to Yemen are classified, leaving Congressmen and -women to vote blind.

Mr. Chairman, we have a long history of free-thinking bipartisanship when it comes to foreign policy. I ask my colleagues to think for themselves, not merely vote along party lines.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. TRONE), another new member of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. TRONE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to voice my support for the joint resolution. It is important for us in this institution, in this critical moment, to undertake serious debate regarding the use of U.S. military in the conflict in Yemen.

As my colleagues have pointed out, Article I of our Constitution clearly states that the power to declare war belongs to the Congress. Congress must put down a marker stating it is unacceptable for our military to support hostilities we have not authorized.

Our support for the Saudi-led coalition's efforts in Yemen has proven problematic in so many ways. The impact on civilian lives is real and painful. Overall, 60,000 lives have been lost.

Ultimately, the question should be really simple: Did Congress authorize our military to engage in hostilities in Yemen? The answer is no.

So, today, we must pass this resolution to stand up for our Constitution and stand up for what is right.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to lend their support to that effort.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN).

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking member of the committee for his leadership.

I rise to speak against this resolution, which would direct the removal of U.S. forces from Yemen. This resolution is dangerous, and the majority should immediately take this vote off of our schedule.

The majority claims to be concerned about the threat of Iranian and Russian influence around the world. If that were the case, they would not force a vote on this war powers resolution.

Let's be clear: The U.S. is not involved in hostilities in Yemen, so this resolution would set a dangerous precedent by calling into question many security agreements we have with nations around the world that do not involve hostilities. The Pentagon has repeatedly stated that America is only providing support to our allies in the region as they combat the Houthis, and everyone is trying to reduce civilian casualties. Ultimately, we want to limit Iran's ability to gain more influence in the region.

The Houthi rebels are just one part of the Iranian regime's proxy battles around the world with the ultimate goal to destroy Israel, America, and all those who share our democratic values.

Mr. Chairman, a vote for this resolution is a vote for Iran. A vote against this resolution is a vote for Israel. I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this dangerous resolution, and I urge the administration to veto this resolution, if it should somehow pass.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. POCAN), a champion of progressive causes.

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for shepherding this important resolution to the floor.

Today, Yemen is the worst humanitarian crisis on the planet. Eighty-five thousand children under the age of 5 have died of starvation since 2015, and 150 children die every single day.

The U.S., alongside Saudi Arabia, which has used starvation as a weapon of war, has supported targeting for deadly airstrikes, provided logistical support and refueling, and sent Special Operations Forces to the Yemeni border.

It is time for these activities to end, absent congressional consent. The American people deserve a transparent debate and a vote by Congress, per Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution, before the U.S. engages in war-making.

While the President is tweeting about wars and nuclear bombs, we must reassert our authority and end the unconstitutional U.S. participation in Yemen's civil war.

Mr. Chairman, I urge all my colleagues to vote in favor of this resolution.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. DAVIDSON).

Mr. DAVIDSON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for allowing me time, as I do support H.J. Res. 37. Fundamentally, it is about Article I and the authority of Congress as addressed in Federalist Paper No. 69.

As the President said, great powers don't fight endless wars. I would add nor do they fight or participate in undeclared wars.

The United States is not participating in the Yemen war in the sense that many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have characterized. In fact, I personally asked Secretary Mattis on two occasions to help draft authorization against Iranian proxies.

This is, at best, a half measure in that it stops any active participation in undeclared unauthorized combat. But it also fails to advance the policy of our country, which is to treat Iran as the threat it is, not just to the United States of America, but to its neighbors and our allies in the region.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. Also, I thank Representative KHANNA, Representative POCAN, and Chairman MCGOVERN for their work in bringing this very critical measure to the floor.

Of course, I rise in strong support of H.J. Res. 37. Today, I am remembering our dear friend and colleague, Congressman Walter Jones, who was an original cosponsor. I miss him tremendously. I know he would be down here speaking on behalf of this resolution.

Since 2015, the United States has participated in the Saudi-led military campaign in Yemen without authorization from Congress. We have helped create and worsen the world's largest humanitarian crisis. 22.2 million Yemenis, 75 percent of the population, need

humanitarian assistance. At least 85,000 children under the age of 5 have died from war-related hunger and disease.

Our involvement in this war, quite frankly, is shameful. That is why this bipartisan measure to end the United States' unconstitutional role in this war is so important. I have long pushed efforts to repeal the overly broad 2001 Authorization for Use of Military Force.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on H.J. Res. 37 and to support this bipartisan bill to end the United States' role in the war on Yemen.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1500

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY), another very valued member of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chair, I thank the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL), chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee. It is a delight to call him that title.

Mr. Chair, I rise in support of H.J. Res. 37, directing the President to remove U.S. Armed Forces from hostilities in or affecting Yemen within 30 days.

Since 2015, the United States has provided support to the Saudi-led coalition in its war against the Houthi rebels in Yemen.

In addition to claiming an estimated 60,000 Yemeni lives, this war is fueling the world's largest humanitarian and refugee crisis. Humanitarian agencies estimate that 85,000 children have died from malnutrition, more than half the population currently requires emergency food assistance, and 1 in every 10 Yemeni children has been forcibly displaced from their homes due to the conflict.

In September of 2018, Secretary Pompeo certified to Congress that the Saudi and Emirati Governments were mitigating harm to civilians and civilian infrastructure in Yemen. Meanwhile, the Saudi-led coalition conducted attacks killing dozens of civilians at a time, often with U.S.-provided munitions.

Article I, Section 8, Clause 2 of the United States Constitution states unequivocally that Congress shall have the power to declare war and to raise and support armies and other Armed Forces. That is Congress' prerogative in the Constitution.

Pursuant to the War Powers Resolution, the President must remove U.S. Armed Forces engaged in hostilities outside U.S. territory without a specific statutory authorization from Congress.

Congress must reclaim its constitutional role, and American complicity in the ongoing humanitarian crisis in Yemen must end. That is why I am glad to support H.J. Res. 37, which

would direct such a removal of U.S. Armed Forces from hostilities associated with the Saudi-led coalition war in Yemen.

Importantly, this legislation defines hostilities to include in-flight fueling of non-U.S. aircraft conducting counter-Houthi missions.

Mr. Chairman, I urge support of this resolution.

Mr. McCAUL. Mr. Chair, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Chair, finally, this House is doing what the Constitution demands: to debate war and peace.

The problem here is that President Trump has essentially subcontracted out American foreign policy in the Middle East to a murderous Saudi regime, and the result has been that 85,000 little children under the age of five have been starved to death or have died of disease as a result of Saudi blockades and aggression. Indifference to their suffering is dooming a generation—unlawful, murderous airstrikes with bombs made in America on schools, on hospitals, on weddings, on markets.

All these people who speak out about the security of Israel and of America, they seem to have forgotten that these same Saudis have been giving away American-made weapons to al-Qaida—al-Qaida—once the sworn enemy of the Houthis about whom they complain.

The Saudi leadership, which approved the killing and dismemberment of an American resident journalist, is unsurprisingly not moved by the suffering of these children. They are intent on annihilation of the Yemenis.

We cannot let the slaughter continue in the name of American taxpayers. The Saudis do not represent our values, but they are using our tax dollars and our weapons.

Instead of shutting down our government, President Trump needs to shut down cooperation with the regime that tortures women who speak out, that kills its enemies who dare to speak the truth, and that is waging an immoral conflict, the world's largest humanitarian catastrophe.

Mr. Chairman, the days of symbolic action have far passed. Months, years, hundreds of small graves ago this Congress should have acted. Today, we can act to put a stop to this nonsense, this misappropriation of our values in the Middle East.

Mr. McCAUL. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH).

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL).

I have listened to the arguments of my colleagues who say that Saudi Arabia is an ally and a partner and we have to support them. Saudi Arabia is a questionable ally—we all know that—

and it is time to reexamine that relationship.

But I have a question that this raises: If we have an ally that is engaged in violent strikes killing innocent civilians, including children, do we turn a blind eye and condone that behavior because it is “an ally”?

Do we condone the bombing of schools, of hospitals, of funerals because it is a partner or an ally?

Do we disregard our own responsibility as human beings to oppose violence against innocence because that violence is being perpetrated by an ally?

And, yes, it is true, our troops are not there, but our bombs are, our mid-air refuelers are, our targeting folks are.

We are allowing ourselves to be complicit in what is the greatest humanitarian tragedy that is on the face of this Earth at this moment. We should not be doing that, and we should stop by voting for this resolution.

Mr. Chair, we have a proud tradition in this country that both sides want to honor, and that is to stand up for freedom and for human decency and dignity.

This policy of Saudi Arabia to bomb and bomb again and bomb yet again, despite the devastating impact upon innocent people, despite how reckless and ineffective it is, must end. Let's end it.

Mr. McCAUL. Mr. Chair, I have no further speakers, so I am prepared to close, and I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chair, let me state a few points.

We all condemn the murder of Khashoggi. I have condemned it publicly, very strongly, what happened with the Saudis killing Khashoggi, executing him.

We are talking about the situation in Yemen.

Who started this humanitarian crisis in the first place? The Houthis tried to take over the Yemeni Government—the Houthis, backed by Iran.

This is about the geopolitics of Iran, Houthis in Yemen, Iran and the Shia crescent in Iraq and Syria, and a direct threat to Israel by the largest state-sponsored terror, Iran, that is a mortal sworn enemy to Israel, as they chant “death to Israel,” “death to America.”

So let's put this all in proper context of what we are really talking about here. Are we defending Iran and the Houthis here today?

So I would like to close by putting two documents in the RECORD. The first is a letter sent by the Department of Defense Office of General Counsel stating that “DOD opposes the resolution because the resolution's fundamental premise is flawed” because the United States support to the Saudi-led coalition “does not involve any introduction of U.S. forces into hostilities.”

Are we going to go around and second-guess every security cooperation agreement we have with 117 countries, including Israel and NATO and other partners?

Mr. Chair, I include in the RECORD this letter from the General Counsel of the Department of Defense.

GENERAL COUNSEL OF THE

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE,

Washington, DC, Feb. 27, 2018.

Hon. MITCHELL “MITCH” MCCONNELL,
Majority Leader, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. MAJORITY LEADER: On February 22, 2018, the Department of Defense (DoD) briefed your staff concerning DoD support to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia's (KSA) operations in Yemen. Subsequently, you requested an unclassified letter reflecting DoD's views on a draft joint resolution that would “direct[] the President to remove United States Armed Forces from hostilities in or affecting the Republic of Yemen, except United States Armed Forces engaged in operations directed at al Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula or associated forces. . . .” DoD opposes this Joint Resolution. Even if enacted into law, the Joint Resolution would not achieve its apparent purpose of restricting U.S. support to the KSA-led coalition, because, as described below, that support does not constitute “hostilities.” In addition to the potential constitutional concerns raised by such a proposal, the draft resolution's restrictions on U.S. military support to our partners could undermine our ability to foster long-term relationships, increase interoperability, promote burden sharing, and build strong security architectures throughout the world. The KSA is a key U.S. partner in the Middle East and we rely on our strong military partnership to promote regional security.

DoD opposes the resolution because the resolution's fundamental premise is flawed. Specifically, the draft resolution incorrectly asserts that U.S. forces have been “introduced into hostilities between the [KSA-led] coalition and the Houthis. . . .” The limited military and intelligence support that the United States is providing to the KSA-led coalition does not involve any introduction of U.S. forces into hostilities for purposes of the War Powers Resolution or of section 1013 of the Department of State Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1984 and 1985 (50 USC 1546a).

Since 2015, the United States has provided limited support to KSA-led coalition military operations against Houthi and Saleh-aligned forces in Yemen. With the exception of a defensive strike in October 2016, U.S. forces are not taking direct military action in this Saudi-led effort in Yemen. Instead, the United States provides the KSA-led coalition defense articles and services, including air-to-air refueling; certain intelligence support; and military advice, including advice regarding compliance with the law of armed conflict and best practices for reducing the risk of civilian casualties.

The draft resolution incorrectly describes United States support to the KSA-led coalition as an operation that introduces U.S. forces into hostilities or imminent involvement in hostilities for purposes of the War Powers Resolution. It has been the longstanding view of the Executive Branch that “hostilities” refers to “a situation in which units of U.S. armed forces are actively engaged in exchanges of fire with opposing units of hostile forces.” U.S. personnel providing support to the KSA-led coalition are not engaged in any such exchanges of fire. Further, the limited U.S. support to the KSA-led coalition does not implicate the activities identified in section 8(c) of the War Powers Resolution. Section 8(c) defines the term “introduction of United States Armed Forces” but does not address the term “hostilities.” “[W]hen applying section 8(c), the

relevant question remains whether U.S. forces—not the foreign forces they are accompanying—are introduced into hostilities or situations involving the imminent threat thereof.” With respect to U.S. support to the KSA-led coalition, U.S. forces do not currently command, coordinate, accompany, or participate in the movement of coalition forces in counter-Houthi operations. Thus, no U.S. forces are accompanying the KSA-led coalition when its military forces are engaged, or an imminent threat exists that they will become engaged, in hostilities. Accordingly, U.S. forces supporting the KSA-led coalition have not been introduced into hostilities or situations where hostilities are imminent.

Although the resolution’s requirement to remove U.S. forces from hostilities would not implicate U.S. support to the KSA-led coalition, this requirement could call into question the statutory authority for ongoing U.S. counterterrorism operations in Yemen. Pursuant to the 2001 Authorization to Use Military Force (AUMF) (Public Law 107-40), U.S. armed forces are currently engaged in hostilities against both al-Qa’ida in the Arabian Peninsula (AQAP) and the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria (ISIS) in Yemen. Hostilities against AQAP and associated forces are explicitly exempted from the resolution’s termination requirement, but hostilities against ISIS are not similarly exempted.

The resolution also asserts incorrectly that there is no authorization for U.S. participation in a Joint Combined Planning Cell with the KSA and mid-air refueling of KSA-led coalition aircraft. President Obama directed such military and intelligence support pursuant to his authority under Article II of the Constitution as Commander in Chief and Chief Executive and his authority to conduct U.S. foreign relations. See *Fleming v. Page*, 50 U.S. (9 How.) 603, 615 (1850) (explaining that the President “is authorized to direct the movements of the naval and military forces placed by law at his command”); *Training of British Flying Students in the United States*, 40 Op. Att’y Gen. 58, 62 (1941) (“[T]he President’s authority has long been recognized as extending to the dispatch of armed forces outside the United States, either on missions of goodwill or rescue, or for the purpose of protecting American lives or property or American interests.”). Because, as discussed above, this limited support to the KSA does not involve the introduction of U.S. forces into hostilities or into situations where imminent involvement in hostilities is clearly indicated, it does not implicate section 4(a)(1) of the War Powers Resolution. See 50 U.S.C. §1543(a)(1). The Obama Administration published its summary of that limited support to the KSA-led coalition as part of the December 2016 “Report of the Legal and Policy Framework Guiding the United States Use of Military Force and Related National Security Operations.” As discussed further below, DoD and the Department of State have implemented the President’s direction through statutory authorities available to the respective Secretaries.

Article II of the Constitution likewise supplied the legal authority for the October 2016 strikes against radar facilities in Houthi-controlled territory in defense of U.S. Navy ships in international waters. The President has authority pursuant to Article II to take military action that furthers sufficiently important national interests. The limited October 2016 strikes were taken to protect U.S. vessels and personnel. Consistent with the War Powers Resolution, President Obama notified Congress of these strikes on October 14, 2016. The Obama Administration also published a summary of its legal analysis for the strike in its December 2016 report.

In late July 2017, President Trump completed a review of the Obama Administra-

tion’s policy of limited support to the Saudi-led coalition. President Trump decided to continue that support, adjusting the priorities in light of the recommendations of Secretary of Defense James Mattis and intervening developments in Yemen. President Trump’s policy guidance for support to the KSA-led coalition’s operations in Yemen is to focus on ending the war and avoiding a regional conflict, mitigating the humanitarian crisis, and defending Saudi Arabia’s territorial integrity and commerce in the Red Sea. Authorized types of support continue to include intelligence, logistics, and advisory support to the KSA-led coalition.

DoD and the Department of State have implemented the President’s policy guidance to provide limited support to the Saudi-led coalition pursuant to legal authorities available to the respective Secretaries. The most prominent forms of support to the KSA and the United Arab Emirates (UAE), as well as the corresponding legal authorities, are detailed below.

Arms and Other Defense Articles: The Arms Export Control Act (AECA) is the underlying authority through which the United States provides or licenses defense articles and defense services to the KSA, UAE, and other members of the KSA-led coalition; many of these defense articles and defense services have been used in the conflict in Yemen. The AECA and associated delegations of authority provide the Secretary of State with the authority to approve the transfer of arms and other defense articles and defense services, primarily through the Foreign Military Sales program (which is overseen by the State Department and implemented through DoD) and through the State Department’s licensing of Direct Commercial Sales to foreign partners. The authority to approve such transfers or licenses is not contingent upon whether the foreign recipient is engaged in an ongoing armed conflict, although the existence of such a conflict clearly increases demand and can be a policy factor in approval decisions. Transfers and licenses made pursuant to the AECA are subject to various requirements (such as notifications to Congress when transfers are above certain monetary thresholds) as well as restrictions on end-use (including no further transfer by the end-user without U.S. consent and that proposed uses must be consistent with the law of armed conflict).

Logistics: Pursuant to licenses issued by the State Department under the AECA, U.S. contractors provide defense services in the form of essential maintenance and sustainment for KSA and UAE combat aircraft engaged in hostilities in Yemen. The in-flight refueling of KSA and UAE aircraft, including combat aircraft, and certain other support, may also be provided pursuant to 10 U.S.C. §§2341 et seq., which authorizes DoD to provide logistic support, supplies, and services to the military forces of a country with which DoD has an Acquisition and Cross-Servicing Agreement (ACSA) in force. DoD must first obtain State Department approval to conclude an ACSA; DoD has ACSAs with the Ministry of Defense of the KSA (applied provisionally pending its formal entry into force) and with the Armed Forces General Headquarters of the UAE.

I trust that this response will be helpful to your understanding of U.S. support to the KSA’s operations in Yemen, and the reason for the DoD’s opposition to this proposed Joint Resolution. Thank you for your continued support of the Department of Defense.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM S. CASTLE,

Acting.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Chair, I include in the RECORD this second document,

which is a Statement of Administration Policy on this point.

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY

S.J. RES. 54—TO DIRECT THE REMOVAL OF UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES FROM HOSTILITIES IN THE REPUBLIC OF YEMEN THAT HAVE NOT BEEN AUTHORIZED BY THE CONGRESS—SEN. SANDERS, I-VT AND 16 COSPONSORS

The Administration strongly opposes passage of S.J. Res. 54, a joint resolution that purports to direct the removal of United States Armed Forces that have not been authorized by the Congress from hostilities in the Republic of Yemen. The fundamental premise of S.J. Res. 54 is flawed—United States forces are not engaged in hostilities between the Saudi-led coalition and Houthi forces in Yemen. Since 2015, the United States has provided limited support to member countries of the Emirati and Saudi-led coalition, including intelligence sharing, logistics, and, until recently, aerial refueling. This support is provided in accordance with licenses and approvals under the Arms Export Control Act, statutory authorities to provide logistics support, and the President’s constitutional powers. United States counterterrorism operations and an October 2016 strike on radar facilities in Houthi-controlled territory, which was the subject of a prior report consistent with the War Powers Resolution of 1973, are separate matters. Other than those engagements, no United States forces have been introduced into hostilities, or into situations where hostilities are clearly imminent, in connection with ongoing support to the Saudi-led coalition. As a result, this United States support does not implicate the War Powers Resolution.

In addition to its erroneous premise, the joint resolution would harm bilateral relationships in the region and negatively impact the ability of the United States to prevent the spread of violent extremist organizations such as al-Qa’ida in the Arabian Peninsula and ISIS in Yemen. The continued cooperation of the United States allows the Administration to support diplomatic negotiations to end the war, ensure humanitarian access, enhance efforts to recover United States hostages in Yemen, and defeat terrorists that seek to harm the United States.

Accordingly, if S.J. Res. 54 were presented to the President in its current form, his advisors would recommend that he veto the joint resolution.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Chair, I am deeply troubled by the one-sided nature of this resolution and what is missing from this resolution, which I just stated earlier, and that is Iran, the world’s leading state sponsor of terror and the Houthis’ benefactor. By staying silent on Iran and by not condemning the Houthis in this resolution, it sends a green light to the Houthis and to the Iranian backers to press on.

This resolution is counterproductive, also, to the efforts that are ongoing right now to negotiate peace in Yemen between the Houthi rebels and the Government of the Yemen Republic.

As we speak, the U.N. envoy is working with the full support of the United States to negotiate a political resolution to this conflict. Getting to these talks has required placing substantial pressure on all parties involved.

The U.N. is encouraging the Houthis to uphold these agreements and to make further agreements with the Yemini Government and the Saudi-led

coalition. But this resolution might cut the U.N. efforts off at its knees.

The Democrats can't tell specifically what assistance this resolution cuts off, but what I can say for sure is that what this resolution says to the Houthis and to Iran is: You have got a green light. Keep going on. You can gain more ground and cause more destruction and humanitarian crisis and cause more problems for Israel and our Saudi ally.

Advancing this pro-Houthi, pro-Iran, anti-Israel resolution does not help to end this war. In Yemen, it only emboldens the rebels in Iran who violently overthrew Yemen's Government and the radical regime that backs them, Iran.

So I would say, Mr. Chairman, in closing, this resolution is not only a dangerous precedent legally—it violates the construction of the War Powers Act—but it is damaging and very bad policy, and I urge my colleagues to vote against it.

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

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

Today is the day that Congress begins to take back its jurisdiction over war and peace. For time after time and year after year, administration after administration, Congress after Congress, the Congress has relinquished its responsibility given to us by the Constitution.

The Constitution clearly says that Congress has the power to wage war, and yet, since President Roosevelt declared war against Japan on December 7, 1941, we have had war after war and conflict after conflict, and Congress has not had anything to do with it. Congress has been silent.

This is not a matter of whether a war is a good war or a bad war. This is a matter of the fact that this Congress needs to make that determination.

Article I makes us a coequal branch of government. And, again, for too long, we have had administration after administration, Republican and Democratic, usurp the power that should be the Congress'. So this is the day my colleagues would begin to take it back.

Mr. Chair, I know that my friends on the other side of the aisle have been saying that this is not the best way to do it, but, you know, I have learned through the years that, if you don't take the bull by the horns, it is never the best way to do it.

There is always a reason not to do it. There is always a reason to point out certain things and say, well, this is not a perfect situation. This isn't the perfect situation. I will be the first to say that. But it is perfect in terms of saying we will take back our jurisdiction and do what the American people elect us to do.

Again, I want to thank Mr. KHANNA for his tireless work on this issue.

As I mentioned, this measure is an important step in Congress reclaiming its role in foreign policy by debating

where and when the United States military is engaged abroad. I don't think that is too much to ask. I think that is what we should be doing.

With the humanitarian crisis in Yemen, it is critical that we act now. We can go after Iran another time—and heaven knows I have been the sponsor of many resolutions and bills sanctioning Iran—but this is not to mix apples with oranges.

There is a civil war going on now in Yemen, and innocent children are dying. We have an ability to put an end to that, and that is what we should do. With this humanitarian crisis, it is critical that we don't delay.

So I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting it, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of H.J. Res. 37, which would end U.S. involvement in the Yemen conflict that has claimed tens of thousands of lives and will soon enter its 4th year.

The humanitarian situation in Yemen is grave and deteriorating. Since the conflict began in 2015 between the Saudi-led military coalition and the Houthi militias, Yemen has faced what is widely recognized as the worst humanitarian crisis in the world.

The conflict has displaced millions of Yemenis, shattered the country, and triggered a famine that has 13 million men, women and children facing starvation.

Additionally, the country is facing an outbreak of cholera of unprecedented scale, with over a million cases of this disease because of the destruction of Yemen's water and sanitation infrastructure.

The United States has provided weapons, targeting assistance and refueling support to the Saudi-led coalition since the conflict began. However, this support was never authorized by Congress and is not covered by any existing Authorization for the Use of Military Force.

In addition, the coalition's bombing campaign has caused significant numbers of civilian casualties, and the conflict continues with no end in sight.

My district is home to a large Yemeni-American community, and I constantly hear stories of the suffering caused by the Yemen conflict and the dire humanitarian situation on the ground.

The breadth and magnitude of the humanitarian crisis is almost unimaginable, and we must take action to address this without delay.

This begins with ending our nation's involvement in the Yemen war. U.S. involvement in the Yemen conflict has undermined our nation's moral authority and has never been authorized by Congress.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support this important resolution, which will send a strong signal that this Congress will not stand idly by in the face of such actions.

H.J. Res. 37 will help bring an end to the suffering of the Yemeni people and reassert Congress's authority as a coequal branch of government. It is my hope that passage of this resolution will be the first step toward healing Yemen and ending this brutal and senseless conflict.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, I rise today in strong support of H.J. Res. 37, which directs the removal of United States Armed

Forces from hostilities in the Republic of Yemen that have not been authorized by Congress.

The passage of H.J. Res. 37 would mark the first time in the 45 years since the enactment of the War Powers Act that the House of Representatives successfully invoked the statute's removal mechanism to compel the Executive Branch to remove American troops from harm's way.

I support this resolution because, Congress has the sole power to declare war under Article I, Section 8, Clause 11 of the United States Constitution.

Mr. Chair, Congress has not declared war with respect to, or provided a specific statutory authorization for, the conflict between military forces led by Saudi Arabia, including forces from the United Arab Emirates, Bahrain, Kuwait, Egypt, Jordan, Morocco, Senegal, and Sudan (the Saudi-led coalition), against the Houthis, also known as Ansar Allah, in the Republic of Yemen.

Since March 2015, members of the United States Armed Forces have been introduced into hostilities between the Saudi-led coalition and the Houthis, including providing to the Saudi-led coalition aerial targeting assistance, intelligence sharing, and mid-flight aerial refueling.

The United States has established a Joint Combined Planning Cell with Saudi Arabia, in which members of the United States Armed Forces assist in aerial targeting and help to coordinate military and intelligence activities.

Mr. Chair, the conflict between the Saudi-led coalition and the Houthis constitutes, within the meaning of Section 4(a) of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1543(a)), either hostilities or a situation where imminent involvement in hostilities is clearly indicated by the circumstances into which United States Armed Forces have been introduced.

Section 5(c) of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1544(c)) states that, "at any time that United States Armed Forces are engaged in hostilities outside the territory of the United States, its possessions and territories without a declaration of war or specific statutory authorization, such forces shall be removed by the President if the Congress so directs".

Most importantly, no specific statutory authorization for the use of United States Armed Forces with respect to the conflict between the Saudi-led coalition and the Houthis in Yemen has been enacted.

Also, no provision of law explicitly authorizes the provision of targeting assistance or of midair refueling services to warplanes of Saudi Arabia or the United Arab Emirates that are engaged in such conflict.

For this reason, the resolution directs that the President remove United States Armed Forces from hostilities in or affecting the Republic of Yemen, except United States Armed Forces engaged in operations directed at al-Qaeda or associated forces, by not later than the date that is 30 days after the date of the enactment.

The resolution makes clear that the term "hostilities" includes in-flight refueling, non-United States aircraft conducting missions as part of the ongoing civil war in Yemen.

Mr. Chair, Yemen is the largest humanitarian crisis in the world right now.

The Yemen crisis began in the Arab Spring of 2011, when an uprising forced the country's long-time authoritarian president, Ali Abdullah

Saleh, to hand over power to his deputy, Abdrabbuh Mansour Hadi.

Since 2015, Saudis Arabia has launched an estimated 18,000 air strikes on Yemen, attacking hospitals, schools, water treatment plants, funerals, markets and even farms.

The Saudis also imposed a blockade on food, fuel and medicine from freely entering the country in what can only be described as a deliberate effort to starve the civilian population into submission.

More than 14 million Yemenis are steps away from starvation and at least 85,000 children under the age of five have perished from war-related hunger and disease.

The United States has supported the Saudi-led air campaign with mid-air refueling support, intelligence and targeting assistance, and other support.

Yemen is experiencing the world's worst famine in 100 years, with 12 million to 13 million innocent civilians at risk of dying from the lack of food within months.

Mr. Chair, too many lives hang in the balance to allow American involvement in Yemen war to continue.

I ask all members to join me in supporting H.J. Res. 37.

□ 1515

The Acting CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

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

It shall be in order to consider as an original joint resolution for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 116-4. The amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

H.J. RES. 37

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) Congress has the sole power to declare war under article I, section 8, clause 11 of the United States Constitution.

(2) Congress has not declared war with respect to, or provided a specific statutory authorization for, the conflict between military forces led by Saudi Arabia, including forces from the United Arab Emirates, Bahrain, Kuwait, Egypt, Jordan, Morocco, Senegal, and Sudan (the Saudi-led coalition), against the Houthis, also known as Ansar Allah, in the Republic of Yemen.

(3) Since March 2015, members of the United States Armed Forces have been introduced into hostilities between the Saudi-led coalition and the Houthis, including providing to the Saudi-led coalition aerial targeting assistance, intelligence sharing, and mid-flight aerial refueling.

(4) The United States has established a Joint Combined Planning Cell with Saudi Arabia, in which members of the United States Armed Forces assist in aerial targeting and help to coordinate military and intelligence activities.

(5) In December 2017, Secretary of Defense James N. Mattis stated, "We have gone in to be very—to be helpful where we can in identifying how you do target analysis and how you make certain you hit the right thing."

(6) The conflict between the Saudi-led coalition and the Houthis constitutes, within the

meaning of section 4(a) of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1543(a)), either hostilities or a situation where imminent involvement in hostilities is clearly indicated by the circumstances into which United States Armed Forces have been introduced.

(7) Section 5(c) of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1544(c)) states that, "at any time that United States Armed Forces are engaged in hostilities outside the territory of the United States, its possessions and territories without a declaration of war or specific statutory authorization, such forces shall be removed by the President if the Congress so directs".

(8) Section 8(c) of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1547(c)) defines the introduction of United States Armed Forces to include "the assignment of members of such armed forces to command, coordinate, participate in the movement of, or accompany the regular or irregular military forces of any foreign country or government when such military forces are engaged, or there exists an imminent threat that such forces will become engaged, in hostilities", and activities that the United States is conducting in support of the Saudi-led coalition, including aerial refueling and targeting assistance, fall within this definition.

(9) Section 1013 of the Department of State Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1984 and 1985 (50 U.S.C. 1546a) provides that any joint resolution or bill to require the removal of United States Armed Forces engaged in hostilities without a declaration of war or specific statutory authorization shall be considered in accordance with the expedited procedures of section 601(b) of the International Security and Arms Export Control Act of 1976 (Public Law 94-329; 90 Stat. 765).

(10) No specific statutory authorization for the use of United States Armed Forces with respect to the conflict between the Saudi-led coalition and the Houthis in Yemen has been enacted, and no provision of law explicitly authorizes the provision of targeting assistance or of midair refueling services to warplanes of Saudi Arabia or the United Arab Emirates that are engaged in such conflict.

SEC. 2. REMOVAL OF UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES FROM HOSTILITIES IN THE REPUBLIC OF YEMEN THAT HAVE NOT BEEN AUTHORIZED BY CONGRESS.

Pursuant to section 1013 of the Department of State Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1984 and 1985 (50 U.S.C. 1546a) and in accordance with the provisions of section 601(b) of the International Security Assistance and Arms Export Control Act of 1976 (Public Law 94-329; 90 Stat. 765), Congress hereby directs the President to remove United States Armed Forces from hostilities in or affecting the Republic of Yemen, except United States Armed Forces engaged in operations directed at al-Qaeda or associated forces, by not later than the date that is 30 days after the date of the enactment of this joint resolution (unless the President requests and Congress authorizes a later date), and unless and until a declaration of war or specific authorization for such use of United States Armed Forces has been enacted. For purposes of this resolution, in this section, the term "hostilities" includes in-flight refueling, non-United States aircraft conducting missions as part of the ongoing civil war in Yemen.

SEC. 3. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION REGARDING CONTINUED MILITARY OPERATIONS AND COOPERATION WITH ISRAEL.

Nothing in this joint resolution may be construed to influence or disrupt any military operations and cooperation with Israel.

SEC. 4. REPORT ON RISKS POSED BY CEASING SAUDI ARABIA SUPPORT OPERATIONS.

Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this joint resolution, the President shall submit to Congress a report assessing the risks posed to United States citizens and the ci-

vilian population of Saudi Arabia and the risk of regional humanitarian crises if the United States were to cease support operations with respect to the conflict between the Saudi-led coalition and the Houthis in Yemen.

SEC. 5. REPORT ON INCREASED RISK OF TERRORIST ATTACKS TO UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES ABROAD, ALLIES, AND THE CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES IF SAUDI ARABIA CEASES YEMEN-RELATED INTELLIGENCE SHARING WITH THE UNITED STATES.

Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this joint resolution, the President shall submit to Congress a report assessing the increased risk of terrorist attacks on United States Armed Forces abroad, allies, and to the continental United States if the Government of Saudi Arabia were to cease Yemen-related intelligence sharing with the United States.

The Acting CHAIR. No amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in House Report 116-8. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, 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 Chair understands that amendment No. 1 will not be offered.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. BUCK

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 116-8.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 5, after line 13, insert the following new section (and redesignate the subsequent sections accordingly):

SEC. 4. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION REGARDING INTELLIGENCE SHARING.

Nothing in this joint resolution may be construed to influence or disrupt any intelligence, counterintelligence, or investigative activities conducted by, or in conjunction with, the United States Government involving—

- (1) the collection of intelligence;
- (2) the analysis of intelligence; or
- (3) the sharing of intelligence between the United States and any foreign country if the President determines such sharing is appropriate and in the national security interests of the United States.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 122, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. BUCK) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, I am an original cosponsor of this resolution, and it was my understanding at the time that I cosponsored this that we would have the opportunity to make this resolution better. This amendment that I have offered does just that.

I actually thought of this amendment after the chairman of the committee held a hearing on this issue, and I listened carefully to the witnesses.

The witnesses talked about the fact that our intelligence sharing with Saudi Arabia helped target sites in Yemen to bomb and reduced civilian casualties.

I want to make sure that we continue to help Saudi Arabia reduce civilian casualties. I want to make sure that we are doing everything we can to avoid the humanitarian crisis there. At the same time, we recognize the geopolitical significance of our relationship with Saudi Arabia.

I support the resolution with the understanding that we have an opportunity to improve this legislation. I am concerned about how broadly the legislation is drafted, and it may inadvertently call into question our ability to maintain intelligence-sharing agreements around the globe; not just in this situation.

My amendment addresses these potential unintended consequences by guaranteeing that this resolution does not curtail our Nation's intelligence-sharing capabilities. It ensures our country will not face another major terrorist attack or be caught flat-footed in battle because the necessary intelligence information didn't reach our leaders.

My amendment keeps the spirit of this important legislation intact, while ensuring that this Congress isn't hamstringing our intelligence capabilities.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense amendment that will keep our intelligence sharing agreements in place.

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Chair, I yield myself 1 minute. I actually support intelligence sharing. We need to work to reduce civilian casualties and ensure that the United States has a clear picture into the security threats in the region.

However, this amendment is unnecessary. The underlying resolution does not implicate intelligence sharing. I have been very clear about what this resolution would do. We have made necessary changes to this resolution, but I do not support adding unnecessary rules of construction to a resolution which has already passed the Senate.

For that reason, I am opposed to this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BUCK. Madam Chair, I appreciate the gentleman's remarks, but it doesn't. This resolution is not clear, and that is the problem. This amendment clarifies something that is unclear.

My friends on the other side of the aisle feel that we must cut our intelligence-sharing operations in order to fully withdraw our forces from the re-

gion. I don't believe that this is the right course.

The Middle East is a dangerous, war-torn part of the world where we need intelligence sharing more than ever. As such, we must ensure that we are not putting our intelligence agreements in jeopardy by passing this resolution.

My amendment keeps the intent of this legislation, allowing Congress to exercise its Article I powers, while ensuring that we are not cutting off our nose to spite our face.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. BUCK).

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. BUCK. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 252, noes 177, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 81]

AYES—252

Abraham	DesJarlais	Johnson (OH)
Aderholt	Diaz-Balart	Johnson (SD)
Allen	Duffy	Jordan
Amodei	Duncan	Joyce (OH)
Armstrong	Dunn	Joyce (PA)
Arrington	Emmer	Kaptur
Axne	Estes	Katko
Babin	Ferguson	Kelly (MS)
Bacon	Finkenauer	Kelly (PA)
Baird	Fitzpatrick	Kim
Balderson	Fleischmann	King (IA)
Banks	Flores	King (NY)
Barr	Fortenberry	Kuster (NH)
Bergman	Fox (NC)	Kustoff (TN)
Biggs	Fulcher	LaHood
Blirakis	Gaetz	LaMalfa
Bishop (UT)	Gallagher	Lamb
Bost	Gianforte	Lamborn
Brady	Gibbs	Latta
Brindisi	Gohmert	Lee (NV)
Brooks (AL)	Golden	Lesko
Brooks (IN)	Gonzalez (OH)	Loebach
Buchanan	González-Colón	Long
Buck	(PR)	Loudermilk
Bucshon	Gooden	Lucas
Budd	Gosar	Luetkemeyer
Burchett	Gottheimer	Luria
Burgess	Granger	Lynch
Bustos	Graves (GA)	Marchant
Byrne	Graves (LA)	Marshall
Calvert	Graves (MO)	Mast
Carter (GA)	Green (TN)	McAdams
Carter (TX)	Griffith	McBath
Case	Grothman	McCarthy
Chabot	Guest	McCaul
Cheney	Guthrie	McClintock
Cisneros	Hagedorn	McHenry
Cline	Harder (CA)	McKinley
Cloud	Harris	Meadows
Cole	Hartzler	Meuser
Collins (GA)	Hastings	Miller
Collins (NY)	Hern, Kevin	Mitchell
Comer	Herrera Beutler	Moolenaar
Conaway	Hice (GA)	Mooney (WV)
Cook	Higgins (LA)	Morelle
Correa	Hill (AR)	Moulton
Craig	Hill (CA)	Mullin
Crawford	Holding	Murphy
Crenshaw	Hollingsworth	Newhouse
Crow	Horn, Kendra S.	Norman
Cuellar	Horsford	Nunes
Cunningham	Houlahan	O'Halleran
Curtis	Hudson	Olson
Davids (KS)	Huizenga	Palazzo
Davidson (OH)	Hunter	Palmer
Davis, Rodney	Hurd (TX)	Panetta
Delgado	Johnson (LA)	Pappas

Pence	Schrier	Torres Small
Perlmutter	Schweikert	(NM)
Perry	Scott (VA)	Turner
Peterson	Scott, Austin	Upton
Phillips	Sensenbrenner	Van Drew
Porter	Sherman	Wagner
Posey	Sherrill	Walberg
Ratcliffe	Shinkus	Walden
Reed	Simpson	Walker
Reschenthaler	Slotkin	Walorski
Rice (SC)	Smith (MO)	Waltz
Riggleman	Smith (NE)	Waters
Roby	Smith (NJ)	Watkins
Rodgers (WA)	Smucker	Weber (TX)
Roe, David P.	Spanberger	Webster (FL)
Rogers (AL)	Spano	Wenstrup
Rogers (KY)	Stauber	Westerman
Rooney (FL)	Stefanik	Wexton
Rose (NY)	Steil	Williams
Rose, John W.	Steube	Wilson (SC)
Rouda	Stevens	Wittman
Rouzer	Stewart	Womack
Roy	Stivers	Woodall
Ruiz	Taylor	Wright
Rush	Thompson (PA)	Yoho
Rutherford	Thornberry	Young
Scalise	Timmons	Zeldin
Schrader	Tipton	

NOES—177

Adams	Gabbard	Neal
Aguilar	Gallego	Neguse
Amash	Garamendi	Norcross
Barragán	Garcia (IL)	Norton
Bass	Garcia (TX)	Ocasio-Cortez
Beatty	Gomez	Omar
Bera	Gonzalez (TX)	Pallone
Beyer	Green (TX)	Pascarell
Bishop (GA)	Grijalva	Peters
Blumenauer	Haaland	Pingree
Blunt Rochester	Hayes	Plaskett
Bonamici	Heck	Pocan
Boyle, Brendan	Higgins (NY)	Pressley
F.	Himes	Price (NC)
Brown (MD)	Hoyer	Raskin
Brownley (CA)	Huffman	Rice (NY)
Butterfield	Jackson Lee	Richmond
Carbajal	Jayapal	Roybal-Allard
Cárdenas	Jeffries	Ruppersberger
Carson (IN)	Johnson (GA)	Sablan
Cartwright	Johnson (TX)	San Nicolas
Casten (IL)	Keating	Sarbanes
Castor (FL)	Kelly (IL)	Scanlon
Castro (TX)	Kennedy	Schakowsky
Chu, Judy	Khanna	Schiff
Cicilline	Kildee	Schneider
Clark (MA)	Kilmer	Scott, David
Clarke (NY)	Kind	Serrano
Clay	Kirkpatrick	Sewell (AL)
Cleaver	Krishnamoorthi	Shalala
Clyburn	Langevin	Sires
Cohen	Larsen (WA)	Smith (WA)
Connolly	Larson (CT)	Soto
Cooper	Lawrence	Speier
Costa	Lawson (FL)	Stanton
Courtney	Lee (CA)	Suozi
Cox (CA)	Levin (CA)	Swalwell (CA)
Crist	Levin (MI)	Takano
Cummings	Lewis	Thompson (CA)
Davis (CA)	Lieu, Ted	Thompson (MS)
Davis, Danny K.	Lipinski	Titus
Dean	Lofgren	Tlaib
DeFazio	Lowenthal	Tonko
DeGette	Lowey	Torres (CA)
DeLauro	Luján	Trahan
DelBene	Malinowski	Trone
Demings	Maloney,	Underwood
DeSaulnier	Carolyn B.	Vargas
Deutch	Maloney, Sean	Veasey
Doggett	Massie	Vela
Doyle, Michael	Matsui	Velázquez
F.	McCollum	Visclosky
Engel	McEachin	Wasserman
Escobar	McGovern	Schultz
Eshoo	McNerney	Watson Coleman
Españillat	Meeks	Welch
Evans	Meng	Wild
Fletcher	Moore	Wilson (FL)
Foster	Mucarsel-Powell	Yarmuth
Frankel	Nadler	
Fudge	Napolitano	

NOT VOTING—8

Allred	Payne	Ryan
Dingell	Quigley	Sánchez
Kinzinger	Radewagen	

□ 1556

Messrs. GONZALEZ of Texas, GARCIA of Illinois, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Messrs. COHEN, SCHNEIDER, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. DELAURO, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. LEWIS, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. JEFFRIES changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. WILSON of South Carolina, MCHENRY, MARCHANT, WALKER, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Messrs. CORREA, CUELLAR, BROOKS of Alabama, and Ms. WATERS changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. RUSH. Madam Chair, during Roll Call Vote number 81 on H.J. Res. 37, the Buck Amendment, I mistakenly recorded my vote as Yes when I should have voted No.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIR. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BUTTERFIELD) having assumed the chair, Ms. PLASKETT, Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 37) directing the removal of United States Armed Forces from hostilities in the Republic of Yemen that have not been authorized by Congress, and, pursuant to House Resolution 122, she reported the joint resolution back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

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

Is a separate vote demanded on the amendment to the amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole?

If not, the question is on the adoption of the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the joint resolution?

Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I am in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Kustoff of Tennessee moves to recommit the joint resolution H.J. Res. 37 to the Committee on Foreign Affairs with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith, with the following amendment:

Add at the end of section 1 the following:

(1) It is in the national security interest of the United States to combat anti-Semitism around the world because—

(A) anti-Semitism is a challenge to the basic principles of tolerance, pluralism, and democracy, and the shared values that bind Americans together;

(B) there has been a significant amount of anti-Semitic and anti-Israel hatred that must be most strongly condemned; and

(C) there is an urgent need to ensure the safety and security of Jewish communities, including synagogues, schools, cemeteries, and other institutions.

(12) It is in the foreign policy interest of the United States to continue to emphasize the importance of combating anti-Semitism in our bilateral and multilateral relations, including with the United Nations, European Union institutions, Arab League, and the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe.

(13) Because it is important to the national security interest of the United States to maintain strong bipartisan support for Israel, the only democracy in the Middle East, all attempts to delegitimize and deny Israel's right to exist must be denounced and rejected.

(14) It is in the national security interest of the United States to oppose restrictive trade practices or boycotts fostered or imposed by any foreign country against other countries friendly to the United States or against any United States person.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, this is the final amendment to the bill. It would not kill the bill nor send it back to committee. If adopted, the resolution will immediately proceed to final passage, as amended.

Mr. Speaker, the attack in October last year against the Tree of Life synagogue in Pittsburgh was a devastating assault on the Jewish community. By inflicting violence on a neighborhood congregation's Shabbat morning service, the gunman sent a bone-chilling message; even in 2018, hate-filled individuals will attack Jews simply for being Jewish.

The Anti-Defamation League believes that this is the deadliest attack on the Jewish community in the history of the United States of America. This tragedy is merely one part of an upsetting development that has emerged in recent years, a resurgence of anti-Semitism around the globe.

The Anti-Defamation League reported a 60 percent rise in anti-Semitic incidents in the United States from 2016 to 2017.

In December, the European Union released a survey of over 16,000 European Jews, which reported that "anti-Semitism pervades everyday life," undermining European Jews' feelings of safety and security.

Mr. Speaker, we should all be alarmed by this international trend. No one should be forced to live in fear of violence, or be deterred from participating in their faith community.

The United States must remain a global leader, not only in speaking out against anti-Semitism, but in holding those who enable these vile beliefs accountable.

Our motion to recommit adds language to H.J. Res. 37 that affirms that it is in the national security interest of the United States to combat anti-Semitism around the world. It states that we must make combating anti-Semitism a priority in all of our diplomatic relationships; and we need to ensure that Jews around the world feel safe in their communities.

Mr. Speaker, I remain deeply concerned by the measure the Democrats have called up today on Yemen, but if this resolution is going to move forward, it should do so while making a strong statement that the United States has no tolerance for anti-Semitism.

I urge all Members to stand in solidarity with Jews around the world and support the motion to recommit.

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

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I claim the time in opposition, although I do not oppose the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I accept this resolution, and I agree with everything that Mr. KUSTOFF just said. Anti-Semitism is a scourge. It is a scourge on humanity; it is a scourge on this country; and it has to be fought just the way prejudice of any kind has to be fought.

I think that this entire House should support this and say, once and for all, with a united voice, we will not tolerate anti-Semitism in any shape or form.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, this 5-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by 5-minute votes on:

Passage of the joint resolution, if ordered; and

The motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 995, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 424, noes 0, answered "present" 2, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 82]

AYES—424

Abraham	Allen	Axne
Adams	Amodei	Babin
Aderholt	Armstrong	Bacon
Aguilar	Arrington	Baird

Balderson
Banks
Barr
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Bergman
Beyer
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bost
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady
Brindisi
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buck
Buchoon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Case
Casten (IL)
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Cisneros
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clever
Cline
Cloud
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Conaway
Connolly
Cook
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Cox (CA)
Craig
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Cummings
Cunningham
Curtis
Davids (KS)
Davidson (OH)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny K.
Davis, Rodney
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duffy

Duncan
Dunn
Emmer
Engel
Escobar
Eshoo
Espallat
Estes
Evans
Ferguson
Finkenauer
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fletcher
Flores
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxy (NC)
Frankel
Fudge
Fulcher
Gabbard
Gaetz
Gallagher
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Golden
Gomez
Gonzalez (OH)
Gonzalez (TX)
Gooden
Gosar
Gottheimer
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Green (TX)
Griffith
Grijalva
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Haaland
Hagedorn
Harder (CA)
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings
Hayes
Heck
Hern, Kevin
Miller
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Higgins (NY)
Hill (AR)
Hill (CA)
Himes
Holding
Hollingsworth
Horn, Kendra S.
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Hudson
Huffman
Huizenga
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson (TX)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kildee
Kim
Kind

King (IA)
King (NY)
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Kustoff (TN)
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamb
Lamborn
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Lesko
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Long
Loudermilk
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marshall
Mast
Matsui
McAdams
McBath
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McHenry
McKinley
McNerney
Meadows
Meeks
Meng
Meuser
Miller
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Morelle
Moulton
Mucarsel-Powell
Mullin
Murphy
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Newhouse
Norcross
Norman
Nunes
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Olson
Omar
Palazzo
Pallone
Palmer
Panetta
Pappas
Pascarell
Payne
Pence
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Posey
Pressley
Price (NC)

Raskin
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reschenthaler
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Riggleman
Roby
Rodgers (WA)
Roe, David P.
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rooney (FL)
Rose (NY)
Rose, John W.
Rouda
Rouzer
Roy
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Rutherford
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Schalick
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sewell (AL)

Shalala
Sherman
Sherrill
Shimkus
Simpson
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Smucker
Soto
Spanberger
Spano
Speier
Stanton
Stauber
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stevens
Stewart
Stivers
Suzuki
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Timmons
Tipton
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres Small
(NM)

Trahan
Trone
Turner
Underwood
Upton
Van Drew
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Waltz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watkins
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westerman
Wexton
Wild
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Wright
Yarmuth
Yoho
Young
Zeldin

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

Amash
Allred
Dingell

Massie
Kinzinger
Quigley

NOT VOTING—5
Ryan

□ 1616

Mr. VISCLOSKEY changed his vote from "nay" to "aye."

So the motion to recommit was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the instructions of the House in the motion to recommit, I report the joint resolution, H.J. Res 37, back to the House with an amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ENGEL:

Add at the end of section 1 the following:

(1) It is in the national security interest of the United States to combat anti-Semitism around the world because—

(A) anti-Semitism is a challenge to the basic principles of tolerance, pluralism, and democracy, and the shared values that bind Americans together;

(B) there has been a significant amount of anti-Semitic and anti-Israel hatred that must be most strongly condemned; and

(C) there is an urgent need to ensure the safety and security of Jewish communities, including synagogues, schools, cemeteries, and other institutions.

(2) It is in the foreign policy interest of the United States to continue to emphasize the importance of combating anti-Semitism in our bilateral and multilateral relations, including with the United Nations, European Union institutions, Arab League, and the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe.

(3) Because it is important to the national security interest of the United States to maintain strong bipartisan support for Israel, the only democracy in the Middle

East, all attempts to delegitimize and deny Israel's right to exist must be denounced and rejected.

(14) It is in the national security interest of the United States to oppose restrictive trade practices or boycotts fostered or imposed by any foreign country against other countries friendly to the United States or against any United States person.

Mr. McCAUL (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

Mr. HOYER. I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

The Clerk will continue to read.

The Clerk continued to read.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 248, nays 177, answered "present" 1, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 83]

YEAS—248

Adams	Courtney	Gottheimer
Aguilar	Cox (CA)	Green (TX)
Axne	Craig	Griffith
Barragán	Crist	Grijalva
Bass	Crow	Haaland
Beatty	Cuellar	Harder (CA)
Bera	Cummings	Hastings
Beyer	Cunningham	Hayes
Biggs	Davids (KS)	Heck
Bishop (GA)	Davidson (OH)	Higgins (NY)
Blumenauer	Davis (CA)	Hill (CA)
Blunt Rochester	Davis, Danny K.	Himes
Bonamici	Dean	Hollingsworth
Boyle, Brendan F.	DeFazio	Horn, Kendra S.
Brindisi	DeGette	Horsford
Brooks (AL)	DeLauro	Houlahan
Brown (MD)	DelBene	Hoyer
Brownley (CA)	Delgado	Huffman
Buck	Demings	Jackson Lee
Bustos	DeSaulnier	Jayapal
Butterfield	Deutch	Jeffries
Carbajal	Doggett	Johnson (GA)
Cárdenas	Doyle, Michael F.	Johnson (TX)
Carson (IN)	Engel	Jordan
Cartwright	Escobar	Kaptur
Case	Eshoo	Keating
Casten (IL)	Espallat	Kelly (IL)
Castor (FL)	Evans	Kennedy
Castro (TX)	Finkenauer	Khanna
Chu, Judy	Fletcher	Kildee
Cicilline	Foster	Kim
Cisneros	Frankel	Kind
Clark (MA)	Fudge	Kirkpatrick
Clarke (NY)	Gabbard	Krishnamoorthi
Clay	Gaetz	Kuster (NH)
Clever	Gallego	Lamb
Cloud	Garamendi	Langevin
Clyburn	Garcia (IL)	Larsen (WA)
Cohen	Garcia (TX)	Larson (CT)
Connolly	Gohmert	Lawrence
Cooper	Golden	Lawson (FL)
Correa	Gomez	Lee (CA)
Costa	Gonzalez (TX)	Lee (NV)

Levin (CA) Pallone
 Levin (MI) Panetta
 Lewis Pappas
 Lieu, Ted Pascrell
 Lipinski Payne
 Loeb sack Perlmutter
 Lofgren Peters
 Lowenthal Peterson
 Lowey Phillips
 Lujan Pingree
 Luria Pocan
 Lynch Porter
 Malinowski Posey
 Maloney, Pressley
 Carolyn B. Price (NC)
 Maloney, Sean Raskin
 Massie Rice (NY)
 Matsui Richmond
 McAdams Rose (NY)
 McBath Rouda
 McCollum Roy
 McEachin Roybal-Allard
 McGovern Ruiz
 McNerney Ruppertsberger
 Meadows Rush
 Meeks Sánchez
 Meng Sarbanes
 Mooney (WV) Scanlon
 Moore Schakowsky
 Morelle Schiff
 Moulton Schneider
 Mucarsel-Powell Schrader
 Murphy Schrier
 Nadler Schweikert
 Napolitano Scott (VA)
 Neal Scott, David
 Neguse Serrano
 Norcross Sewell (AL)
 O'Halleran Shalala
 Ocasio-Cortez Sherman
 Omar Sherrill

NAYS—177

Abraham Gibbs
 Aderholt Gonzalez (OH)
 Allen Gooden
 Amodei Gosar
 Armstrong Granger
 Arrington Graves (GA)
 Babin Graves (LA)
 Bacon Graves (MO)
 Baird Green (TN)
 Balderson Grothman
 Banks Guest
 Barr Guthrie
 Bergman Hagedorn
 Bilirakis Harris
 Bishop (UT) Hartzler
 Bost Hern, Kevin
 Brady Herrera Beutler
 Brooks (IN) Hice (GA)
 Buchanan Higgins (LA)
 Bucshon Hill (AR)
 Budd Holding
 Burchett Hudson
 Burgess Huizenga
 Byrne Hunter
 Calvert Hurd (TX)
 Carter (GA) Johnson (LA)
 Carter (TX) Johnson (OH)
 Chabot Johnson (SD)
 Cheney Joyce (OH)
 Cline Joyce (PA)
 Cole Katko
 Collins (GA) Kelly (MS)
 Collins (NY) Kelly (PA)
 Comer King (IA)
 Conaway King (NY)
 Cook Kustoff (TN)
 Crawford LaHood
 Crenshaw LaMalfa
 Curtis Lamborn
 Davis, Rodney Latta
 DesJarlais Lesko
 Diaz-Balart Long
 Duffy Loudermilk
 Duncan Lucas
 Dunn Luetkemeyer
 Emmer Marchant
 Estes Marshall
 Ferguson Mast
 Fitzpatrick McCarthy
 Fleischmann McCaul
 Flores McClintock
 Fortenberry McHenry
 Foxx (NC) McKinley
 Fulcher Meuser
 Gallagher Miller
 Gianforte Mitchell

Sires
 Slotkin
 Smith (WA)
 Soto
 Spanberger
 Speier
 Stanton
 Stevens
 Suozzi
 Swalwell (CA)
 Takano
 Thompson (CA)
 Thompson (MS)
 Tipton
 Titus
 Tlaib
 Tonko
 Torres (CA)
 Torres Small
 (NM)
 Trahan
 Trone
 Underwood
 Van Drew
 Vargas
 Veasey
 Vela
 Velázquez
 Visclosky
 Wasserman
 Schultz
 Waters
 Watson Coleman
 Webster (FL)
 Welch
 Wexton
 Wild
 Wilson (FL)
 Yarmuth

Williams
 Wilson (SC)
 Wittman

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Amash

NOT VOTING—5

Allred
 Dingell

Kinzinger
 Quigley

Ryan

□ 1628

So the joint resolution was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Ms. SHERRILL. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained this afternoon immediately following the vote on final passage of H.J. Res. 37. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 83.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. ALLRED. Mr. Speaker, as I am back home in Dallas, Texas on paternity leave with my family, I submit the following vote explanation. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 78, "yea" on rollcall No. 79, "yea" on rollcall No. 80, "yea" on rollcall No. 81, "yea" on rollcall No. 82, and "yea" on rollcall No. 83.

MOMENT OF SILENCE IN REMEMBRANCE OF THE LATE HONORABLE WALTER B. JONES

(Mr. PRICE of North Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, along with my colleagues in the North Carolina delegation, to remember and honor the life of Representative Walter Jones, Jr., a treasured colleague, a conscientious public servant, and a personal friend to many across this Chamber.

Walter died on February 10, his 76th birthday. He lived a life full of service: 4 years in the North Carolina National Guard, 10 years in the North Carolina General Assembly, and nearly a quarter century in the U.S. House of Representatives.

Walter and I met long before either of us served in the House. We worked together on the North Carolina Presidential campaign of Jimmy Carter in 1976. I have a photo on my desk of a very youthful-looking campaign team to prove it.

Walter went on to chart a different course politically, a course that was uniquely his own. In fact, he found himself frequently at odds with if not one party, then the other. But by the same token, he sometimes found possibilities for alliances and cooperation in unexpected places and did not hesitate to take those opportunities.

This approach was rooted in Walter's strong conscience and his personal sincerity. He stood out in an age when sincerity is sometimes in short supply in our Nation's politics, earning him respect and admiration on both sides of the aisle. The outpouring of tributes and remembrances we have seen in recent days is a testament to that fact.

Much has been said about the personal encounters Walter had with veterans of the Iraq war and the families of those who never returned, and how these encounters led him to reassess his past and present policy stances.

Walter sent over 10,000 letters to families of fallen troops, and he memorialized those who died from North Carolina's Camp Lejeune with photos outside his office.

Walter's determined and effective voice for our military—certainly, the Marines especially—and his deep love for his home State of North Carolina will be missed in these halls and in the coastal, farming, and military communities that make up the Third Congressional District.

We extend heartfelt condolences to Walter's wife, Joe Anne; his daughter, Ashley; his loyal staff; and the countless friends, neighbors, and community members whose lives he touched along the way. Our State, our Nation, and the institution of Congress will be poorer without him.

We will miss Walter's reliable and cordial presence right here in this center aisle.

Mr. Speaker, before we observe a moment of silence in Walter's honor, I yield to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX), the senior Republican in the North Carolina delegation.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. PRICE for yielding and for his wonderful comments remembering Walter.

On behalf of the Republican Members of the North Carolina delegation—indeed, all the Members of our Republican Conference—we remember our long-serving colleague, Walter B. Jones, already miss him, and express our prayers for him and his family.

Walter asked to be memorialized on the floor by his dear friend THOMAS MASSIE, and Mr. PRICE will yield to him in a moment for that purpose.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for those remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. MASSIE).

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. PRICE for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, our colleague and my great friend, Walter Jones, was both courageous and kind.

He frequently quoted a statement by Senator John Ashcroft's father: "Washington is the spirit of arrogance, and Christ is the spirit of humility." Walter had the spirit of Christ.

It didn't matter if you were a waiter at his table, a summer intern in his office, or the chairman of his committee, Walter extended the same respect to everyone. In his heart, he never believed that he was any better than the most common person.

Walter's chief, Josh, who has been with him for 16 years, reminded me that some people in Washington, DC, kiss up and punch down. Walter often did the opposite. Walter would kiss down and punch up.

He was a statesman and a true southern gentleman who followed his heart while fighting for his constituents.

Whether you agreed with him or not, Walter displayed the type of courage we could all hope to possess. He was willing to admit when he was wrong, like that time he devoted to Jimmy Carter. He would admit it in front of God, his colleagues, and his 750,000 constituents. That is true courage.

Walter's conscience guided his every vote and action in the 6 years that I knew him.

11,266; that is the final number of letters that Walter Jones personally wrote, offering his apologies and condolences to the families of soldiers who lost their lives in the wars in the Middle East. You see, Walter eagerly voted for the Iraq war, but then later came to believe that he had made a grave mistake.

Did he write those letters to prepare him for his next reelection? No. He wrote those letters to prepare him for this day, when he would be judged at the gates of Heaven.

What might seem like a small plight could become Walter's greatest cause, if honor and respect were in the balance. Whenever Walter gave the blessing before the meals that I shared with him, he would mention two marine pilots who had been unfairly implicated in a tragic crash. Clearing the names of Major Brooks Gruber and Lieutenant Colonel John Brow was one of his most important achievements. When I spoke with Walter 2 weeks ago, he said he looked forward to meeting them in Heaven. He was at peace.

Walter told me something else in that hour that we shared a couple of weeks ago. He reminded me that his father had served 13 terms in Congress, and it had been Walter's goal, he said, to match his father's service. For those who don't know, this was Walter's 13th term.

I told Walter, "They never beat you, did they?" Well, I used another word than that. He laughed. You see, all the money in the world was no match for Walter's sincerity, which always shone through to the people he served, even if they didn't always agree with him.

Walter wanted to finish this term, but God called him back too soon. I told Walter he would finish this term because when I would vote, I would ask myself: What would Walter do? He seemed pleased at that.

So please join me. The next time you are torn on what to do or say in this body, ask yourself: What would Walter do? Walter would follow his conscience. Just follow your conscience, and together, we can ensure that Walter's spirit finishes this 13th term.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask that we observe a moment of silence.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair asks all present to rise and observe a moment of silence.

SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT INFORMATION DATABASE ACT OF 2019

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and passing the bill (H.R. 995) to amend chapter 3 of title 5, United States Code, to require the publication of settlement agreements, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HILL) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, 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.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 418, noes 0, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 84]

AYES—418

Abraham
Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Axne
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Bergman
Beyer
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bost
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady
Brindisi
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Case
Casten (IL)
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)

Chabot
Cheney
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Cisneros
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Cline
Cloud
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Conaway
Connolly
Cook
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Cox (CA)
Craig
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Cummings
Cunningham
Curtis
Davids (KS)
Davidson (OH)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny K.
Davis, Rodney
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaunier
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duffy
Duncan
Dunn
Emmer
Engel

Escobar
Eshoo
Espallat
Estes
Evans
Ferguson
Finkenauer
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fletcher
Flores
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx (NC)
Frankel
Fudge
Fulcher
Gaetz
Gallagher
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Golden
Gomez
Gonzalez (OH)
Gonzalez (TX)
Gooden
Gosar
Gottheimer
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Green (TX)
Griffith
Grijalva
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Haaland
Hagedorn
Harder (CA)
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings
Hayes
Heck
Hern, Kevin
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Higgins (NY)
Hill (AR)

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

McClintock
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McHenry
McKinley
McNerney
Meadows
Meeks
Meng
Meuser
Miller
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Morelle
Moulton
Mucarsel-Powell
Mullin
Murphy
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Newhouse
Norcross
Norman
Nunes
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Olson
Omar
Palazzo
Pallone
Palmer
Panetta
Pappas
Payne
Pence
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Posey
Pressley
Price (NC)
Raskin
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reschenthaler
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Riggleman
Roby
Rodgers (WA)
Roe, David P.
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rooney (FL)
Rose (NY)
Rose, John W.
Rouda
Rouzer
Roy
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Rutherford
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scalise
Scanlon
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier

Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shalala
Sherman
Shimkus
Simpson
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Soto
Spanberger
Spano
Speier
Stanton
Stauber
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stevens
Stewart
Stivers
Suozi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Timmons
Tipton
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres Small
(NM)
Trahan
Trone
Turner
Underwood
Upton
Van Drew
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Waltz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watkins
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westerman
Wexton
Wild
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Wright
Yarmuth
Yoho
Young
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—13

Allred
Dingell
Gabbard
Kinzinger
Lowenthal
Pascrell
Quigley
Ryan
Schakowsky
Sherrill
Smith (WA)
Taylor
Wilson (FL)

□ 1653

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.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. ALLRED. Mr. Speaker, as I am back home in Dallas, Texas, on paternity leave with my family, I submit the following vote explanation. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 84.

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON RULES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on Rules:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, February 13, 2019.

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

DEAR SPEAKER PELOSI: I was honored to return to serve on the Rules Committee at the start of the 116th Congress. It has been my privilege to work alongside Chairman McGovern, Ranking Member Cole, and the hardworking members that work so hard to bring serious legislation and policy to the House Floor.

Respectfully, I am writing to tender my resignation as a member of the Rules Committee, effective February 13, 2019.

Thank you for this opportunity and to my colleagues on the Committee for their hard work and friendship.

Sincerely,

DORIS MATSUI,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted. There was no objection.

ELECTING MEMBERS TO CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AND RANKING MEMBERS ON A CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

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

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 125

Resolved, That the following named Members be, and are hereby, elected to the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET: Mr. Sires, Mr. Peters, and Mr. Cooper.

COMMITTEE ON ETHICS: Ms. Meng, Ms. Wild, and Mr. Phillips.

COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES: Mr. Cartwright.

COMMITTEE ON RULES: Mr. DeSaulnier.

Resolved, That the following named Member be, and is hereby, ranked as follows on the following standing committee of the House of Representatives:

COMMITTEE ON RULES: Mr. Perlmutter (to rank immediately after Mrs. Torres of California).

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

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

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 940

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 940.

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

There was no objection.

REQUEST TO CONSIDER H.R. 962, THE BORN-ALIVE ABORTION SURVIVORS PROTECTION ACT

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H.R. 962) the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman is advised that, under guidelines consistently issued by successive Speakers, as recorded in section 956 of the House Rules and Manual, the Chair is constrained not to entertain the request unless it has been cleared by the bipartisan floor and committee leaderships.

□ 1700

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF CONGRESSMAN WALTER JONES

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

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, I want to offer my condolences and prayers to my dear friend, Congressman Walter Jones, and also to the people of North Carolina, who lost a tireless champion.

Throughout his time in service, Congressman Jones never lost sight of those he served: the families in North Carolina, people across the country, and, of course, our brave servicemembers around the globe.

Congressman Jones will be remembered for his limitless compassion and his willingness to reach across the aisle and to find common ground.

I worked with him on many issues over the years, but our greatest collaboration was on our shared effort to draw down our endless wars and bring our brave troops home. He was a colead on several of my bills, including the one to repeal the 2001 and 2002 Authorization for Use of Military Force to finally end our limitless wars abroad.

It fills me with unspeakable sadness, Mr. Speaker, that Congressman Jones did not live to see the end of these wars, but his memory will live on. We will fight harder in his memory to ensure that Congress does its job on matters of war and peace.

I was honored to call Congressman Jones my colleague and my friend. His

spirit will be greatly missed in the Halls of Congress, and tonight I again offer my condolences to his family, his friends; and also, I celebrate his life, because it was truly a life well lived.

REMEMBERING FLIGHT 3407 10 YEARS LATER

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, yesterday marked the 10th anniversary of the flight 3407 crash that went down outside of Buffalo, New York, resulting in the untimely deaths of 49 people. I rise today with a heavy heart as we commemorate this tragedy.

A decade has gone by, but for families who lost loved ones, the pain will live with them forever. These individuals have suffered an unspeakable loss, yet so many of them have traveled to Washington numerous times over the past 10 years to advocate for improved airline safety.

They advocate for regional flights to operate under the same standards as major airlines and to ensure that the tragedy of flight 3407 is never repeated. They advocate in memory of their loved ones whose lives were cut short.

Nothing can bring back their loved ones, but the standards implemented, thanks to their advocacy, have saved lives, and for that we are grateful.

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN ENGROSSMENT OF H.J. RES. 37, REMOVAL OF UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES FROM HOSTILITIES IN YEMEN THAT HAVE NOT BEEN AUTHORIZED BY CONGRESS

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in the engrossment of H.J. Res. 37, the Clerk be authorized to correct section numbers, punctuation, spelling, and cross-references and to make such other technical and conforming changes as may be necessary to reflect the actions of the House, including the change now at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PAPPAS). The Clerk will report the change.

The Clerk read as follows:

In section 2 of the joint resolution, strike "refueling," and insert "refueling of".

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

There was no objection.

RESTORE AMERICA'S FAITH IN OUR DEMOCRACY

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, last week I received a peculiar invitation from

the Kuwaiti Government to celebrate Kuwait's independence at the Trump Hotel.

While Kuwait is a close ally of the United States, I feel compelled to decline the invitation. We must reject the culture of corruption that surrounds President Trump and his family.

President Trump promised he would drain the swamp. He promised to put the interests of the American people before his own. Yet he has used his office to enrich himself further.

According to USA Today, the President earned—get ready for this—\$40 million from his Washington hotel just in 2017. This includes \$350,000 in campaign funds and events hosted by the Republican National Committee.

As we press foreign nations to better their own governments, it is clear that President Trump has reduced America's moral authority.

I remind the President of Article II, Section 1 of the Constitution, which prohibits the President from receiving gifts from a foreign power without the consent of Congress.

We must restore America's faith in our democracy. That is why I look forward to working with my colleagues to hold the Trump administration fully accountable for their misdeeds.

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

RECOGNIZING CHARLIE DANIEL ON HIS RETIREMENT

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

Mr. BURCHETT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the career of one of my district's most notable journalistic figures, Charlie Daniel. He spent the last six decades as a political cartoonist in Knoxville and retired this year.

He is a marine, like my brother-in-law, Cliff Worsham, and my father, and he served his country admirably. His retirement is a loss to our community.

I have never known a time when you couldn't open the Knoxville News Sentinel to see Charlie's latest cartoon taking one politician or another to task. Quite often, Mr. Speaker, it was me, because Charlie and I didn't always get along or see eye to eye, and I have forgiven him for his transgressions.

Mr. Speaker, he was and is one of the best. I have been made fun of by people all over the world, but my friend Charlie is my favorite. His cartoons were razor sharp while still being respectful.

Comic artists that I grew up looking at, like Steve Ditko, Frank Frazetta, Neal Adams, and Joe Kubert, are probably more famous but never were as creative as Charlie is. He is a Tennessee Journalism Hall of Fame inductee and has been recognized by the National Cartoonists Society.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to call him my dear friend, and I know I speak for many in east Tennessee when I say that the morning paper isn't the same without him.

HONORING PARKLAND SHOOTING VICTIMS

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

Mrs. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the victims of the shooting at Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School on February 14, 2018.

It was just a year ago that we lost 17 lives at the hands of a gunman as part of the terrible epidemic that is gun violence in America. Fourteen of these were young students with a bright future ahead of them.

Today, I am here to honor the memories of Alyssa, Martin, Nicholas, Jaime, Luke, Cara, Gina, Joaquin, Alaina, Meadow, Helena, Alex, Carmen, and Peter and the three courageous staff members: Scott, Aaron, and Chris.

May their souls in Heaven be a guiding light to us here on Earth as we continue to fight against gun violence, because no parent wants to send their kids to school, to church, or to a movie theater worried about whether they may ever come home.

It took less than 7 minutes for a gunman in Parkland, Florida, to try to erase these 17 people, but he could not and will not be able to erase them from the memories of their loved ones.

Today we remember their lives by saying their names, and we honor them by taking action. We can and must act. I, for one, will never stop fighting to honor their legacies and make our communities safer by ending gun violence. We as a nation shall never forget.

PROTECT BORN-ALIVE CHILDREN

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

Mr. SPANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to enthusiastically support Congresswoman WAGNER's born-alive bill, a bill that would protect children born after a failed abortion from further attempts on their lives.

This is not a liberal or conservative issue. This is not a Democratic or Republican issue. This is not a political issue, even. It is a moral issue, and moral issues have a way of being undeniable.

It is a universal truth that laws protect the living; and while many of us cannot agree when life begins, I am confident that everyone in this House would agree that life begins at least at birth. More importantly, I am confident that the vast majority of the American people would agree that a child born alive is, in fact, alive.

I understand there may be attempts to prevent a vote on this bill to protect

Members who are against the born-alive bill, but, no, it is impossible to protect politicians from the moral convictions of the American people, and history is unkind to those who try.

I urge Members from both parties to see the born-alive bill as an opportunity to foster bipartisanship in this House.

Supporting this bill does not make you antiabortion or against a woman's right to choose; it simply ensures that laws already in place are enforced to protect the most vulnerable among us.

GUN VIOLENCE

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, we have spent a very long day in the Judiciary Committee working on legislation to respond to the American people's cry for universal background checks, but I rise as well, in the backdrop of that legislation, to stand for the victims of gun violence.

I think it is important to note that America has 329 million people-plus here in the United States, and it is growing every day. But we have 393 million guns here in this country. We have lost, in this past year, almost 40,000 people to gun violence.

I believe it is important, in a bipartisan way, that, when we are here in the people's House, we act on behalf of the American people. They want fair, simple universal background checks, which I hope will be on this floor very soon.

Let me close by giving my deepest sympathy to the family, friends, and staff of Walter Jones. I viewed him as a great American, a great public servant, and one of great principle. I know that Walter, in his life and now in his passing, will wish for this Nation peace and dignity for all of those men and women who serve in the United States military.

May he rest in peace.

SUPREME COURT ETHICS

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, in recent years, some Americans suspect that politics has infected our courts, particularly the United States Supreme Court. This troubling trend threatens our democracy when the independence of our judiciary is questioned.

Last week, I introduced a bill that requires the Judicial Conference of the United States to create a code of ethical conduct for the U.S. Supreme Court.

Unlike Federal judges, Supreme Court Justices are exempt from the code of conduct. The Supreme Court Ethics Act changes that.

Supreme Court Justices should not be exempt from adhering to the standards other Federal judges must follow.

Passage of this necessary ethical reform would restore the public's confidence and perception that the judiciary is independent, impartial, and apolitical; and it would protect public confidence in the rule of law, the inviolability of the judiciary and the incomparable and unique role it plays in the delicate system of checks and balances that sustains our democracy.

HONORING THE LIFE OF REPRESENTATIVE WALTER JONES, JR.

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

Ms. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of my colleague, Representative Walter Jones, Jr.

For 24 years, Congressman Jones represented the people of North Carolina's Third Congressional District with pride and integrity. In his quarter century in service to our great country, Congressman JONES was a steadfast voice and advocate for North Carolina.

He was unafraid to put people before politics and was a dedicated public servant. He was a principled leader. He stood firmly for what he believed and wasn't afraid to admit when he made a mistake.

Second Corinthians 5:8 reminds us that "... to be absent from the body is to be present with the Lord." I pray that Congressman Jones has now found the peace that he sought.

To his wife, Joe Anne, and daughter, Ashley, please know that Walter Jones left an indelible mark upon our State and Nation, and he will be missed.

PROTECT BABIES BORN ALIVE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. WALORSKI) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the topic of this Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today alongside my colleagues to speak out against the radical and dangerous policies being pursued by Democratic leadership and State legislators across the country.

In New York, a new law legalizes what amounts to infanticide—allowing abortions up to and even after birth for almost any reason—and ends the safeguards that protect babies born alive after an abortion attempt.

□ 1715

In Virginia, a similar bill is under consideration that could lead to babies

being denied lifesaving medical care. As Governor Ralph Northam put it: "The infant would be kept comfortable ... and then a discussion would ensue."

I think this is sickening. That is why my colleagues and I have called for the House vote on H.R. 962, the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act, a commonsense bill to require that medical care—just medical care—be provided to children who survive a failed abortion.

Sadly, Democratic leadership in the House is standing in the way and refusing even to allow an up-or-down vote on this issue. This is not a partisan issue. It is simply what is right.

We have got to stand together against this radical and inhumane agenda. We must act to protect the rights of all infants.

I am grateful to be joined in this call by so many of my colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from the Third District of Washington (Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER).

Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to get to be here on this floor, and I get to share my story.

In mid-2013 my husband, Dan, and I went in for our 20-week ultrasound as excited first-time parents. We were not prepared for what we were told. We were told our unborn baby had a zero percent chance at survival. There were no kidneys. It was a condition called bilateral renal agenesis, or Potter's syndrome. As a result, our baby would either miscarry or be born unable to breathe because her lungs wouldn't develop. She would literally suffocate upon arrival if we brought her to term.

I, of course, was encouraged from physicians to abort my baby. While there are many reasons that lead women to make that decision, Dr. Jennifer Gunter, who is a women's health advocate, asserts that "terminations after 24 weeks are for severe fetal anomalies."

Now, our baby's diagnosis wasn't just severe; it was without any glimmer of hope. Being told that that wriggling, alive, kicking child in your stomach will certainly die doesn't just take the breath out of your lungs, it is like hell screaming in your face, and it leads to fear.

Miraculously, our doctors were wrong. We pushed forward with that pregnancy and were successful. We had seen something that had never happened before: my baby developed lungs in utero without kidneys. It was an impossible outcome to the medical world at that time.

In good faith, our doctors had given us their honest, professional opinions. But guess what. Doctors aren't infallible.

While we wouldn't have known this if we hadn't tried to overcome this diagnosis—and through divine intervention and some amazing doctors who were willing to charter new waters, literally—we now get to experience our

daughter, Abigail, who is holding the Bible for the swearing-in standing next to me and Speaker PELOSI, a healthy, happy 5-year-old who is a big sister. She says that some day she is going to be the boss of Mommy's work.

Look out, Speaker PELOSI.

So since our story became public, I have talked to moms all over the world who, like me, carried their babies into the second and third trimesters hoping to deliver and then are given devastating diagnoses. But what if the doctor is wrong about their babies, too?

Abigail was the first to survive her condition, but because of her breakthrough, she is not the only survivor now.

Radical legislation in New York and Virginia has recently brought late-term or partial-birth abortion into the spotlight. But what if we used this discussion to go on the offensive against the potential disease instead of attacking the pregnancy itself?

Some parents have been presented with scary prenatal tests that can produce false alarms. These same earnest, loving, would-be parents have made permanent decisions based on what could be incorrect information.

What if the baby won't have that significant health condition or disability after all? Or even if she does, what about the loving families eager to raise a child in anticipation of her living a full and fulfilling life?

We got to hear Frank Stephens, an exceptionally joy-filled disability champion with Down syndrome, describe, at a congressional hearing, how he is a medical gift to society in that his extra chromosome might lead to the answer to Alzheimer's. Science bears this out.

Our society celebrates the term, "diversity." Shouldn't that mean full diversity, which includes all physical and mental abilities, or disabilities as some call it?

We step onto very shaky ground when we start deciding who lives or dies based on one's abilities or, possibly, lack thereof in utero because, despite our best intentions or the best intentions of the messenger—doctor or otherwise—there is a limit to what science can predict.

That is not naivete speaking. That is coming from the mom of a child who was given a zero percent chance of survival based on, at the time, sound science.

Now this kiddo has a full, adult life ahead of her, and those of us who know her are privileged, immeasurably.

Do you know what? Every single child, regardless of their ability, has that same potential if we only give them that chance.

I believe that care, understanding, and compassion are needed at every stage of a woman's maternal journey. But to me, that means empowering mothers to dwell in the realm of the possible, not the impossible, even if it has never been tried before.

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from the Fourth District of New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), who is the co-chair of the Bipartisan Congressional Pro-Life Caucus, and I thank Representative CHRIS SMITH for his leadership and courage.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, what an expression of love, compassion, and faith we just heard, the child who was thought to be impossible; and what a tribute to parents and a mother who just love so unconditionally.

Mr. Speaker, in 2012, two bioethicists, Dr. Alberto Giubilini and Francesca Minerva, published an outrageous paper in the *Journal of Medical Ethics* justifying the deliberate, premeditated murder of newborn babies during the first hours, days, and even weeks after birth. The ethicists said:

When circumstances occur after birth that would have justified abortion, what we call after-birth abortion should be permissible.

In other words, the same conditions that would justify the killing of a baby in utero justifies the killing of that baby even when she is born.

These two individuals made it clear that because the child does not have dreams about the future at birth, that that somehow is a disqualifier to personhood.

The infanticide that they proposed, Mr. Speaker, is here. After-birth abortion is here.

A couple weeks ago, New York Governor Cuomo signed into law a bill to allow abortion until birth and even removes penalties for infanticide. Other States, including Virginia, Rhode Island, and New Mexico, have similar anti-child statutes under consideration.

The violent assault on children, Mr. Speaker, must end. Not only have 61 million unborn babies been killed since 1973 by either dismemberment—when a child is torn apart, arms, legs, and torso, literally dismembered—or by chemical poisoning, a death toll that equates with the entire population of Italy, the pro-choice crowd now is legislating to extend the violence after birth.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot look away when a child's fundamental human rights are being violated with such lethal actions. Pass the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act now. Mr. Speaker, give us that chance to vote on this.

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from the Second Congressional District of Alabama (Mrs. ROBY).

Mrs. ROBY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding, and I thank the gentlewoman for leading this very, very Special Order tonight.

This topic is critically important, especially in light of the heartbreaking news we have already referenced that has come out of New York and Virginia in recent weeks.

I want to start by thanking the gentlewoman from Washington for stand-

ing up tonight and telling us her story. The gentlewoman does have an amazing story and an amazing family: a loving husband, Dan; and Ethan and Abigail.

This is a family, and so we know each other's children. I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, that walking through that journey with the gentlewoman as her friend and colleague has been so special to Riley, to me, and to our children, Margaret and George, who love them just the same.

So I thank the gentlewoman so much for standing on the floor tonight and having the courage to tell her amazing story. It just means a lot. So I thank the gentlewoman for that.

Of course, I was stunned to hear the boisterous cheering upon the New York State Legislature's passage of a bill that would significantly loosen restrictions on late-term abortions.

Meanwhile, in Virginia, the Democratic Governor recently threw his support behind similar legislation and made comments that served as a horrific defense of born-alive abortions.

For the purpose of tonight's discussion, we have got to call born-alive abortion what it is, and it is infanticide.

Here in Congress, part of our job is to debate the issues. Our dialogue surrounding legislation is a critically important component of the democratic process in this country.

Still, no matter how our stances on abortion may vary, I hope we can all agree that, if an abortion fails and a child is born alive, the child must be given the same medical care that any other living, breathing infant would otherwise be given.

I want to take this opportunity to reassure the people I represent in Alabama that I remain unapologetically pro-life. I believe that life begins at conception, and I am opposed to abortion at any stage.

I am severely disturbed that this country now requires written legal provision to protect living babies. But, sadly, in the aftermath of this news coming out of New York and Virginia, it is clear that this step is immediately necessary.

That is why I am proud that the House of Representatives has wasted no time in acting, and I especially appreciate my colleagues, Mr. SCALISE and Mrs. WAGNER, who have been working tirelessly to force a vote on the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act, a bill I cosponsored that would protect babies who are born alive during failed abortion procedures.

Again, to my colleague, I thank her so much for organizing and having this special hour tonight. This is a critically important issue, and I hope that we will continue to have these discussions not just tonight but in the days moving forward.

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend from the Second District of Missouri (Mrs. WAGNER), who is the sponsor of H.R. 962, the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act.

Mrs. WAGNER. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my good friend and colleague, the gentlewoman from Indiana, JACKIE WALORSKI. We are classmates and came in to Congress almost 7 years ago. I am so grateful to her for pulling this Special Order together tonight to talk about the most vulnerable in our society and talk about the right to life.

To the gentlewoman from Washington State, I have to say her story moves us all, and we are so excited about her growing family.

I cannot thank Mrs. ROBY enough for her support, her passion, and her dignity when it comes to supporting life—all of my colleagues who are here with us tonight and stand with us on this legislation.

Above all, I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that I believe our President, last week at the National Prayer Breakfast, said it best:

All children, born and unborn, are made in the holy image of God. Every life is sacred, and every soul is a precious gift from Heaven.

None of us could say it any better than that.

I never thought the time would come when I would have to actually argue, fight, debate, and stand for providing healthcare to infants after they are born. Yet here we are. There are, apparently, many legislators who believe it is okay to allow a child to die after it has been born.

When I first heard the news of State officials in New York and Virginia believing that it is acceptable to limit healthcare for newborn babies, I was horrified. But I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, it is not just in the Commonwealth of Virginia and the State of New York. In fact, only 26 States have affirmative protections for children born alive after attempted abortions—only 26 States.

In fact, in recent days, Vermont, Rhode Island, and New Mexico are considering legislation to loosen the late-term abortion restrictions that have gone forward in Virginia and New York.

□ 1730

In fact, New Mexico's House passed H.B. 51, which would effectively permit abortions up until birth and eliminate all restrictions thereafter.

To me, it is unthinkable that if a baby is born alive, anyone's first instinct could be anything but to try to save that precious, innocent life by any means possible.

Our babies are some of the most innocent, most vulnerable members of our society, and it is our responsibility, our duty, our calling to make sure that they are cared for.

Every year, babies survive late-term abortions and are left to die on tables, in bedpans, in operating rooms. This should not happen in the United States of America. It is a flagrant violation of our Constitution and an offense against women and children.

I implore my colleagues to support our bill, H.R. 962, the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act.

Mr. Speaker, for the next 25 days, until we can put forward a discharge petition, we will bring the born-alive act and ask for unanimous consent that it be passed by the full House. This should not be in question. This is a piece of legislation that was passed in the 115th Congress. We will do that the next 25 days until we can put together a discharge petition and force it to a vote on the floor of the United States House of Representatives.

Last week, I was told, when I offered the unanimous consent decree, that it was the "wrong time" to fight for the most basic of human rights. Well, Mr. Speaker, I say it is always the time to fight for those who cannot fight for themselves. I ask my colleagues to join me, join us, in this fight for innocent, newborn babies.

I thank the gentlewoman for her courage and her standing up for life.

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friends who are here, Jaime, Representative ROBY, and Representative ANN WAGNER standing here, and I reiterate the reason we are here is that we are serious about this.

I did the unanimous consent tonight and asked the Speaker to bring that bill down right now and bring it to a vote.

This is an issue of what is right and what is wrong. This is an issue where we have been able to rise up together tonight and speak for those who not only can't speak for themselves but those that could potentially be born alive in this country and given a lethal injection by a doctor or some other medical professional.

What is going on in this country is absolutely horrific.

Mrs. WAGNER. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. WALORSKI. I yield to the gentlewoman.

Mrs. WAGNER. So we can have a bit of a colloquy here.

I can say that it does happen. Next week, in Missouri's Second Congressional District, I have invited a guest. She will be traveling from Kansas City to share her story. She was, in fact, a born-alive baby after an attempted abortion through saline.

She will give her testimony about what her life has meant; that it was saved; that, in fact, she was given that opportunity to live her life and to follow in the ways of the Lord and to be productive to society.

So this has happened, and we should do all we can.

Mrs. WALORSKI. It does happen. We are going to do all we can to absolutely prevent this happening. I thank my colleagues who have spoken so far.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE), my friend and fellow Hoosier from Indiana's Sixth District.

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to reaffirm my unwavering commitment to life, the protection of the unborn, and the protection of those who survive the violence of the unborn.

The greatness of our free society can best be measured by how it cares for the most vulnerable. I am deeply troubled by the efforts by some to expand late-term abortion and remove any conceivable limits on this horrific practice.

In the face of such an onslaught, let the miracles of conception, pregnancy, and childbirth serve as a solemn reminder of the constant fight for life. On this, there should be no question that Members of Congress from both parties should agree to the fact that every child born into this world has the right to live.

We must stand together for life and the unborn and protect those who cannot protect themselves when handed abortion's death sentence.

I pray that one day each and every life, born and unborn, is respected, valued, and given the chance to pursue his or her dreams. That is why I am a proud cosponsor of H.R. 962.

We must never, ever give up in the fight for life.

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to my friend from the Second District of Tennessee (Mr. BURCHETT).

Mr. BURCHETT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Indiana for yielding to me.

I rise to join my colleagues in advocating for the unborn. This country was founded to preserve our inalienable rights: life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Abortion, the murder of innocent children, cannot coexist with our fundamental beliefs. Late-term abortion is particularly brutal. It includes tearing limbs from bodies and stopping beating hearts.

Only seven countries, including China and North Korea, have legalized this practice. The United States, Mr. Speaker, should not be in that same category as known human rights abusers.

Proponents of abortion claim pro-life policy is an attack on women's rights, but doctors have determined late-term abortions, Mr. Speaker, endanger the mother more than giving birth. The best way to protect women's rights is to protect life.

I close with a little story. Before my mama left this Earth to meet her savior, she was in and out of consciousness, Mr. Speaker. At one point, she had talked to her father, who had passed away long before her, and her brother, who had passed away in the Second World War, and my daddy, who had gone before her just a couple years prior.

She was looking off into the corner, and I said: What are you looking at, mama?

She said: Baby, I am looking at all those sweet little babies up there.

Mr. Speaker, I firmly believe that my mother was looking at some babies that had been murdered.

I urge my colleagues to stand with me to protect the unborn. By doing so, we defend the inalienable rights of all Americans.

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend from the Fifth District of North Carolina (Ms. FOXX).

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, the distinguished Member from Indiana, Congresswoman WALORSKI, for leading this Special Order tonight and all my colleagues who are here to affirm life.

Mr. Speaker, abortion advocates used to say they wanted abortion to be "safe, legal, and rare." Now, abortion advocates have reached new levels of disregard for new human lives by openly promoting infanticide. And legislation that would prohibit doctors from leaving born-alive infants to die cannot even get a vote under this new majority in this House of Representatives.

Bills such as the Reproductive Health Act, RHA, which was recently passed with celebration in New York, are starkly at odds with reasonable limits on abortion that most Americans support and exposes the extreme agenda of the pro-abortion movement. The RHA would expand upon Roe v. Wade's already wide protections for access to abortion.

In New York, an abortionist no longer needs to be a licensed physician. If an abortion is not successful and the child is born alive, the law offers no protections for the life of the baby. It is almost unthinkable, Mr. Speaker. Such a horrifying bill should be met with disgust and outrage, not celebrated.

It is clear that the value of life has eroded in our culture. Without a society that questions, "What are the rights of the unborn?" legislators can use their power to eliminate the right to life and promote the idea that life is dispensable.

Proponents of the New York and similar Virginia legislation should ask whether these policies truly reflect a society where women are valued or where unwanted babies are worthy of protection.

In a culture where aborted babies are collateral damage in so-called women's healthcare, we should all fear that, following unborn children and newborns, there will soon be new targets for disposal.

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to my friend from the First District of Kansas (Mr. MARSHALL).

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

Mr. Speaker, since I was a freshman in high school, I wanted to become a physician. I was blessed to get to do that. By the time of my second year in medical school, my wife and I had our first daughter, and most of us were trying to decide what type of doctor we were going to be. The moment that little girl was born, I knew that I wanted to spend my medical career delivering babies.

I think my wife can attest that, for the next 30 years of my life, most of my waking moments were spent with somebody in labor. I was so blessed to get to participate in that wonderful moment.

I was blessed to get to go to Congress and represent the people of Kansas.

I woke up a couple weeks ago to the cheering of State legislators from New York and their Governor. I turned up the volume to see what the fuss was. The fuss was they were celebrating their ability to murder the same babies that I had been trying to protect and deliver for the last 30 years of my life.

I don't think there are any Americans—I have never met such an American—who would think that it is right to murder a baby moments, days, or weeks before its due date. It is the most barbaric law I have ever heard of in our society.

If this wasn't enough, I turned the news on a week later, and now they are talking about murdering babies after they were born from so-called failed abortions.

I cannot believe that I live in a society that would even think about this. So I went to my office the next day, and I got my staff together and said, look, we have got some legislation that is going to take care of this. We have our born survivor abortion bill that protects babies after they are born, and then we have a pain-capable bill as well to protect babies who are able to feel pain from being aborted.

My staff looked at me: Right, we have got that legislation.

I said: All we will need is 20 or 30 Democrats to sign on to this. Surely, the Speaker of the House is against late-term abortion. Surely, she is against infanticide.

My staff looked at me with bewildered eyes and said: Congressman, I don't think we are going to find any Democrats to do that.

I wanted to talk a second about the moms, too. No one is talking about how horrible this is going to be for mothers. Moms are going to die from these late-term abortions. As an obstetrician, I never did an abortion, but guess who takes care of complications from abortions. It is obstetricians.

I remember the first week I was in residency. I was called to the emergency room, and there before me was a lady in shock. I apologize if this is too graphic, but the situation is so graphic, I have to tell you the details.

This young lady was bleeding out buckets of blood. I found out what had happened is she just had had an abortion done hours before, and now she was hemorrhaging.

I looked at the nurse. I said: What is going on here?

I knew that we needed to take her to the operating room. We found out during the procedure that a piece of that baby was still inside her uterus, and the uterus couldn't clamp down, so she was hemorrhaging.

This is a story I would see over and over again. The later the abortion procedure is done in the pregnancy, the more often we are going to see this. People are going to get perforated uteri. It will be catastrophic for women.

Mr. Speaker, we can't allow this to continue.

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from the Fourth District of Missouri (Mrs. HARTZLER), a great friend of mine who stands for life every single day that she is here.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentlewoman's leadership in bringing this subject up here to the floor, to the American people, and to our colleagues.

It is deeply disturbing to see what is happening across this country, as life is no longer valued and babies are allowed to be killed, their lives snuffed out in the final moments before they are born and after they are born.

Like my colleague from Kansas before me, I was shocked when I turned on my TV, very similarly—and I am sure there are people all across this country who did that—to see the Governor of New York sitting at his table signing this bill and having all these women celebrate it and then even having a building in New York City lit up in honor of this celebration. But what were they celebrating?

□ 1745

They were celebrating not only the demise of human lives in late-term abortion, when, as Dr. MARSHALL said, they could be born alive in a hospital and given medical care, and have a productive, full life; they could have permission to have that life snuffed out; but then to have the death, perhaps, of the woman as well, at the hands of that procedure.

A lot of people are unfamiliar of how a late-term abortion is done and what these individuals in New York were celebrating. It is graphic, but people need to know what happens.

The woman's uterus is dilated, and forceps are put in there, and a limb of the baby, in the womb, is grabbed hold of. Steel forceps grab hold. They find a leg or they find an arm. They clamp down, and they pull and they pull until it rips off, and they pull out the leg and they put it in the tray.

And they go in again and they find the other leg. They pull and they rip it off and pull it out.

And then they go in for the arm, and then they pull that out. They pull out the other arm. And then they go in and crush the skull and suck it out.

Now, if this doesn't turn your stomach, America, I don't know what does. And that we could be celebrating this in parts of the country is just not only tragic, it is barbaric, and it has to be stopped.

So that is why, here in Congress, we are trying to pass the Born-Alive Infants Protection Act, to stand up and to say, we are better than this as a country. That is not what America is about; that our Founders established this country and the basic rights of all who are created by our Creator, and that is the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

We want to make sure every American can live out that American Dream, the ones who have the privilege of being born and the ones who, right now, people are celebrating, unborn. We want everybody to have that opportunity of life.

I call on all my colleagues and everyone across this country to rise up and say, now, now is the time that we stop this, and we set up a new path for America that values every life.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for leading this.

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire on the time remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Indiana has 26¼ minutes remaining.

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend from Utah's Second District, Representative CHRIS STEWART.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for chairing this Special Order.

You listen to our colleagues, and it is hard to listen to this and not just feel overwhelmed by it. Some things are so emotional and some things are so obvious that there are times when you just speak from the heart.

One week ago tonight, little baby Dawson was born to my family, a beautiful little baby boy, my sixth grandson. It is unbelievable to me that someone would argue that you could take that child, moments before birth, pull him from his mother's protection, and destroy that life, take away any chance he has of having any happiness in this world, take away any chance he has of being loved in this world; that you would suggest that and not call it evil.

That we could have this conversation like the Virginia Governor who said, Well, we'll take that infant; we'll make them comfortable while we decide how we are going to kill it. How could you have that conversation and not call it evil?

If you think that is okay, go make that argument to the American people. But while you are making that argument, be honest. Yes, this is a baby. Yes, it is moments from birth; in some cases the child has been delivered. It is alive, laying there before you. Yes, you are going to kill it.

Most Americans find that repulsive. Most Americans find it unbelievable that we are having this conversation. Most Americans find it evil.

Please help us save these children.

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend from Florida's Fourth District, Representative JOHN RUTHERFORD.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Indiana for yielding, and I appreciate this opportunity to speak for life.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today because there are actually elected leaders in this country, in the United States of America, who believe a baby can be left

to die after having been born alive. How is this even a debate in the United States of America?

When did murder become a partisan issue?

Some on the other side of the aisle call this “parental choice” and “healthcare.”

But, Mr. Speaker, I tell you that infanticide is murder, not healthcare. And abortion is not the answer to a pre-born child's physical or mental disability.

But don't just take it from me. Listen to the words of Mr. Frank Stephens, who was actually born with Down syndrome and leads a remarkable life, a life worth living.

He had this to say about abortion: “On abortion, I don't want to make it illegal. I want to make it unthinkable. Politicians change laws. I want to change people's hearts.”

Mr. Speaker, I want to partner with Frank Stephens because I believe that we can do both, making late-term abortion unthinkable, and illegal.

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my fellow Hoosier from Indiana's Fourth District, Representative JIM BAIRD.

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I just want to thank the gentlewoman, and I appreciate all her efforts regarding this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I rise here today to voice a concern over the actions taking place in New York, Virginia, and across the country that directly threaten the sanctity of life. These proposals are far beyond what Hoosiers in my community, and most folks around the country, believe is right.

That is why I am proud to cosponsor H.R. 962, the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act. This legislation will make it illegal to kill babies that are born alive after surviving an attempted abortion.

The degradation of life in this country is deeply concerning. Congress needs to step up and do what is right. The extreme views of some should not overwhelm the commonsense majority of millions of Americans.

Protecting the sanctity of life is something I will continue to fight for, to ensure that those without a voice can be heard and their lives spared.

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend from Michigan's Seventh District, Representative TIM WALBERG.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for taking on this issue.

When we have heard words such as the Governor of Virginia and others who would say that it is okay for a male Governor of Virginia to make a statement; but generally, men should not be talking about something that is only given to women to talk about because it is about their bodies, about their lives. Well, it is. But I think we need to talk as well.

And if it is not me who should talk, I would like to read for you the state-

ments of another individual who, I think, expresses all I would want to say this evening. And I will read just a few excerpts from an article he wrote.

He said: “Do you want us to let him go?”

“Those were the first words that were spoken over me as I came into the world. Those were the words of my delivery room doctor as he held my armless and lifeless body in his arms. As he assessed me and my situation, all he could tell my parents is that I was ‘not viable.’”

Those were the words of Daniel Ritchie as he spoke about his birth. He said: “Not bad for a kid that wasn't supposed to lead a full life.”

And why did he say that? He says: “It has now been almost 35 years since those words were spoken over me and a lot has happened since then. By God's grace, I was revived. . . . I learned to feed myself, dress myself, write, type, and drive, all with my feet. I graduated from high school with honors and double majored in college. I met the girl of my dreams, got married 13 years ago, and we have two beautiful kids. Now I am a sought after speaker who shares his story at conferences, churches, schools, colleges and with corporations across the country.

Not bad for a kid that wasn't supposed to lead a full life.”

Viability and independence are terrible indicators of life.

“I am no less of a man because of my two vacant sleeves. I am a perfect creation crafted by the hands of a careful Creator. I am not the sum of my missing parts. I am a man that God has made with talents, gifts, and abilities. Just like any person who is born blind, deaf, or paralyzed has the same sort of giftings.”

He ended by saying this: “We are all made in God's image. We are all given talents and abilities. We are all worth being given a chance at life, no matter how small the chance may be, and I am the living example of that.

“My armless life is worth living, and I am beyond thankful my parents saw that on day one.” And he was viable.

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend from South Carolina's Fifth District, RALPH NORMAN.

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to raise my voice for those who have no voice.

You know, while we may have disagreements in this Chamber, I never thought I would have to come to this floor for this reason, to denounce the killing of children after they have been born. But I am here today because one of our Nation's governors has endorsed infanticide in all but name.

Even though the media may be distracted by the Governor's latest scandal, I refuse to allow this atrocity to be ignored. It is wrong, plain and simple.

I wish to live in a nation where we respect the sanctity of all human life; where condemning the murder of a child is not for debate, but a matter of course. Until then, I will not stand by

silently. I will continue to call out those who attempt to corrupt our values, whether through State laws allowing abortion on demand or Governors commending abortion.

These actions do not represent the values of the American people. They represent the views of a small but powerful group of ideologues with no respect for the sanctity of life or the rights of the voiceless.

I find it bizarre that the party of birthright citizenship will not endorse the birthright to life.

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend from West Virginia's Third District, Representative CAROL MILLER.

Mrs. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to stand for life.

I am a wife, a mother, and a grandmother. I have felt life quicken in my womb. I know the blessing of children, all of whom are created in God's image. And that is why I am so saddened by the pro-abortion discussions taking place around the country and in places like New York, Virginia, and others, where State legislatures are debating and legalizing abortion all the way up to birth and, in some cases, after a child is born.

I am sickened that laws are being written which allow for a baby who survives an abortion attempt to no longer receive support and care once they are born. This is infanticide. There is no other way to say it. This is an affront to life.

We must demand more from our country and our citizens. We must ensure protections for the youngest and most innocent of our citizens, both inside and outside the womb. We must take care of those who cannot take care of themselves. We must take care of our children. We must take care of and respect and cherish life.

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend from Ohio's Sixth District, Representative BILL JOHNSON.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, as a proud father of four and a grandfather of six, I rise today in strong support of those who cannot defend themselves, the most innocent and defenseless among us, the unborn.

□ 1800

I share the pro-life views of those I serve in eastern and southeastern Ohio.

A few weeks ago, many Ohioans joined more than 100,000 pro-life Americans at the annual March for Life here in Washington, D.C. Although, with so little national media coverage of this major event, some may have missed this passionate and growing movement made up of men and women, boys and girls from all walks of life.

Recently, we have witnessed the inhuman policies introduced by multiple States permitting late-term abortions, even, unbelievably, all the way up to birth.

It is past time that Congress pass legislation banning this horrific practice.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge my colleagues on both sides to reject infanticide and defend the sanctity of human life.

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. RODGERS), my friend from Washington's Fifth District.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my colleagues this afternoon in celebrating the dignity and the value of every human life.

I am a mom of three young kids, Cole, Grace, and Brynn, and I can testify that becoming a mom, bringing a life into the world, is the most amazing thing ever.

With technology today, we can look into the womb; we can see day by day how a baby is developing. It is a miracle to witness and it is proof that we as human beings are not defined by our limits. We are empowered by the potential that we have and who we can become.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am frightened and I am heartbroken that anyone would oppose the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act led by Congresswoman ANN WAGNER.

Just as the science is undeniable, it should be unthinkable to deny life-saving care to a newborn baby.

We have amazing technology. We can do more than ever. It is limitless.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues across the aisle to take a step back, to look at the science, and let this bill come to the floor. It is the right thing to do.

You know, since our founding, we have been a country that cherishes every person's inalienable human right, and it is the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. It is in all of us to uphold those values and ensure that we are protecting the dignity of every person as God intended.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Congresswoman JACKIE WALORSKI for her leadership. I thank her for bringing us all together so that we could be warriors of human dignity and human value.

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I would again inquire how much time I have remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman has 11 minutes remaining.

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD), my friend from Illinois's 18th District.

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I want to say thanks to Mrs. WALORSKI, my colleague on the Ways and Means Committee, for yielding to me and for her leadership in putting together this Special Order and her tireless fight for life.

Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor today in defense of life and the unborn. Over the last few weeks, we have witnessed extreme abortion views pushed in States across the country.

In New York, the State legislature passed and the Governor signed into

law an abortion bill so broad it effectively allows abortion on demand until birth while removing protections for infants born alive during an abortion. Barbaric legislation such as this is nothing to cheer about.

In Virginia, the Governor tried to soften the blow of his infanticide endorsement by saying "the infant would be kept comfortable" while a decision was made on whether to abort the infant.

These disturbing and extreme trends seeping into the mainstream of the Democratic platform underscore the need for its leaders in Congress to stand up, to fight for life in the face of these abhorrent actions.

Now more than ever, leaders in Washington need to stand up for life.

I stand committed with the millions of pro-life advocates around the country to make sure infanticide is condemned and the voiceless are given a voice.

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WALKER), my friend from North Carolina's Sixth District.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative WALORSKI, JACKIE, if I may, for her leadership and showing courage on this important topic.

The Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act protects the lives of babies who survive abortions by requiring the healthcare practitioner to save the life of the baby. Sounds pretty much like common sense, doesn't it?

I am a proud cosponsor of Ms. ANN WAGNER's bill fighting for the sanctity of life.

As a former pastor, I value each and every life that is brought into this world, and that is why it is imperative that we pass this legislation and put an end to the senseless murders of innocent babies.

Earlier this week, I asked for unanimous consent, before being gaveled out, to bring the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act to the House floor for a vote. Unfortunately, my Democratic colleagues put their party leadership and affiliation over voting for what is morally right.

The statistics are staggering. In just looking at a few States, we found 25 children that were born alive that survived a botched abortion just in 2017. It is concerning to think how much higher those numbers would be if we looked throughout the entire country.

Simply put, I stand with 80 percent of Americans who support legislation to protect the life of a baby who survives a failed abortion.

At a time when States like New York and Virginia are matching abortion laws of North Korea in making it easier to perform abortions until the birth of a child, it is absolutely necessary for us to stand in unity and fight for those who cannot fight for themselves.

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ALLEN), my friend from Georgia's 12th District.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congresswoman WALORSKI for her efforts in organizing this important Special Order.

You know, Mr. Speaker, as the proud father of four and grandfather of 13, I rise here this evening, joined by many of my Republican colleagues, to recognize that we have a moral duty and obligation to protect the most vulnerable among us: those who cannot yet protect or speak for themselves.

But as we stand here tonight, Democrats in State legislatures across the country are celebrating legislation to deny medical care to an innocent baby who is born alive after a failed abortion. We cannot stand idly by and allow this to happen.

How have we come to this point in our country where infanticide is something we disagree on? Each and every one of us has a right to life, even an innocent newly born gift from God, and I will continue to stand up and fight for that right to life every step of the way.

We must continue to be proactive in bringing commonsense pro-life legislation to the House floor. I hope to have an opportunity to offer my full support for these bills and protect the sanctity of life.

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. OLSON), my friend from Texas' 22nd District.

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Missouri for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, in 2012, Ashley and Toribio Cardenas got the best news parents can hear: they are going to have a baby girl.

They got an ultrasound at 16 weeks. They saw the outlines of their new daughter, Audrina. She was gorgeous. They had pure joy.

Right after they left, the sonographer rushes to call the obstetrician. This little gift from God has ectopia cordis. Her heart is outside of her body. Sixteen human beings out of 1 million have this condition, and it is usually fatal.

The doctors tell Ashley she has two choices: either abort Audrina or keep going and pray for the best.

Ashley had to act quickly, because Texas law prohibited abortion after 20 weeks. This happened at 17 weeks.

She felt Audrina in her womb kicking and thriving, and she thought: "Who wants to take a life away? Who wants to stop a beating heart?"

That is true love.

Audrina was born alive. Ashley saw her, gave her a kiss, and then she was rushed off to the cardiac intensive care room for babies, the ICU. Little Audrina had surgery the very next day.

Here is a picture of her I printed out in the hospital; that beautiful young girl, her heart behind that plate.

Her first year of life, there are wires everywhere. She was on oxygen and had to eat through a feeding tube.

But here that beautiful girl is today with a sign that says: "#speaknowforkids."

This is a sign for Audrina and for every kid facing abortion.

Congress, American people, speak now for the kids. Support the bill, the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act. Don't kill babies.

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleagues for joining me this evening to stand up for the most vulnerable among us.

We stand together to defend the sanctity of life, to speak out against a radical anti-life agenda that would effectively legalize infanticide.

I have long fought to defend the unborn, but I am shocked that I now have to defend the right to life of newborn infants. These precious children are in peril, their rights are under attack, their lives are under attack, and this House has the responsibility to act.

Tonight the American people heard our call to action. It is time to vote on the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act. Will the leadership of this House listen or will the Democratic majority continue to allow this march toward legalized infanticide?

If we don't send a strong message that every baby has been endowed by its creator with inalienable rights, that we are not defending the fundamental principles of the Constitution, if we don't protect these children from harm, we are abandoning the basic truth of our humanity.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleagues for standing with me here tonight. I urge the support of House bill H.R. 962, the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act, and to stand against infanticide.

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

HONORING THE LIFE OF REPRESENTATIVE JOHN DINGELL

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

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today and will be joined by a number of my colleagues from the State of Michigan to pay tribute to a person that I have known of and got to know as an adult, but I have known Congressman John Dingell virtually all of my life. Having grown up in Michigan and grown up in a family involved in politics in Michigan, I was aware of John Dingell from my earliest days.

He served in this House with incredible dignity and great distinction, longer than anyone else in the history of this country, of this government. In fact, nearly one out of four Members of the House of Representatives in its entire history served with Congressman John Dingell.

Yesterday, several of us made an attempt to fly, we left Andrews Air Force Base in a storm and attempted to fly to Michigan and were, unfortunately, unable to land due to the weather.

We are here and will be able to honor him this evening and also honor him tomorrow at the funeral that will take place here in Washington.

So our thoughts go to the Dingell family, especially to our colleague, John's wife, Congressman Dingell's wife, whom he often referred to as "the lovely Deborah." She is a friend and a colleague. I have known her myself, as well, for as long as I can possibly remember.

I will have more to say about Congressman Dingell, but I think there are just a few aspects of his career that I just want to make sure I noted for the record.

The longest-serving Member of this House, he is known not just for the longevity and the quantity of his time here, but for the incredible impact that he had on our country, on our Nation, and on the policies that he believed in and stood for.

He served as the chairman or the ranking member on the House Energy and Commerce Committee from 1981 to 2008, shaping very important legislation on clean air, clean water, protecting endangered animals, advocating for national healthcare. In fact, in every Congress that he served in, he continued the legacy of his father, who preceded him in Congress, by introducing legislation that would guarantee healthcare for every American.

□ 1815

Some of the legislative highlights: National Wilderness Act, 1964; Water Quality Act, 1965; National Environmental Policy Act, 1970; Endangered Species Act, 1973; Natural Gas Policy Act, 1978; Prescription Drug Marketing Act, 1988; Clean Air Act Amendments, 1990; Energy Independence and Security Act, 2007; National Instant Criminal Background Check System Improvements, 2008; Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, 2010; FDA Food Safety Modernization Act, 2011.

Any one of these would constitute the highlight of a legislative career, and every one of them are attributable to the work of Congressman John Dingell.

Before I yield to my colleagues, I want to mention one other piece of legislation that he is known for. In my first term—the only term that I shared with Congressman Dingell—we celebrated, as a nation, the 50th anniversary of the 1964 Civil Rights Act. Late that evening, commemorating that day, I happened to turn on C-SPAN and was watching old videotape of the signing ceremony where President Lyndon Johnson stood with the civil rights and legislative leaders of our Nation. I saw this tall figure walk into the frame, shake President Johnson's hand, and receive the President's congratulations for his work on that historic piece of legislation.

I went to bed, and the very next day, I got up and walked over here for a session. I sat in that chair right there, next to the one that Congressman John

Dingell sat in for all those years, and I spoke to the guy who I saw the night before in a moment of American history. He was still here fighting for the very same things that he had fought for, for so long. I took that as a personal privilege, to have been able to serve with him.

As I said, this is a tremendous loss for our country. It is a tremendous loss for me personally. Our hearts go out to DEBBIE.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG).

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Flint for yielding. I appreciate the opportunity that we have to stand on the floor tonight as a bipartisan delegation, Republicans and Democrats who are joined together by a love of a great State, the greatest State, Michigan, and the history that is there that includes a gentleman, a leader, like John Dingell.

This is a vision that too often is not seen by constituents back in the district, isn't it? They often think that if you are a Republican or a Democrat, you are automatically an antagonist for the other side. That is just not true, especially as we work together as a delegation.

I learned one thing of many things, but one thing I will share tonight from John D. Dingell, Jr. I will let that rest a little bit and let it build to what in the world I am going to say that I learned specifically from John Dingell that was unique, special, and important to me and that I hope I never forget.

It was in 1983 that I first met John Dingell. I was a freshman in the State House of Representatives. I was in Adrian, Michigan, the county seat of the house district I represented. We were there for a ribbon cutting. I heard a commotion going on through the room, and the commotion was simply this: Big John Dingell is about here. He is about to arrive.

Well, I had never met big John Dingell or John Dingell at all. Mr. Speaker, like Mr. KILDEE, I knew it was a historic moment.

Sure enough, soon he came in. He swept into the room, and I met a man who, yes, indeed, was 6-foot-4. Strong of appearance and presence, he commanded a presence in the room. Yet he shook every single hand in the room, including this freshman member of the State legislature who he had never met, maybe even never heard my name. There was a warmth about that. I learned something from that.

Over the years, seeing him in operation, and then, ultimately, coming here in 2007 for my first term, and having a chance to go up and sit where he always sat, right over there, to sit and talk with him, initially, very timid, asking legislative questions, but then we got down to important things like: What is your favorite shotgun? What are your favorite hunting sports? Who, indeed, fitted your shotgun to you?

As we began to talk about things later on, it became apparent that, with

redistricting, I was going to lose Calhoun County in the district, and I was going to pick up Monroe County, which was John Dingell's county, which had been his father's before him. I was going to be given an opportunity to represent that county as part of the Seventh Congressional District of Michigan.

I remember asking John about Monroe County. He talked about the marshlands. He talked about the fact that, if I were going to come into that, he expected me to feel the same way about water fowling, protecting the resources there, and making sure that the wildlife refuge continued to grow, expand, and meet the needs of coming generations. We talked about that, and we shared those things together.

I found out about the River Raisin National Battlefield Park. A significant war, a loss to the United States, took place there at the River Raisin, but it became the rallying cry that, ultimately, I believe, led to the winning of the War of 1812, "Remember the Raisin."

This became part of my district, but it became part of sharing with John Dingell. Mr. Speaker, this is what I learned that I will never forget, and I hope none of us forget it, because it is the way of life that I think leads to a valued life of service.

I had the chance to serve with his son Chris in the State legislature. That was a Dingell who served and then went on to be a circuit court judge. I have the privilege now of serving with DEBBIE DINGELL, our great friend and colleague, who we all have expressed our love to in these last few days, even more than before.

But to serve with John Dingell, I said to him, "Congressman," and he said: No, no, John.

I said: I believe, if the election goes as I think, I am going to get Monroe County. That has been your county for many years. You have loved it. You have loved all about it. I am giving up Calhoun County. How are you going to deal with that, giving away Monroe County?

He said this to me, and this is what I will never forget. He said: My young friend, I never give away a friend.

He said: You know, it is going to be your district. It is going to be your county. But I will never give away my friends in Monroe County.

And he said: You should never give away Calhoun County either.

Marvelous advice. I think it would be good for all of us to remember that in our relationships, not only with our districts and districts that may change, but our relationships with our colleagues. Democrat, Republican, independent, delightful, ornery, whatever, these are friends. The way we respond to them is the same way John Dingell responded in such a way that he had a life that made an impact.

Remember, he served almost 60 years—59 years and 29 days—historic, not because he chose that, but his con-

stituents chose that. They made it possible for him to serve those years. They chose not to term limit him but to say thank you for representing us well.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for giving us the opportunity to do this tonight for a great man, a human, but a great man who loved this country, who served this country. And I am not going to give him away as a friend.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for those remarks. I think it says a lot about John Dingell that the affection that we feel for him not only spans the middle aisle here across party lines, but it transcends it. It is meaningless, in some ways. He had a relationship with people here just based on the human touch that he had. He was a wonderful, wonderful person, and you, obviously, had a close relationship with him.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. STEVENS)—we have Democrats and Republicans here—a freshman, a person who did not have a chance to serve directly with him but knew him and admired him.

Ms. STEVENS. Mr. Speaker, it is with profound honor and great humility that I rise on this historic floor to recognize and honor the great Chairman John Dingell—the day after the birthday of the great President Lincoln, might I add.

It is clear that John Dingell's life manifested Michigan. He depicted that rich legacy that our State symbolizes. Mr. Dingell was a veteran, a man of dignity, honor, and great fortitude. He most assuredly represented a great America, that great generation. It was his life, this long life, that is compounded by its beginning and its end and that arc of progress that he certainly represents.

Mr. Dingell loved life, and he loved this body. He loved this House of Representatives. He was the man of the House. He was the dean of the House. I lovingly referred to him as "The Dean."

As we remember the Honorable John Dingell and reflect on what he meant to this body, to this Nation, and to our great State of Michigan, as somebody who is now representing parts of southeastern Michigan that touched the auto industry he so loved, we can remember his steadfast support of our domestic automakers over the decades.

John Dingell understood the fate of the auto industry and the fate of southeastern Michigan and Michigan as a whole as being forever intertwined, that so many Michigan workers depend on the success of our auto industry, from General Motors to Ford, Chrysler, all the way down the supply chain.

I had the privilege, not as a Member of the House of Representatives, but as a White House appointee in the administration of Barack Obama in the United States Department of the Treasury, on the team that was responsible for saving General Motors and Chrysler—we were called the auto rescue team—10 years ago when Mr. Din-

gell was raising his voice and leading conversations in standing up for that auto industry. Just as he always has been a ferocious advocate, he was then a ferocious advocate for the Federal initiative to save our automakers from liquidation, to save over 200,000 Michigan jobs, and to stand up for Michigan and everything we represent.

Today, there are thousands of families in Michigan who have kept their jobs because of John Dingell, whose value of work is respected and understood because of John Dingell. To him, that was just another day of work. To him, public service and doing right by his constituents was simply second nature.

Any elected official in our country—and there are 535 of us who sit in the House of Representatives and the Senate—would all be wise to study John Dingell's passion, his mastery of legislating, his dedication to public service.

□ 1830

In an era that has sometimes felt very polarizing, somehow this man, this great dean of ours, is the great unifier. And we saw that in his passing. We saw that when we welcomed his casket to the Capitol, and we will see that tomorrow at his funeral in Washington, D.C.

John Dingell knew how important it was to bring industry and labor to the table during the policymaking process. He knew that the auto industry needed a friend, needed a champion for everything that was right by our country and, frankly, our State's origin. He made our Big Three stronger by pushing them to adopt fuel emission standards.

You see, complicated policymaking brings all the stakeholders to the table, and John Dingell knew how to do that. He knew how to do that for the environment; he knew how to do that on safety; and he certainly contributed to a safer, more sustainable industry that has its moonshot views of the future, the visions of the future around zero emissions and zero accidents that are now being shepherded by the workers and innovation and the talent in our State.

John Dingell also strived to do the most good. He understood what service meant. He understood what doing the most good for the most people meant. He fought for our water; he fought for our infrastructure guarantee; and he fought for universal healthcare every day he was here.

He had such a profound respect for his colleagues, even when he disagreed with them. And he loved his wife. He loved his wife for all 40 years.

And we heard howlings from this Michigan delegation. We celebrate and we share that love for the great DEBBIE DINGELL, who has been such a pillar of strength, of openness, of vulnerability.

I told Congresswoman DINGELL: You are every woman today. You are every woman in your grief.

And as we recognize her incredible husband, as we recognize him here

today in this codified moment and as we carry his torch forward—because that is what we do through the generations is we pick up the torch and keep carrying it forward—we will also continue to carry Congresswoman DINGELL forward in her grief and in her adjustment and in the memory of her husband.

As such, John Dingell most assuredly will also be remembered in our great State of Michigan, watching the people come to pay their respects, the servicemen and -women, the thousands of people who felt connected to his life and his life's work. It is what Vice President Biden referred to as his great dignity: his respect for his friends, for his neighbors, for his fellow man.

His contributions to this Nation will not be forgotten, and they will certainly be felt for generations to come.

So today, in a very official way, I say good-bye to the chairman, to the dean, to the Congressman, to the veteran John Dingell.

Thank you. We will miss you dearly.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congresswoman STEVENS for her comments.

Yesterday, as we stood on the east front steps of the Capitol, I stood next to Congressman PAUL MITCHELL as Congressman Dingell and Congresswoman DINGELL and the motorcade came by. It was an emotional moment that we shared with one another, and I know he meant a lot to him, so I now yield to Congressman PAUL MITCHELL.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE). I join all of our delegation rising to recognize the life and legacy of the chairman, John Dingell, the longest serving member in the history of this Congress—over nearly six decades in Congress. He touched tens of thousands of Americans. Frankly, he impacted this Nation in so many ways.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman was talking about the bills that he authored and led. I was listening to that list. The Endangered Species Act, I was still in high school, and I am not a young man anymore.

The legacy he left this Nation is massive and will be for a long time.

I first met the Congressman years ago when I represented the Governor of Michigan. He came to Washington to talk with Members about workforce development education. I was a bright-eyed 22-year old, eager, ready to go.

I am sure the Congressman was wondering what I was doing there talking to him and representing the Governor. He agreed to meet with me because the Governor had called him and said I was the guy to talk to him about that.

So here was the chairman meeting with a 22-year-old about workforce development—the kindest man. He listened; we talked about it.

I represented a Republican Governor. And there is no question that John Dingell was a Democrat, but partisanship wasn't a priority for John Dingell. He always focused on getting things

done effectively for people. It was people over politics, something sometimes we should take to heart around here. We have talked about that.

His question was always: What is good for our people in our State?

The other question he often had, as was referenced, was: What is good for our auto industry?

Lord help you if you are going to take a shot at our auto industry. We are the auto capital, and he defended that fiercely.

A memory I have of meeting with the chairman, one that stands out for me, was about 20 years later, believe it or not. I came in for a meeting with his lead staffer on Education and Workforce Development. He came out of his office. He was going off to vote, I believe. He looked over. He said: I should know you.

I explained why I was there, what I was there to talk about. He said: I can't sign that letter to the White House. I know what you are talking about, but I can do one better. I can call the White House and tell them they need to pay attention to this. Don't mess up the people of my State.

He made that call. He was a man of his word.

When I joined Congress, I had the opportunity to talk a little more with John Dingell. Earlier on, he said to me: Just call me John now.

Unlike many in D.C., he cared to hear what others thought, listened to others speak, not just himself. You know, he always asked me: How is your family? How are they dealing with you being in Congress?

He will be remembered as one of the greatest modern-day legislators. He addressed the tough problems of America and got things done.

He wouldn't just talk about it—and Lord knows sometimes around here they do. He found compromises and solutions. He tackled them. He would wrangle them. He would find a way to bring it to a compromise and solve the problem. He worked across the aisle.

I don't believe his dedicated service to this country will ever be met again. He left an enormous mark on this institution, our country, and the world that we will all remember.

So I say God bless this great Nation with John Dingell, and may God bless you, John David Dingell, Jr.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MITCHELL), and I remember, as well, when he told me—I used to call him Mr. Chairman, mainly because I was afraid of him most of my life. And when he told me to call him John, I think it might have been a full year before I developed enough courage to call him by that name.

Another one of our Members who I know is very close to John, has worked in Michigan politics and knew John Dingell for a long time, is our colleague Congresswoman BRENDA LAWRENCE.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mrs. LAWRENCE).

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues; and to all who are listening, my entire life, I had John Dingell's name as Congressman John Dingell in my atmosphere, growing up in Detroit, knowing about his work and his tireless defending of people.

John Dingell served in Congress with dedication and an earnest sense of duty to his constituents, to his country, and to his solemn oath of office. As a Michigander, support of the auto industry was a high priority of his. From steering the original Corporate Average Fuel Economy Act in 1975 to his efforts on the Energy and Commerce Committee, John Dingell helped to build a legacy of laws in strong support of Michigan's manufacturing workforce and the American auto industry—a champion for the auto industry, a champion for our veterans and for what our government can do when we truly work together for the people.

He was a man of many accomplishments on and off the Hill. And while many may forget the thousands of votes that he voted throughout his career, many may lose track of the legislation he promoted in support of the American people, but as we heard from so many colleagues, staff, family, and friends, people never forget an uplifting voice in a time of need or a simple act of kindness that brightens up their day.

There are many times that people forget, but they often never forget how you made them feel. John Dingell was well known for his sense of humor, friendly spirit, and how he treated everyone with dignity and respect. His is a legacy that we all can only hope to achieve.

John Dingell is and always will be a shining star for the State of Michigan, a north star of direction for us as Members of Congress, and a superstar to all his family—his wife and my colleague, DEBBIE DINGELL—and all of his friends. His life, his legacy, an example of true patriotism, will never fade. John Dingell will never be forgotten.

John Dingell showed this country—while so many say this House doesn't work or there is not a sense of respect for our government, this is a time, as we reflect on his life, to understand that this government is important—that the things we do every day matter to people, and that if we do our job, do it together, we will be contributors to why this is such a great country.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congresswoman LAWRENCE for her comments.

Mr. Speaker, I know that Congressman FRED UPTON was a very close friend with John Dingell. They served together. They served on the same committee together. They were one another's chairman at different times, but I know, first and foremost, they were just real friends.

I now yield to the dean of the Michigan delegation, Congressman FRED UPTON.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank my fellow dean, my bipartisan dean on the

other side. I have so many stories to tell, so I am going to watch the clock here a little bit. I am going to ramble. I don't have a prepared speech.

I am delighted to be here. I am delighted that you were able to get this time for some of us to speak and honor a legend. And when you think about this last year, man, we have lost some really terrific ones: President Bush, John McCain, others. Certainly, John Dingell joins those ranks as a distinguished American who really made a mark on everyone's life in this country.

Mr. Speaker, I include into the RECORD an article written by editor Nolan Finley of The Detroit News.

[From the Detroit News, Feb. 9, 2019]

JOHN DINGELL KNEW HOW TO LIVE, HOW TO LOVE

(By Nolan Finley)

I was up to my waist and cork tight in what I can only describe as quicksand when I looked up and saw John Dingell squinting down at me with that familiar, satisfied grin.

"How in bloody hell did you get in there? And more important, how in blue blazes are you going to get out?"

We were hunting ducks on Maryland's Eastern Shore. I'd winged a goose that came down running, and was in hot pursuit when I stepped into the hole of muck and quickly sank.

John pulled me out, and then finished off the goose.

I never know how to answer when someone asks how a conservative, Republican-leaning newspaperman could become such fast friends with a New Deal Democrat who shaped the liberal politics and policies of the second half of the 20th century.

I never occurred to either of us that we could be anything else.

John didn't choose the people he loved based on political compatibility. Certainly, he had strong opinions, and so do I, and we engaged often in intense discussions. Not once in 25 years did we exchange angry words, nor ever part with hard feelings.

We were more than our politics. When together, our conversation quickly moved to our common loves—guns and hunting. It was what drew us together in the first place.

John was a great hunter, a dead-eye with a shotgun. I was with him when he shot the last duck he ever killed. Four of us were settled into a blind on a brisk but sunny January morning, and the ducks were coming in fast and furious. Three of us were blasting away like a trio of Elmer Fudds, shooting a lot of birds, but burning up a case of shells in doing so. Not John.

Barely able to stand, he shouldered his shotgun just three times that day. And all three times a duck fell from the sky. Not a shell wasted.

John's great passion was his wife, Debbie. After that, it was a toss-up between a duck blind and the House chamber for his next greatest love. I recall an afternoon when we were returning to Washington, and as we crested a hill the gleaming white Capitol dome came into view. "I never get tired of seeing that," he said softly.

And obviously he never did. John spent nearly 60 years in Congress, serving longer than anyone else. And better. John was a parliamentarian; he cherished the traditions and processes of the House.

And while he was a bare-knuckled negotiator who relished a fight, he was ultimately a pragmatist. When the time came to

compromise, John set down his club and made the deal.

His decision to retire was based mostly on his waning physical condition. But he was also disgusted with the poisonous partisanship and gridlock ruining Congress. He couldn't stand to watch what was becoming of the institution he joined as a teen-aged page during World War II.

Still, he hated to leave. The night before he announced his retirement, he called me to have dinner with him and Debbie. John had made his decision but hadn't accepted it. He was looking for assurance that he wasn't letting down the people of his district by leaving, that he'd done his best for them, that they'd understand his reasons.

At the same time, he was offering counsel to Debbie, who had a quick decision of her own to make. He wanted her to succeed him, as he had his father, to continue a Dingell legacy in Congress stretching back to 1935. It was a poignant moment between the past and future.

When I'd visit him after retirement, the questions were always the same. Did I make a difference? Do my people remember me? Would Pop be proud?

I was always stunned that he could harbor such doubts, given his enormous accomplishments. But John Dingell never took the obligations of public service lightly. He always felt there was more he could do for the people who placed their trust in him.

He was a man in the best sense of the word. A man of the Greatest Generation. A man of courage, confidence, compassion. A man who did his duty. A man who took care of his own business, and of the people he loved.

And he sure did know how to love. He and Debbie shared an epic love affair that never waned. You couldn't be around them more than five minutes without hearing him say, "I love you, Fox." The fire in his eyes when he looked at her burned until his last breath.

She was fiercely protective of him, and kept him alive years longer than he should have expected by the sheer force of her will.

Our friendship may have been unlikely, but it was one I cherished. I loved him, and hate to see him go.

But if life's a game, John Dingell won it. Nearly 93 years, and every minute of it lived honorably and with passion and purpose.

Goodbye, good friend. I hope wherever you are this morning, the ducks are coming in fast and low.

Mr. UPTON. I am going to also read to you an email that I got just an hour or two ago from his wife, DEBBIE, our colleague, who received this from the Ford family.

This is from Mike Ford. Of course, his father was Gerry Ford, a great man, President, Michigander. And he wrote this, it is very brief:

Debbie,
Since learning of John's recent passing, my thoughts and prayers have been constant with you and your extended family.

Through my reading of the many wonderful remembrances of and tributes to John, I have been deeply moved and blessed to revisit his remarkable legacy of leadership and service to the people of Michigan and to all of our Nation.

John and my father, though identified from competing political parties, held so much in common as men of wisdom, integrity, compassion, and selfless service for all of humanity, and their friendship was true and enduring through a shared lifetime calling of public service. John Dingell and Gerry Ford represent what is good, honorable, and decent in our country.

Please know of our Ford family's grace giving wishes and prayers for you and all the Dingell family at this time of loss and grief.

May you know of God's abiding comfort, love, and hope this day and always.

MIKE FORD.

Good guy that, again, some of us know, particularly those of us on the west side of our State. You know, he was our dean. And when I became the dean of the Michigan Republican delegation—that was in the early nineties. I have got to say—I was just adding it up here sitting with Tim—I was probably in thousands of meetings with John.

□ 1845

Our delegation is close. We stand together on a host of issues, from the Great Lakes to the autos. We often had an agenda we worked together. Our offices were across the hall from each other for a lot of years. Of course, we have known DEBORAH forever and a day as well.

I had the chance to talk to John Dingell the day before he died, and I talked to him a number of times over the last number of weeks. I read his book, which I would recommend to folks. Might put the R rating next to it, in terms of his language. You can hear him speak, and he had a genuine sense of humor. He had so many stories.

I was asked a little bit earlier today: What about his tweeting?

He tweeted until, literally, the last day or two. For those of you watching tonight, get on Google. Google MLive. That is sort of the Michigan news network. Google: MLive Dingell tweet. This weekend, they ran the top 20 tweets that he did, and they will make you laugh. They really will, especially the one with the bulldog. All of the animal lovers out there, make sure you find this one. He had a sense of humor.

People say: How could a 92-year-old do all this?

Well, let me tell you how. It is because of our committee. The committee has so much jurisdiction, part of which is telecommunications. We were the first ones. We forced the broadcasters. It was actually the Tauzin-Dingell bill, I want to say a lot of years ago, and I had an amendment that was critical there. We passed the Tauzin-Dingell bill. He cared so much about bipartisanship.

We forced the broadcasters to go from analog to digital. That then allowed us all to have devices like this: iPhones and the internet. Instead of using a shoe for your phone, you got something like this that is like the world.

We forced them to go digital, and that allowed this to happen. So guess what? John Dingell, in Congress, we would often sit down. We all meet in Detroit, let's face it. All of us, our delegation, we come from someplace. Mr. KILDEE comes from Flint. TIM WALBERG is actually lucky and gets on in Detroit. I come from South Bend or Kalamazoo or Grand Rapids. We all come from someplace, but generally, we fly Delta from Detroit back to D.C.

We are all sitting at that A-75 gate. There is John Dingell, a colleague, and

he is on his BlackBerry, zipping away, typing just as fast as you could imagine, communicating with people around the world. It is because of the work he did in our committee. That made our lives what they are today.

Whether it is that or the environment or healthcare or pipeline safety, you name the issue—we are sorry Mr. KILDEE went to the Ways and Means Committee. DEBORAH chose right; she went to the Energy and Commerce Committee. Mr. KILDEE went to the dark side. Our committee has jurisdiction over so much.

John Dingell was such a leader. He didn't care about who got the credit. He just wanted to get the job done. He sat right over here. When you would come over and ask his advice, you would make sure that you were on his good ear, and he would talk, and he would remember things.

I can remember taking the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD from some big debates, the Voting Rights Act and others, and I would sit with him here, and we would go through the names, particularly the Michigan delegation, and why they voted this way or that way. He would tell the history. He was here for our lifetime.

He was a gentleman to the very end. He knew the rules. He had respect from both sides of the aisle. He was a guy who we will never see replaced here in this House.

In closing, let me say, even at the end, he was wondering: Did I make a difference?

Of course he did. But here was a guy who made such a difference and a guy who really never thought he would be in this institution. When his dad died, a week before his dad died, he didn't think he was going to run for that seat. It was the people at home who encouraged him to run. When he chose to retire, he didn't push Deborah, nudge Deborah, to run for that seat.

It is hard to imagine, 86 years of a Dingell representing southeast Michigan. What a tribute to a family that has made such a difference in this body, folks who love not only our State, but certainly their constituents.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. KILDEE for doing this Special Order.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I recall yesterday, when we were attempting to get to the funeral in Detroit, Congressman UPTON participated in an impromptu observance for Congressman Dingell at 30,000 feet as we flew back to Washington, because of our failure to land. I will never forget that.

Another one of our colleagues who I know, like me, has known the Dingell family and Congressman John Dingell for as long as he can remember, and whose father served with Congressman Dingell, and was also once the dean of the Michigan delegation, Congressman ANDY LEVIN. I know this means a lot to the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan. (Mr. LEVIN).

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I say to the gentleman from St. Joseph, in this Special Order, we are a little different from Michigan. I say to the gentleman from St. Joseph, if KILDEE went to the dark side, LEVIN will come over to the Energy and Commerce Committee. So I appreciate that. We will get that all lined up, so we can take care of that right here.

Mr. UPTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. UPTON. We really ribbed Dave Camp about this, and the good Sandy, too.

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. I am ready to diversify things in Michigan again.

I really want to pick up where the gentleman left off, because I don't want to talk about John's unbelievable legislative record. I want to talk about two families, the Levin family and the Dingell family, and really about what the Dingell family has meant to my family for almost 80 years.

My dad has been interviewed about this, and my Uncle Carl. But my dad has not revealed the beginning of his relationship with the Dingells, and that is about John's dad, John Dingell, Sr.

My father, Sander Levin's first political memory, aside from listening to fireside chats all around the living room radio coming from President Roosevelt, is of campaigning for John Dingell, Sr., in his knickers. My dad would have been maybe 10 years old, so this is going back to the late 1930s or the early 1940s.

In 1946, I think, John Dingell, Sr., recommended to President Harry Truman that he appoint a lawyer named Theodore Levin to the Eastern District of Michigan to be a Federal judge, and Harry Truman did that. I was looking at the RECORD, and with all the time things take these days, the President nominated Uncle Ted on July 3, and he was sitting on July 27 of either 1946 or 1947. Things happened at a different speed in those days.

Theodore Levin served for many years, and he was the chief judge of the Eastern District of Michigan.

Earlier than that, before he was chief judge, I think, John Dingell's son, John D. Dingell, Jr., clerked for Judge Levin. It made a profound impact on the chairman. He told me about this all the time.

Imagine getting to go see this very senior Member of Congress to find out about your own great uncle. What was he like? Mr. Dingell loved Uncle Ted.

Then many years later, John Dingell—I don't even know how this happens—he did whatever you do to name the Federal courthouse in Detroit after my great uncle. He did not tell Congressman Sander Levin and he did not tell Senator Carl Levin about this at all until it was a done deal. He didn't want any sense, I guess, of conflict of interest or whatever. He was doing this for his own sake. This was his mentor.

So if you go to downtown Detroit, the courthouse is named after Theodore Levin.

Over the years, my dad served here for 36 years. All 36 years, his beloved senior colleague was John Dingell. My dad rose to be the chair of the House Ways and Means Committee, and Mr. Dingell was the chair of the Energy and Commerce Committee. They worked together on so many things, things that people from other States wouldn't know about, like cleaning up the Rouge River, a symbol of industrialism that now is a much cleaner river, a really clean river, and working to save the auto industry, of course.

Imagine what it meant to my dad to be the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee when we passed the Affordable Care Act, and getting to work with his legendary and beloved senior colleague from Michigan who had introduced universal healthcare in this country every Congress since he entered in 1955, to get to work together to advance the ball, not achieving universal healthcare, but achieving so much through the Affordable Care Act.

I don't know how to say good-bye to Mr. Dingell. Like Mr. KILDEE, he scared the heck out of me. He was gruff. He was big. But for the sparkle in his eye, I am not sure I would have even approached him.

He was always willing to sit down, no matter how big and powerful he was. He was always willing to listen. The advice he gave was unfailingly honest and direct. A lot of times, you couldn't repeat exactly the advice, all of the words in the advice he gave, but it was really special to me.

I am not sure I am willing to say good-bye to Mr. D. I will just say Godspeed to someone who, to me, will always be the dean of the House and represent what this body is supposed to be: down to Earth and sophisticated at the same time, highly principled, and expert at making the sausage.

This is the people's House, and John Dingell was the people's Representative.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman LEVIN for his kind words.

Mr. Speaker, I would now like to call on the last of our Michigan Members to speak, a new Member, a freshman, someone who I know had a very special relationship with Congressman Dingell.

I yield to the gentlewoman from Michigan, Congresswoman RASHIDA TLAIB.

Ms. TLAIB. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from the incredibly strong city of Flint.

I had a unique relationship with Congressman Dingell, who we lovingly called "The Dean" in Michigan. Because I was a young activist, "radical," always out there protesting for clean air, protesting for good-paying jobs, and he was the person who, even though we had different styles and different approaches to various issues, he never reduced or tried to silence my voice and many of the voices of the

young people who were really trying to get the Clean Air Act to be put in place and have corporate polluters be held accountable.

As I transitioned into elected office in the Michigan Legislature and became a State representative, within a few months of being a State representative, there was a corporate billionaire who owned a bridge, and there was this whole, huge controversy around whether or not he had a permit or whether or not he was following the environmental impact statement process that is there on the Federal level.

This is a community where one in five children has asthma. This is the community I was raised in. It was the first issue that came before me as a member of the State legislature in Michigan, and I was at a loss. Many people said, Congressman Dingell, The Dean, has historical, institutional knowledge of this company, and you should sit down with him and talk to him.

I was completely taken aback and could not believe that Congressman Dingell reached out to me right away and also got my residents at that time a hearing, which you don't usually get with the U.S. Coast Guard, a hearing that happened in a public school right in the center of the neighborhood that was directly impacted.

We had over 500 residents that finally felt heard, many of them giving testimony after testimony of why a corporation needed to follow the rules, needed to follow the processes for the EPA, the Federal Highway Administration, and the number of entities that were involved in possibly a new bridge crossing.

□ 1900

What I also incredibly loved is I remember sitting on a panel about immigration reform with Congressman Dingell at the University of Michigan—Ann Arbor. As a city and State rep, I remember coming in to the capitol, driving about an hour or so. It was a very cold day, and I believe it was snowing. I was disheveled, as I usually am, and I looked to him—if you know Congressman Dingell, Mr. Speaker, he always had the cane, and he would put his cane right between his two knees and just sit there, and he would look up from his glasses.

I looked at him, and I said: Congressman Dingell, I just don't know how you have been doing it for so long. This is so hard because they lie.

He looked at me, and he said—I just loved what he said, because he turned to me, and he always called me young lady—he said: Young lady, there is a saying in India that if you stand still enough at the riverbank—stand still—that your enemies will float by dead.

I have no idea why, but that calmed me because he was teaching me stillness, but he was also teaching me patience. I just felt so much better afterward.

We had an incredible panel that uplifted so many of our immigrant neigh-

bors. Again, from someone who has such a huge and powerful presence and from me, this young activist who carries a bullhorn in her car, and I could sit next to this amazing, incredible person and feel heard, feel seen, and be on a panel with him and serve with him in so many powerful ways around our environmental justice issues.

I will forever remember the humbling experience as his last ride in front of the Capitol, to have been serving now in this Chamber that he served for 59 years, 11 different Presidents. I was telling my 13-year-old son about him. He said: I want to look him up. I want to find out.

I said: You need to, because he is a rarity.

I hope to honor his tremendous legacy by doing the same thing he did, because I know there will be a generation after me that may be different and may have a different style, and I never want to ever shush or silence them in any way and I want them to be heard just like he did for me.

So I want to thank him from the bottom of my heart for teaching me so much. I am just so pleased to have been serving by his side in many ways, but also that he served me and my family for so many years.

I thank Congressman KILDEE so much for allowing me to speak about my dear friend, Congressman John Dingell.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congresswoman TLAI.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN), who served a very long time—most of his career—here in the House side by side with Congressman John Dingell. Congressman BRAD SHERMAN is a member of the Financial Services Committee and the Foreign Affairs Committee and a good friend of Congressman John Dingell.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I was in my office watching these tributes to the dean, and after a while I couldn't just sit there and watch. I realized this is an hour devoted to remembrances from his colleagues from Michigan, and I thank Congressman KILDEE for allowing a humble Californian to participate.

America is healthier because of John Dingell. Less tobacco is smoked now than decades ago because of John Dingell. Our air is cleaner. Our water is cleaner. We are healthier, and we are closer to completely universal healthcare than we have ever been in our history because of John Dingell.

Not only is our environment healthier and our bodies are healthier, our country is healthier because of what John Dingell did to move forward the fight for civil rights in this country.

John is the dean of the Michigan delegation, but he belongs to us, too. He is the dean of the House. He is the dean of the House for all time. I doubt that any Member will ever match his record of tenure, but I know that no Member

will ever match his record of accomplishment.

So we have had so many new Members come to the House this year wondering how to learn, how to be an effective Member, and how to serve their country. They could not do any better than to study the life of John Dingell in his nearly six decades of service to this country and to this House.

I am so pleased that DEBBIE DINGELL continues to serve the district, a district served by John and John's father. I thank the gentleman from Michigan for inviting a California member and taking just a bit of his time.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we will lay Congressman John Dingell to rest, and it will be a painful time. But we can take a lot of comfort in the contribution that he has made, not just to this body but to the quality of life in this country; and as individuals with our own perspective, our own experience here, we can take some comfort in knowing that his wife—the love of his life—will continue his legacy by serving here with us side by side.

Our hearts go out to her. I know this is a very difficult time for the Dingell family, but especially for DEBBIE. They loved one another. They were inseparable. They were one. I know this will be a difficult time for her. We stand with her.

Mr. Speaker, John Dingell served with 11 Presidents and 11 Speakers of the House. Mr. Speaker, 2,419 Members of Congress served with him. He served 21,551 days in this House and cast over 25,000 votes. But as he would say and has said many times: It is not the longevity that counts, it is the way you serve.

He served in a way that brought honor to this Congress and made it a better institution. He led in a way that made this country a better place. And I know for each of us who came to the floor and each of us who served with him, he not only made us better Representatives of the people whom we work for, but he made us better people.

We honor John Dingell's life and legacy.

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

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 7 o'clock and 6 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 2337

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CUELLAR) at 11 o'clock and 37 minutes p.m.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair

declares the House in recess for a period of less than 15 minutes.

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 37 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 2350

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CUELLAR) at 11 o'clock and 50 minutes p.m.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.J. RES. 31, FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS FOR DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY, 2019

Mrs. LOWEY submitted the following conference report and statement on the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 31) making further continuing appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for fiscal year 2019, and for other purposes:

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of February 13, 2019, in Book II.)

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. QUIGLEY (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today on account of death in the family.

PUBLICATION OF COMMITTEE RULES

RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES FOR THE 116TH CONGRESS

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, DC, February 13, 2019.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,

Speaker of the House, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to Rule XI, Clause 2(a)(2) of the Rules of the House of Representatives, I respectfully submit the rules of the 116th Congress for the Committee on Natural Resources for publication in the Congressional Record. The Committee adopted these rules by voice vote, with a quorum being present, at our organizational meeting on Wednesday, January 30th, 2019.

Sincerely,

RAÚL M. GRIJALVA,

Chairman, Committee on Natural Resources.

RULE 1. RULES OF THE HOUSE; VICE CHAIRS

(a) Applicability of House Rules.

(1) The Rules of the House of Representatives, so far as they are applicable, are the rules of the Committee on Natural Resources (hereinafter in these rules referred to as the "Committee") and its Subcommittees.

(2) Each Subcommittee is part of the Committee and is subject to the authority, direction and rules of the Committee. References in these rules to "Committee" and "Chair" shall apply to each Subcommittee and its Chair wherever applicable.

(3) House Rule XI is incorporated and made a part of the rules of the Committee to the extent applicable.

(b) Vice Chair.—Unless inconsistent with other rules, the Chair shall designate a Vice Chair of the Committee and appoint Vice Chairs of the Subcommittees. If the Chair of the Committee or Subcommittee is not present at any meeting of the Committee or Subcommittee, as the case may be, the Vice Chair shall preside. If the Vice Chair is not present, the Ranking Member of the Majority party on the Committee or Sub-

committee who is present, or the Chair's designee, shall preside at that meeting.

RULE 2. MEETINGS IN GENERAL

(a) Scheduled Meetings.—The Committee shall meet at 10 a.m. the first Wednesday of each month when the House is in session if so noticed by the Chair under Committee Rule 3(a). The Committee shall also meet at the call of the Chair subject to advance notice to all Members of the Committee. Special meetings shall be called and convened by the Chair as provided in clause 2(c)(1) of House Rule XI. Any Committee meeting or hearing that conflicts with a party caucus, conference, or similar party meeting shall be rescheduled at the discretion of the Chair, in consultation with the Ranking Minority Member. The Committee may not sit during a joint session of the House and Senate or during a recess when a joint meeting of the House and Senate is in progress.

(b) Open Meetings.—Each meeting for the transaction of business, including the markup of legislation, and each hearing of the Committee or a Subcommittee shall be open to the public, except as provided by clause 2(g) and clause 2(k) of House Rule XI.

(c) Broadcasting.—Whenever a meeting for the transaction of business, including the markup of legislation, or a hearing is open to the public, that meeting or hearing shall be open to coverage by television, radio, and still photography in accordance with clauses 2(a)(1) and 4 of House Rule XI. The provisions of clause 4(f) of House Rule XI are specifically made part of these rules by reference. To the maximum extent practicable, the Committee shall provide audio and visual coverage of each hearing or meeting for the transaction of business in a manner that allows the public to easily listen to and view the proceedings, and maintain the recordings of such coverage in a manner that is easily accessible to the public. Operation and use of any Committee internet broadcast system shall be fair, and nonpartisan, and in accordance with clause 4(b) of House Rule XI and all other applicable rules of the Committee and the House.

(d) Oversight Plan.—No later than March 1 of the first session of each Congress, the Committee shall prepare and submit its oversight plan for that Congress in accordance with clause 2(d) of House Rule X.

RULE 3. MEETING AND HEARING PROCEDURES IN GENERAL

(a) Notice and Information for Members and the Public.

(1) The Chair shall publicly announce the date, place and subject matter of a Committee hearing or meeting in accordance with clause 2(g)(3) of House Rule XI.

(2) A hearing or meeting may begin sooner if the Chair, with the concurrence of the Ranking Minority Member, determines that there is good cause to begin the meeting or hearing sooner, or if the Committee so determines by majority vote. In these cases, the Chair shall publicly announce the meeting or hearing at the earliest possible time. The Committee shall promptly notify the Daily Digest Clerk of the Congressional Record and shall promptly make publicly available in electronic form the appropriate information as soon as possible after the public announcement is made.

(3) To the extent practicable, a background memorandum prepared by the Majority staff summarizing the major provisions of any bill being considered by the Committee, including the need for the bill and its effect on current law, will be available for the Members of the Committee and the public no later than 48 hours before the meeting.

(b) Public Availability of Markup Text.—At least 24 hours prior to the markup of any legislation (or at the time of an announcement under paragraph (a)(2) above made within 24 hours before such meeting), the Chair shall cause the text of such legislation to be made publicly available in electronic form.

(c) Meetings and Hearings to Begin Promptly.—Each meeting or hearing of the

Committee shall begin promptly at the time stipulated in the public announcement of the meeting or hearing.

(d) Addressing the Committee.—A Committee Member may address the Committee or a Subcommittee on any bill, motion, or other matter under consideration or may question a witness at a hearing only when recognized by the Chair for that purpose. The time a Member may address the Committee or Subcommittee for any purpose or to question a witness shall be limited to five minutes, except as provided in Committee Rule 4(f). Members shall limit remarks to the subject matter under consideration.

(e) Quorums.

(1) A majority of the Members of the Committee shall constitute a quorum for the reporting of any measure or recommendation, the authorizing of a subpoena, the closing of any meeting or hearing to the public under clause 2(g)(1), clause 2(g)(2)(A) and clause 2(k)(5)(B) of House Rule XI, and the releasing of executive session materials under clause 2(k)(7) of House Rule X. Testimony and evidence may be received at any hearing at which there are at least two Members of the Committee present. For the purpose of transacting all other business of the Committee, one-third of the Members shall constitute a quorum.

(2) When a call of the roll is required to ascertain the presence of a quorum, the offices of all Members shall be notified and the Members shall have not less than 15 minutes to prove their attendance. The Chair shall have the discretion to waive this requirement when a quorum is actually present or whenever a quorum is secured and may direct the relevant Committee staff to note the names of all Members present within the 15-minute period.

(f) Participation of Members in Committee and Subcommittees.—Any Member of the Committee may sit with any Subcommittee during any meeting or hearing, and by unanimous consent of the Members of the Subcommittee, may participate in such meeting or hearing. However, a Member who is not a Member of the Subcommittee may not vote on any matter before the Subcommittee, be counted for purposes of establishing a quorum, or raise points of order.

(g) Proxies.—No vote in the Committee or its Subcommittees may be cast by proxy.

(h) Record Votes.—Record votes shall be ordered on the demand of one-fifth of the Members present, or by any Member in the apparent absence of a quorum.

(i) Postponed Record Votes.

(1) Subject to paragraph (2), the Chair may, after consultation with the Ranking Minority Member, postpone further proceedings when a record vote is ordered on the question of approving any measure or matter or adopting an amendment. The Chair shall resume proceedings on a postponed request at any time after reasonable notice, but no later than the next meeting day.

(2) Notwithstanding any intervening order for the previous question, when proceedings resume on a postponed question under paragraph (1), an underlying proposition shall remain subject to further debate or amendment to the same extent as when the question was postponed.

(3) This rule shall apply to Subcommittee proceedings.

(j) Privileged Motions.—A motion to recess from day to day, a motion to recess subject to the call of the Chair (within 24 hours), and a motion to dispense with the first reading (in full) of a bill or resolution if printed copies are available, are nondebatable motions of high privilege.

(k) Layover and Copy of Bill.—No measure or recommendation reported by a Subcommittee shall be considered by the Committee until two calendar days from the time of Subcommittee action. No bill shall be considered by the Committee unless a copy has been delivered to the office of each Member of the Committee requesting a copy.

These requirements may be waived by a majority vote of the Committee at the time of consideration of the measure or recommendation.

(l) Access to Dais and Conference Room.—Access to the hearing rooms' daises (and to the conference rooms adjacent to the Committee hearing rooms) shall be limited to Members of Congress and employees of the Committee during a meeting or hearing of the Committee, except that Committee Members' personal staff may be present on the daises if their employing Member is the author of a bill or amendment under consideration by the Committee, but only during the time that the bill or amendment is under active consideration by the Committee. Access to the conference rooms adjacent to the Committee hearing rooms shall be limited to Members of Congress and employees of Congress during a meeting or hearing of the Committee.

(m) Cellular Telephones and other Electronic Devices.—During a meeting of the Committee, ringing or audible sounds or conversational use of cellular telephones or other electronic devices is prohibited on the Committee dais or in the Committee hearing rooms.

(n) Motion to go to Conference with the Senate.—The Chair may offer a motion under clause 1 of House Rule XXII whenever the Chair considers it appropriate.

(o) Materials for Record.—Other than witness questions for the hearing record, materials must be submitted within 10 business days following the last day of the hearing or meeting. Witness questions for the hearing record must be submitted to the relevant Full Committee staff or Subcommittee Clerk within 3 business days following the last day of the hearing. The materials submitted must address the subject matter of the hearing or meeting. Only a Member of the Committee or an invited witness may submit materials for inclusion in the hearing or meeting record.

RULE 4. HEARING PROCEDURES

(a) Written Statement; Oral Testimony.—Witnesses who are to appear before the Committee or a Subcommittee shall file with the relevant Full Committee staff or Subcommittee Clerk, at least two business days before the day of their appearance, a written statement of their proposed testimony. Witnesses shall limit their oral presentation to a five-minute summary of the written statement, unless the Chair, in consultation with the Ranking Minority Member, extends this time period. Subject to the approval of the Committee, the Chair may waive oral testimony of any witness who has submitted written testimony for the record.

In addition, a witness appearing in a non-governmental capacity shall include a curriculum vitae and a disclosure of any Federal grants or contracts, or contracts or payments originating with a foreign government, received during the current calendar year or either of the previous two calendar years by the witness or by the entity represented by the witness and related to the subject matter of the hearing. The disclosure shall include the amount and source of each Federal grant (or subgrant thereof) or contract (or subcontract thereof) related to the subject matter of the hearing and the amount and country of origin of any payment or contract related to the subject matter of the hearing originating with a foreign government. Failure to comply with these disclosure requirements may result in the exclusion of the written testimony from the hearing record and/or the barring of an oral presentation of the testimony.

(b) Minority Witnesses.—When any hearing is conducted by the Committee or any Sub-

committee upon any measure or matter, the Minority party Members on the Committee or Subcommittee shall be entitled, upon request to the Chair by a majority of those Minority Members before the completion of the hearing, to call witnesses selected by the Minority to testify with respect to that measure or matter during at least one day of hearings thereon.

(c) Information for Members.—After announcement of a hearing, the Committee shall make available as soon as practicable to all Members of the Committee a tentative witness list and to the extent practicable the Majority staff shall make publicly available a memorandum explaining the subject matter of the hearing (including relevant legislative reports and other necessary material). In addition, the Chair shall make available to the Members of the Committee any official reports from departments and agencies on the subject matter as they are received.

(d) Subpoenas.—The Committee or a Subcommittee may authorize and issue a subpoena under clause 2(m) of House Rule XI if authorized by a majority of the Members voting. In addition, the Chair of the Committee may authorize and issue subpoenas during any period of time in which the House of Representatives has adjourned for more than three days and, as soon as practicable, the Chair shall notify all Members of the Committee of such action. Subpoenas shall be signed only by the Chair of the Committee, or any Member of the Committee authorized by the Committee, and may be served by any person designated by the Chair or Member.

(e) Oaths.—The Chair of the Committee, the Chairs of the Subcommittees or any Member designated by the Chair may administer oaths to any witness before the Committee. All witnesses appearing in hearings may be administered the following oath by the Chair or his designee prior to receiving the testimony: "Do you solemnly swear or affirm, under penalty of law, that the testimony that you are about to give is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?"

(f) Opening Statements; Questioning of Witnesses.

(1) Opening statements may be made by the Chair and the Ranking Member or their designee. If a witness scheduled to testify at any hearing of the Committee is a constituent of a Member of the Committee, that Member may be recognized for up to 30 seconds to briefly introduce the witness at the hearing.

(2) The questioning of witnesses in Committee and Subcommittee hearings may be initiated by the Chair, followed by the Ranking Minority Member and all other Members alternating between the Majority and Minority parties. In recognizing Members to question witnesses, the Chair shall take into consideration the ratio of the Majority to Minority Members present and shall establish the order of recognition for questioning in a manner so as not to disadvantage the Members of the Majority or the Members of the Minority. A motion is in order to allow designated Majority and Minority party Members to question a witness for a specified period to be equally divided between the Majority and Minority parties. This period shall not exceed one hour in the aggregate.

(g) Claims of Privilege.—Claims of common-law privileges made by witnesses in hearings, or by interviewees or deponents in investigations or inquiries, are applicable only at the discretion of the Chair, subject to appeal to the Committee.

RULE 5. FILING OF COMMITTEE REPORTS

(a) Duty of Chair.—Whenever the Committee authorizes the favorable reporting of

a measure from the Committee, the Chair or the Chair's designee shall report the same to the House of Representatives and shall take all steps necessary to secure its passage without any additional authority needing to be set forth in the motion to report each individual measure. In appropriate cases, the authority set forth in this rule shall extend to moving in accordance with the Rules of the House of Representatives that the House be resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the measure; and to moving in accordance with the Rules of the House of Representatives for the disposition of a Senate measure that is substantially the same as the House measure as reported.

(b) Filing.—A report on a measure which has been approved by the Committee shall be filed within seven calendar days (exclusive of days on which the House of Representatives is not in session) after the day on which there has been filed with the relevant Full Committee staff a written request, signed by a majority of the Members of the Committee, for the reporting of that measure. Upon the filing with the relevant Full Committee staff of this request, the staff shall transmit immediately to the Chair notice of the filing of that request.

(c) Supplemental, Additional, Dissenting or Minority Views.—Any Member may, if notice is given by any Member at the time a measure or matter is approved by the Committee, file supplemental, additional, dissenting or minority views. These views must be in writing and signed by each Member joining therein and be filed with the Committee Chief Counsel not less than two additional calendar days (excluding Saturdays, Sundays and legal holidays except when the House is in session on those days) of the time the bill or resolution is approved by the Committee. This paragraph shall not preclude the filing of any supplemental report on any measure or matter that may be required for the correction of any technical error in a previous report made by the Committee on that bill or resolution.

(d) Review by Members.—Each Member of the Committee shall be given an opportunity to review each proposed Committee report before it is filed with the Clerk of the House of Representatives. Nothing in this paragraph extends the time allowed for filing supplemental, additional, dissenting or minority views under paragraph (c).

(e) Disclaimer.—All Committee or Subcommittee reports printed and not approved by a majority vote of the Committee or Subcommittee, as appropriate, shall contain the following disclaimer on the cover of the report: "This report has not been officially adopted by the {Committee on Natural Resources} {Subcommittee} and may not therefore necessarily reflect the views of its Members."

RULE 6. ESTABLISHMENT OF SUBCOMMITTEES; FULL COMMITTEE JURISDICTION; BILL REFERRALS

(a) Subcommittees.—There shall be five standing Subcommittees of the Committee, with the following jurisdiction and responsibilities:

SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL PARKS, FORESTS, AND PUBLIC LANDS

(1) Measures and matters related to the National Park System and its units, including Federal reserved water rights.

(2) The National Wilderness Preservation System.

(3) Wild and Scenic Rivers System, National Trails System, national heritage areas and other national units established for protection, conservation, preservation or recreational development, other than coastal barriers.

(4) Military parks and battlefields, national cemeteries administered by the Secretary of the Interior, parks in and within the vicinity of the District of Columbia and the erection of monuments to the memory of individuals.

(5) Federal and non-Federal outdoor recreation plans, programs and administration including the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 and the Outdoor Recreation Act of 1963.

(6) Preservation of prehistoric ruins and objects of interest on the public domain and other historic preservation programs and activities, including national monuments, historic sites and programs for international cooperation in the field of historic preservation.

(7) Matters concerning the following agencies and programs: Urban Parks and Recreation Recovery Program, Historic American Buildings Survey, Historic American Engineering Record, and U.S. Holocaust Memorial.

(8) Public lands generally, including measures or matters relating to entry, easements, withdrawals, grazing and Federal reserved water rights.

(9) Forfeiture of land grants and alien ownership, including alien ownership of mineral lands.

(10) Cooperative efforts to encourage, enhance and improve international programs for the protection of the environment and the conservation of natural resources otherwise within the jurisdiction of the Subcommittee.

(11) Forest reservations, including management thereof, created from the public domain.

(12) Public forest lands generally, including measures or matters related to entry, easements, withdrawals, grazing and Federal reserved water rights.

(13) General and continuing oversight and investigative authority over activities, policies and programs within the jurisdiction of the Subcommittee.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON WATER, OCEANS, AND WILDLIFE

(1) All measures and matters concerning water resources planning conducted pursuant to the Water Resources Planning Act, water resource research and development programs and saline water research and development.

(2) Compacts relating to the use and apportionment of interstate waters, water rights and major interbasin water or power movement programs.

(3) All measures and matters pertaining to irrigation and reclamation projects and other water resources development and recycling programs, including policies and procedures.

(4) Indian water rights and settlements.

(5) Activities and programs of the Water Resources Division or its successor within the U.S. Geological Survey.

(6) The Endangered Species Act.

(7) Fisheries management and fisheries research generally, including the management of all commercial and recreational fisheries (including the reauthorization of the Magnuson Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act), interjurisdictional fisheries, international fisheries agreements, aquaculture, seafood safety, and fisheries promotion.

(8) All matters pertaining to the protection of coastal and marine environments, estuarine protection, and coastal barriers.

(9) Oceanography.

(10) Ocean engineering, including materials, technology and systems.

(11) Marine sanctuaries.

(12) U.N. Convention on the Law of the Sea.

(13) All matters regarding Antarctica within the Committee's jurisdiction.

(14) Sea Grant programs and marine extension services.

(15) Cooperative efforts to encourage, enhance and improve international programs for the protection of the environment and the conservation of natural resources otherwise within the jurisdiction of the Subcommittee.

(16) Coastal zone management.

(17) Wildlife resources, including research, restoration, and conservation.

(18) Measures and matters related to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, including ecological services, fish and aquatic conservation, international affairs, migratory birds, national wildlife refuge system, wildlife and sport fish restoration, and the Lacey Act.

(19) General and continuing oversight and investigative authority over activities, policies and programs within the jurisdiction of the Subcommittee.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND MINERAL RESOURCES

(1) Planning for and development of energy from solar and wind resources on land belonging to the United States, including the outer Continental Shelf.

(2) All matters and measures affecting geothermal resources.

(3) Marine hydrokinetic energy development on the outer Continental Shelf.

(4) All matters related to the leasing, development, and conservation of fossil fuel resources belonging to the United States, including on the outer Continental Shelf and land where the surface is owned by entities other than the United States, including decommissioning of relevant facilities and reclamation of affected areas.

(5) Mitigation of energy and mining related impacts on Federal lands and resources.

(6) Terrestrial and geological sequestration of carbon dioxide, except for matters involving implementation of land or forestry management strategies.

(7) All measures and matters concerning the Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement.

(8) All measures and matters concerning the U.S. Geological Survey, except for the activities and programs of the Water Resources Division or its successor.

(9) Collection and management of energy and mineral revenues.

(10) Mining interests generally, including all matters involving mining regulation and enforcement, including the reclamation of mined lands, the environmental effects of mining, mineral land laws and claims, long-range mineral programs, and seabed mining.

(11) Conservation of United States uranium supply.

(12) Geospatial data collection and management, except for nautical charts (or data collected by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration).

(13) Helium supply and management of the Federal helium program.

(14) Rights-of-way over public lands for pipeline transportation of oil, natural gas, carbon dioxide, and helium.

(15) Measures and matters concerning the transportation of natural gas from or within Alaska and disposition of oil transported by the trans-Alaska oil pipeline.

(16) Cooperative efforts to encourage, enhance and improve international programs for the protection of the environment and the conservation of natural resources otherwise within the jurisdiction of the Subcommittee.

(17) Generation and marketing of electric power from Federal water projects by Federally chartered or Federal regional power marketing authorities.

(18) Rights-of-way over public lands for energy-related transmission.

(19) General and continuing oversight and investigative authority over activities, policies and programs within the jurisdiction of the Subcommittee.

SUBCOMMITTEE FOR INDIGENOUS PEOPLES OF THE UNITED STATES

(1) All matters related to the Federal trust responsibility to Native Americans and the sovereignty of Native Americans.

(2) Measures relating to the welfare of Native Americans, including management of Indian lands in general and special measures relating to claims which are paid out of Indian funds.

(3) All matters regarding Native Alaskans.

(4) All matters regarding the relations of the United States with Native Americans and Native American tribes, including special oversight functions under House Rule X.

(5) All matters regarding Native Hawaiians.

(6) General and continuing oversight and investigative authority over activities, policies and programs within the jurisdiction of the Subcommittee.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND INVESTIGATIONS

(1) Primary and general oversight and investigative authority on all activities, policies and programs within the jurisdiction of the Committee under House Rule X.

(b) Full Committee.—The following measures and matters shall be retained at the Full Committee:

(1) Environmental and habitat measures of general applicability, including the National Environmental Policy Act.

(2) All matters regarding insular areas of the United States.

(3) All measures or matters regarding the Freely Associated States.

(4) Cooperative efforts to encourage, enhance and improve international programs for the protection of the environment and the conservation of natural resources otherwise within the jurisdiction of the Full Committee.

(5) All other measures and matters retained by the Full Committee, including those retained under Committee Rule 6(e).

(6) General and continuing oversight and investigative authority over activities, policies and programs within the jurisdiction of the Full Committee.

(c) Ex-officio Members.—The Chair and Ranking Minority Member of the Committee may serve as ex-officio Members of each standing Subcommittee to which the Chair or the Ranking Minority Member have not been assigned. Ex-officio Members shall have the right to fully participate in Subcommittee activities but may not vote and may not be counted in establishing a quorum.

(d) Powers and Duties of Subcommittees.—Each Subcommittee is authorized to meet, hold hearings, receive evidence and report to the Committee on all matters within its jurisdiction. Each Subcommittee shall review and study on a continuing basis the application, administration, execution and effectiveness of those statutes, or parts of statutes, the subject matter of which is within that Subcommittee's jurisdiction; and the organization, operation, and regulations of any Federal agency or entity having responsibilities in or for the administration of such statutes, to determine whether these statutes are being implemented and carried out in accordance with the intent of Congress. Each Subcommittee shall review and study any conditions or circumstances indicating the need for enacting new or supplemental legislation within the jurisdiction of the Subcommittee. Each Subcommittee shall

have general and continuing oversight and investigative authority over activities, policies and programs within the jurisdiction of the Subcommittee.

(e) Referral to Subcommittees; Recall.

(1) Except as provided in paragraph

(2) and for those measures or matters retained at the Full Committee, every legislative measure or other matter referred to the Committee shall be referred to the maximum extent possible to the Subcommittee of jurisdiction within two weeks of the date of its referral to the Committee. If any measure or matter is within or affects the jurisdiction of one or more Subcommittees, the Chair may refer that measure or matter simultaneously to two or more Subcommittees for concurrent consideration or for consideration in sequence subject to appropriate time limits, or divide the matter into two or more parts and refer each part to a Subcommittee.

(2) The Chair, with the approval of a majority of the Majority Members of the Committee, may refer a legislative measure or other matter to a select or special Subcommittee. A legislative measure or other matter referred by the Chair to a Subcommittee may be recalled from the Subcommittee for direct consideration by the Full Committee, or for referral to another Subcommittee, provided Members of the Committee receive one week written notice of the recall and a majority of the Members of the Committee do not object. In addition, a legislative measure or other matter referred by the Chair to a Subcommittee may be recalled from the Subcommittee at any time by majority vote of the Committee for direct consideration by the Full Committee or for referral to another Subcommittee.

(f) Consultation.—Each Subcommittee Chair shall consult with the Chair of the Full Committee prior to setting dates for Subcommittee meetings and hearings with a view towards avoiding whenever possible conflicting Committee and Subcommittee meetings and hearings.

(g) Vacancy.—A vacancy in the membership of a Subcommittee shall not affect the power of the remaining Members to execute the functions of the Subcommittee.

RULE 7. TASK FORCES, SPECIAL OR SELECT SUBCOMMITTEES

(a) Appointment.—The Chair of the Committee is authorized, after consultation with the Ranking Minority Member, to appoint Task Forces, or special or select Subcommittees, to carry out the duties and functions of the Committee.

(b) Ex-officio Members.—The Chair and Ranking Minority Member of the Committee may serve as ex-officio Members of each Task Force, or special or select Subcommittee if they are not otherwise Members. Ex-officio Members shall have the right to fully participate in activities but may not vote and may not be counted in establishing a quorum.

(c) Party Ratios.—The ratio of Majority Members to Minority Members, excluding ex-officio Members, on each Task Force, special or select Subcommittee shall be as close as practicable to the ratio on the Full Committee.

(d) Temporary Resignation.—Members can temporarily resign their position on a Subcommittee to serve on a Task Force, special or select Subcommittee without prejudice to the Member's seniority on the Subcommittee.

(e) Chair and Ranking Minority Member.—The Chair of any Task Force, or special or select Subcommittee shall be appointed by the Chair of the Committee. The Ranking Minority Member shall select a Ranking Minority Member for each Task Force, or standing, special or select Subcommittee.

RULE 8. RECOMMENDATION OF CONFEREES

Whenever it becomes necessary to appoint conferees on a particular measure, the Chair shall recommend to the Speaker as conferees those Majority Members primarily responsible for the measure. Similarly, the Ranking Member shall recommend to the Minority Leader as conferees those Minority Members primarily responsible for the measure. The ratio of Majority Members to Minority Members recommended for conferences shall be no greater than the ratio on the Committee.

RULE 9. COMMITTEE RECORDS

(a) Segregation of Records.—All Committee records shall be kept separate and distinct from the office records of individual Committee Members serving as Chairs or Ranking Minority Members. These records shall be the property of the House and all Members shall have access to them in accordance with clause 2(e)(2) of House Rule XI.

(b) Availability.—The Committee shall make available to the public for review at reasonable times in the Committee office transcripts of public meetings and hearings, except those that are unrevised or unedited and intended solely for the use of the Committee.

(c) Archived Records.—Records of the Committee which are deposited with the National Archives shall be made available for public use pursuant to House Rule VII. The Chair shall notify the Ranking Minority Member of any decision, pursuant to clause 3(b)(3) or clause 4(b) of House Rule VII, to withhold, or to provide a time, schedule or condition for availability of any record otherwise available. At the written request of any Member of the Committee, the matter shall be presented to the Committee for a determination and shall be subject to the same notice and quorum requirements for the conduct of business under Committee Rule 3.

(d) Records of Closed Meetings.—Notwithstanding the other provisions of this rule, no records of Committee meetings or hearings which were closed to the public pursuant to the Rules of the House of Representatives shall be released to the public unless the Committee votes to release those records in accordance with the procedure used to close the Committee meeting.

(e) Classified Materials.—All classified materials shall be maintained in an appropriately secured location and shall be released only to authorized persons for review, who shall not remove the material from the Committee offices without the written permission of the Chair.

(f) Committee Information Available for the Public.—In addition to any other requirement of these rules or the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Chair shall cause to be made available publicly in electronic form the following:

(1) a record of the votes on any question on which a recorded vote is taken which shall be posted no later than 24 hours after the vote is taken that shall include:

(i) a copy of the amendment or a detailed description of the motion, order or other proposition; and

(ii) the name of each Member voting for and each Member voting against such amendment, motion, order, or proposition, the names of those Members voting present, and the names of any Member not present.

(2) copies of all amendments adopted in Committee by voice vote or unanimous consent within 24 hours of the adoption of the amendment.

(3) the rules of the Committee, once adopted, and any amendments thereto, in accordance with clause 2(a)(2) of House Rule XI.

(4) the statements required under the second sentence of clause 2(g)(5) of House Rule

XI, with appropriate redactions to protect the privacy of the witness, which shall be posted no later than one day after the witness appears before the Committee.

RULE 10. COMMITTEE BUDGET AND EXPENSES

(a) Budget.—At the beginning of each Congress, after consultation with the Chair of each Subcommittee and the Ranking Minority Member, the Chair shall present to the Committee for its approval a budget covering the funding required for staff, travel, and miscellaneous expenses.

(b) Expense Resolution.—Upon approval by the Committee of each budget, the Chair, acting pursuant to clause 6 of House Rule X, shall prepare and introduce in the House a supporting expense resolution, and take all action necessary to bring about its approval by the Committee on House Administration and by the House of Representatives.

(c) Amendments.—The Chair shall report to the Committee any amendments to each expense resolution and any related changes in the budget.

(d) Additional Expenses.—Authorization for the payment of additional or unforeseen Committee expenses may be procured by one or more additional expense resolutions processed in the same manner as set out under this rule.

(e) Monthly Reports.—Copies of each monthly report prepared by the Chair for the Committee on House Administration which shows expenditures made during the reporting period and cumulative for the year, anticipated expenditures for the projected Committee program, and detailed information on travel, shall be available to each Member.

RULE 11. COMMITTEE STAFF

(a) Rules and Policies.—Committee staff are subject to the provisions of clause 9 of House Rule X, as well as any written personnel policies the Committee may from time to time adopt.

(b) Majority and Nonpartisan Staff.—The Chair shall appoint, determine the remuneration of, and may remove, the legislative and administrative employees of the Committee not assigned to the Minority. The legislative and administrative staff of the Committee not assigned to the Minority shall be under the general supervision and direction of the Chair, who shall establish and assign the duties and responsibilities of Committee staff and delegate any authority the Chair determines appropriate.

(c) Minority Staff.—The Ranking Minority Member of the Committee shall appoint, determine the remuneration of, and may remove, the legislative and administrative staff assigned to the Minority within the budget approved for those purposes. The legislative and administrative staff assigned to the Minority shall be under the general supervision and direction of the Ranking Minority Member of the Committee who may delegate any authority the Ranking Member determines appropriate.

(d) Availability.—The skills and services of all Committee staff shall be available to all Members of the Committee.

RULE 12. COMMITTEE TRAVEL

In addition to any written travel policies the Committee may from time to time adopt, all travel of Members and staff of the Committee or its Subcommittees to hearings, meetings, conferences and investigations, including all foreign travel, must be authorized by the Full Committee Chair prior to any public notice of the travel and prior to the actual travel. In the case of Minority staff, all travel shall first be approved by the Ranking Minority Member. Funds authorized for the Committee under clauses 6 and 7 of House Rule X are for expenses incurred in the Committee's activities within the United States.

RULE 13. CHANGES TO COMMITTEE RULES

The rules of the Committee may be modified, amended, or repealed by a majority vote of the Committee provided that written notice of the proposed change has been provided to each Member of the Committee prior to the meeting date on which the changes are to be discussed and voted on consistent with Committee Rule 3(a). A change to the rules of the Committee shall be published in the Congressional Record no later than 30 days after its approval and made publicly available in electronic form.

RULE 14. OTHER PROCEDURES

The Chair may establish procedures and take actions as may be necessary to carry out the rules of the Committee or to facilitate the effective administration of the Committee, in accordance with the rules of the Committee and the Rules of the House of Representatives.

PUBLICATION OF COMMITTEE RULES

RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS FOR THE 116TH CONGRESS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC, February 13, 2019.

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

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to Rule XI, Clause 2(a) of the Rules of the House of Representatives, I respectfully submit the rules of the 116th Congress for the Committee on Veterans' Affairs for publication in the Congressional Record. The Committee adopted these rules by voice vote, with a quorum being present, at our organizational meeting on Wednesday, February 13, 2019.

Sincerely,

MARK TAKANO,
Chairman.

RULE 1.—GENERAL PROVISIONS

(a) Applicability of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives.—

In General.—The rules of the U.S. House of Representatives (the House) are the rules of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs (Committee) and its subcommittees so far as applicable.

(b) Subcommittees.—Each subcommittee of the Committee is a part of the Committee and is INN subject to the authority and direction of the Committee and to its rules so far as applicable. Except where the terms "full Committee" and "Subcommittee" are specifically mentioned, the following rules shall apply to the Committee's subcommittees and their respective chairs and ranking minority members to the same extent as they apply to the full Committee and its Chair and Ranking Minority Member.

(c) Incorporation of House Rule on Committee Procedure.—Clause 2 of House rule XI, which pertains entirely to Committee procedure, is incorporated and made part of the rules of the Committee so far as applicable.

(d) Privileged Motions.—In the Committee, a motion to recess from day to day, a motion to recess subject to the call of the Chair (within 24 hours), and a motion to dispense with the first reading (in full) of a bill or resolution if printed copies are available, shall be privileged and decided without debate.

(e) Conferences.—Pursuant to clause 2(a)(3) of House rule XI, the Chair is authorized to offer a motion under clause 1 of House rule XXII whenever the Chair considers it appropriate.

(f) Vice Chair.—Pursuant to clause 2(d) of House rule XI, the Chair of the Committee

shall designate the Vice Chair of the Committee.

(g) Taking of Depositions.—Pursuant to section 103(a) of House Resolution 6 of the 116th Congress, the Chair upon consultation with the Ranking Minority Member may order the taking of depositions, including pursuant to subpoena, by a member or counsel of the Committee. Depositions taken by a member or counsel of the Committee shall be subject to regulations issued by the Committee on Rules and printed in the Congressional Record.

(h) Subpoenas.—Pursuant to clause 2(m) of House rule XI, subpoenas may be authorized and issued by the Committee in the conduct of any investigation or series of investigations or activities, only when authorized by a majority of the members voting, a majority being present.

(i) Open Meetings and Hearings.—Meetings and hearings of the Committee shall be open to the public unless closed in accordance with clause 2(g) of House rule XI.

(j) Motions, Reduced to Writing.—Every motion made to the Committee and entertained by the Chair shall be reduced to writing upon demand of any member, and a copy made available to each member present.

(k) Wireless Telephone Use Prohibited.—No person may use a wireless telephone during a Committee meeting or hearing.

RULE 2.—COMMITTEE MEETINGS

(a) Notice Requirements for Meetings.—The Chair shall furnish each member of the Committee with the date, place, and a list of measures and subjects to be considered at a Committee meeting, which may not commence earlier than the third calendar day on which members have notice thereof (excluding Saturdays, Sundays and legal holidays except when the House is in session on such a day).

(b) At least 48 hours prior to the commencement of a meeting for the markup of legislation, including any amendment in the nature of a substitute to such bills or resolutions that shall first be recognized by the Chair, the text of such legislation shall be made publicly available in electronic form.

(c) In an emergency that does not reasonably allow for the notice as required in paragraph (a), the Chair may waive the notice requirement with the concurrence of the Ranking Minority Member; or if the Committee so determines by majority vote of the quorum required under Committee Rule 4(a). An announcement made under this subparagraph shall be published promptly in the Daily Digest and made publicly available in electronic form.

(d) To the maximum extent practicable, amendments to a measure or matter noticed under paragraph (b) shall be submitted in writing or electronically to the designee of both the Chair and Ranking Member and made available electronically to each member of the Committee at least 24 hours prior to the consideration of the measure or matter. The Chair may use his or her discretion to give priority to amendments submitted in advance.

(e) Transcripts of markups shall be recorded and may be published in the same manner as hearings before the Committee.

(f) Additional Meetings.—The Chair of the Committee may call and convene, as the Chair considers necessary, additional meetings of the Committee for the consideration of any bill or resolution pending before the Committee or for the conduct of other Committee business. The Committee shall meet for such purpose pursuant to the call of the Chair.

(g) Congressional Budget Office Scoring.—The Committee shall not include any bill or resolution for consideration during a Com-

mittee markup which is not accompanied by an accounting from the Congressional Budget Office of the mandatory and discretionary costs or savings associated with such bill or resolution.

The accounting from the Congressional Budget Office need not be official, but is expected to provide Committee members with an approximation of the budgetary impact a bill or resolution may have prior to any vote to favorably forward or report such bill or resolution. The requirements of this paragraph may be waived by a majority of Committee members, a quorum being present.

RULE 3.—HEARINGS

(a) Announcement of Hearing.—(1) The Chair, in the case of a hearing to be conducted by the Committee, shall publicly announce the date, place, and subject matter of any hearing to be conducted on any measure or matter at least one week before the commencement of that hearing, unless in accordance with clause 2(g)(3)(B) of House rule XI—

(A) the Chair with the concurrence of the Ranking Minority Member determines that there is good cause to begin the hearing at an earlier date, or

(B) the Committee determines by majority vote of the quorum required under Committee rule 4(a) that a hearing may begin earlier than one week after announcement of the hearing as required under this subsection. An announcement made under this subparagraph shall be published promptly in the Daily Digest and made publicly available in electronic form.

(b) Requirements for Testimony.—

(1) Pursuant to clause 2(g)(5) of House rule XI, each witness who is to appear before the Committee shall file with the clerk of the Committee, at least 48 hours (exclusive of weekends and holidays) in advance of his or her appearance, or at such other time as designated by the Chair after consultation with the Ranking Minority Member, a written statement of his or her proposed testimony. Each witness shall, to the greatest extent practicable, provide a copy of such written testimony in an electronic format prescribed by the Chair. Each witness shall limit initial presentations to a brief summary of the written statement.

(2)(A) In the case of a witness appearing in a non-governmental capacity, a written statement of proposed testimony shall include a curriculum vitae and a disclosure of any Federal grants or contracts, or contracts or payments originating with a foreign government, received during the current calendar year or either of the two previous calendar years by the witness and related to the subject matter of the hearing.

(B) The disclosure required by this rule shall include the amount and source of each Federal grant (or subgrant thereof) or contract (or subcontract thereof) related to the subject matter of the hearing and the amount and country of origin of any payment or contract related to the subject matter of the hearing originating with a foreign government.

(c) Calling and Questioning Witnesses.—

(1) Committee members may question witnesses only when they have been recognized by the Chair of the Committee for that purpose, and only for a 5-minute period until all members present have had an opportunity to question a witness. The questioning of witnesses in Committee hearings shall be initiated by the Chair, followed by the Ranking Minority Member and all other members alternating between the majority and minority. Except as otherwise announced by the Chair at the beginning of a hearing, members who are present at the start of the hearing will be recognized before other members who arrive after the hearing has begun. In recognizing members to question witnesses in this

fashion, the Chair shall take into consideration the ratio of the majority to minority members present and shall establish the order of recognition for questioning in such a manner as not to disadvantage the members of the majority.

(2) Notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (1) regarding the 5-minute rule, and pursuant to clause 2(j) of House rule XI, the Chair after consultation with the Ranking Minority Member, may permit a specified number of Committee members to question a witness for longer than 5 minutes. The time for extended questioning of a witness under this paragraph shall be equal for the majority party and the minority party and may not exceed one hour in the aggregate. In no event shall the Chair allow a member to question a witness for an extended period under this rule until all members present have had the opportunity to ask questions under the 5-minute rule. The Chair after consultation with the Ranking Minority Member may permit Committee staff for its majority and minority party members to question a witness for equal specified periods. The time for extended questioning of witnesses by staff shall be equal for the majority party and the minority party and may not exceed one hour in the aggregate.

(3) Pursuant to clause 2(k) of House rule XI, the Chair at a hearing shall announce in an opening statement the subject of the hearing, and a copy of the committee rules and of clause 2 of House rule XI shall be made available to each witness on request.

(A) Witnesses at hearings may be accompanied by their own counsel for the purpose of advising them concerning their constitutional rights. The Chair may punish breaches of order and decorum, and of professional ethics on the part of counsel, by censure and exclusion from the hearings; and the Committee may cite the offender to the House for contempt.

(B) Whenever it is asserted by a member of the Committee that the evidence or testimony at a hearing may tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate any person, or it is asserted by a witness that the evidence or testimony that the witness would give at a hearing may tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate the witness

(i) notwithstanding clause 2(g)(2) of House rule XI, such testimony or evidence shall be presented in executive session if, in the presence of the number of members required under Committee rule 4(a), the Committee determines by vote of a majority of those present that such evidence or testimony may tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate any person; and

(ii) the Committee shall proceed to receive such testimony in open session only if the Committee, a majority being present, determines that such evidence or testimony will not tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate any person.

In either case the Committee shall afford such person an opportunity voluntarily to appear as a witness, and receive and dispose of requests from such person to subpoena additional witnesses.

(C) Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the Chair shall receive and the Committee shall dispose of requests to subpoena additional witnesses.

(D) Evidence or testimony taken in executive session, and proceedings conducted in executive session, may be released or used in public sessions only when authorized by the Committee, a majority being present.

(E) In the discretion of the Committee, witnesses may submit brief and pertinent sworn statements in writing for inclusion in the record. The Committee is the sole judge of the pertinence of testimony and evidence adduced at its hearing.

(F) A witness may obtain a transcript copy of the testimony of such witness given at a public session or, if given at an executive session, when authorized by the Committee.

(4) Non-Committee members may be invited to sit at the dais for and participate in Committee hearings with the unanimous consent of the members present. Further, non-Committee members may be recognized for questioning of witnesses but only after all Committee members have first been recognized.

(5) Pursuant to House rule XI clause 2(j)(1), when a hearing is conducted by the Committee on any measure or matter, the minority members of the Committee shall be entitled, upon request to the Chair of a majority of those minority members before the completion of the hearing, to call witnesses selected by the minority to testify with respect to that measure or matter during at least one day of the hearing thereon.

RULE 4.—QUORUM AND RECORD VOTES; POSTPONEMENT OF PROCEEDINGS

(a) Working Quorum.—A majority of the members of the Committee shall constitute a quorum for business, except that two members shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of taking testimony and receiving evidence.

(b) Quorum for Reporting.—No measure or recommendation shall be reported to the House or to the full Committee in a meeting of a subcommittee unless a majority of the members of the Committee are present.

(c) Record Votes.—A record vote may be demanded by one-fifth of the members present or, in the apparent absence of a quorum, by any one member. With respect to any record vote on any motion to amend or report, the total number of votes cast for and against, and the names of those members voting for and against, shall be included in the report of the Committee on the bill or resolution.

(d) Prohibition Against Proxy Voting.—No vote by any member of the Committee with respect to any measure or matter may be cast by proxy.

(e) Postponing Proceedings.—The Committee Chair may postpone further proceedings when a record vote is ordered on the question of approving a measure or matter or on adopting an amendment; and may resume proceedings on a postponed question after reasonable notice. When proceedings resume on a postponed question, notwithstanding any intervening order for the previous question, an underlying proposition shall remain subject to further debate or amendment to the same extent as when the question was postponed.

RULE 5.—SUBCOMMITTEES

(a) Establishment and Jurisdiction—
(1) There shall be five subcommittees of the Committee with jurisdictions as follows:

(A) Subcommittee on Disability Assistance and Memorial Affairs, which shall have legislative, oversight, and investigative jurisdiction over compensation; general and special pensions of all the wars of the United States; life insurance issued by the Government on account of service in the Armed Forces; cemeteries of the United States in which veterans of any war or conflict are or may be buried, whether in the United States or abroad, except cemeteries administered by the Secretary of the Interior; burial benefits; the Board of Veterans' Appeals; and the United States Court of Appeals for Veterans Claims.

(B) Subcommittee on Economic Opportunity, which shall have legislative, oversight, and investigative jurisdiction over education of veterans, employment and training of veterans, vocational rehabilitation, veterans' housing programs (including

homeless veterans housing), transition of servicemembers to civilian life, veteran-owned business concerns, and servicemembers civil relief.

(C) Subcommittee on Health, which shall have legislative, oversight, and investigative jurisdiction over the Veterans Health Administration (VHA) including medical services, community care, medical support and compliance, medical facilities, medical and prosthetic research, provision of healthcare to homeless veterans, and major and minor construction.

(D) Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, which shall have oversight and investigative jurisdiction over veterans' matters generally, and over such matters as may be referred to the Subcommittee by the Chair of the full Committee for its oversight or investigation and for its appropriate recommendations. The Subcommittee shall have legislative jurisdiction over information technology and procurement generally, and over such bills or resolutions as may be referred to it by the Chair of the full Committee.

(E) Subcommittee on Technology Modernization, which shall have oversight and investigative jurisdiction over Department of Veterans Affairs' enterprise technology modernization programs and projects, including the Electronic Health Record Modernization (EHRM) program.

(2) Each subcommittee shall have responsibility for such other measures or matters as the Chair refers to it.

(b) Vacancies.—Any vacancy in the membership of a subcommittee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of that subcommittee.

(c) Ratios.—On each subcommittee, there shall be a ratio of majority party members to minority party members, which shall be consistent with the ratio on the full Committee.

(d) Referral to Subcommittees.—The Chair of the Committee may refer a measure or matter, which is within the general responsibility of more than one of the subcommittees of the Committee, as the Chair deems appropriate. In referring any measure or matter to a subcommittee, the Chair of the Committee may specify a date by which the subcommittee shall report thereon to the Committee.

(e) Powers and Duties—

(1) Each subcommittee is authorized to meet, hold hearings, receive evidence, and report to the full Committee on all matters referred to it or under its jurisdiction. Subcommittee Chairs shall set dates for hearings and meetings of their respective subcommittees after consultation with the Chair of the Committee and other subcommittee chairs with a view toward avoiding simultaneous scheduling of Committee and subcommittee meetings or hearings whenever possible.

(2) Whenever a subcommittee has ordered a bill, resolution, or other matter to be reported to the Committee, the Chair of the subcommittee reporting the bill, resolution, or matter to the full Committee, or any member authorized by the subcommittee to do so, shall notify the Chair and the Ranking Minority Member of the Committee of the subcommittee's action.

(3) A member of the Committee who is not a member of a subcommittee may sit with the subcommittee during any of its meetings and hearings, but shall not have authority to vote, cannot be counted for a quorum, and cannot raise a point of order at the meeting or hearing.

(4) The Chair and Ranking Minority Member of the Committee may serve as ex-officio members of each standing subcommittee to which the Chair or Ranking Minority Member have not been assigned. Ex-officio members shall have the right to fully participate

in subcommittee activities but may not vote and may not be counted in establishing a quorum.

(5) Non-Committee members may be invited to sit at the dais for and participate in subcommittee hearings with the unanimous consent of all Members present. Further, non-Committee members may be recognized for questioning of witnesses but only after all subcommittee members have first been recognized for questioning.

(6) Each subcommittee shall provide the full Committee with copies of such record votes taken in subcommittee and such other records with respect to the subcommittee as the Chair of the Committee deems necessary for the Committee to comply with the House rules.

RULE 6.—GENERAL OVERSIGHT RESPONSIBILITY

(a) Purpose.—Pursuant to House Rule X clause 2, the Committee shall carry out oversight responsibilities consistent with clause 1(s) of House rule X and Committee rule 5.

(b) Oversight Plan.—Not later than March 1 of the first session of a Congress, the Chair shall prepare, in consultation with the Ranking Minority Member, an oversight plan for that Congress; provide a copy of that plan to each member of the Committee for at least seven calendar days before its submission; and submit the plan (including any supplemental, minority, additional, or dissenting views submitted by a member of the Committee) to the Committee on Oversight and Reform and the Committee on House Administration, in accordance with House rule X clause 2(d).

(c) Oversight by Subcommittees.—The existence and activities of the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations shall in no way limit the responsibility of the other subcommittees of the Committee for carrying out oversight duties.

(d) Pursuant to House rule XI clause 1(b), the Committee may conduct at any time such investigations and studies as it considers necessary or appropriate in the exercise of its responsibilities under rule X.

RULE 7.—BUDGET ACT RESPONSIBILITIES

(a) Budget Act Responsibilities.—Pursuant to clause 4(f)(1) of Rule X of the Rules of the House, the Committee shall submit to the Committee on the Budget not later than six weeks after submission of the budget by the President, or at such time as the Committee on the Budget may request—

(1) Its views and estimates with respect to all matters to be set forth in the concurrent resolution on the budget for the ensuing fiscal year that are within its jurisdiction or functions; and

(2) An estimate of the total amounts of new budget authority, and budget outlays resulting therefrom, to be provided or authorized in all bills and resolutions within its jurisdiction that it intends to be effective during that fiscal year.

RULE 8.—RECORDS AND OTHER MATTERS

(a) Transcripts.—There shall be a transcript made of each meeting and hearing of the Committee. Any such transcript shall be a substantially verbatim account of remarks actually made during the proceedings, subject only to technical, grammatical, and typographical corrections authorized by the person making the remarks involved.

(b) Records.—(1) The Committee shall keep a record of all Committee action. The record shall contain all information required by clause 2(e)(1) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House and shall be available for public inspection at reasonable times in the offices of the Committee.

(2) There shall be kept in writing a record of the proceedings of the Committee, including a record of the votes on any question on

which a record vote is taken. The result of each such record vote shall be made available by the Committee for inspection by the public at reasonable times in the offices of the Committee and also made publicly available in electronic form within 48 hours of such record vote. Information so available shall include a description of the amendment, motion, order, or other proposition, the name of each member voting for and each member voting against such amendment, motion, order, or proposition, and the names of those members present but not voting.

(c) Availability of Archived Records.—The records of the Committee at the National Archives and Records Administration shall be made available for public use in accordance with House rule VII. The Chair shall notify the Ranking Minority Member of any decision made by the Clerk of the House, pursuant to clause 4 of House rule VII, to withhold a record otherwise available, and the matter shall be presented to the Committee for a vote on written request of any member of the Committee.

(d) Availability of Adopted Amendments.—Not later than 24 hours after the adoption of any amendment to a measure or matter considered by the Committee, the Chair shall cause the text of each such amendment to be made publicly available in electronic form.

(e) Availability of Publications.—Pursuant to clause 2(e)(4) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House, the Committee shall make its publications available in electronic form to the maximum extent feasible.

RULE 9.—TRAVEL

(a) Requirements for Travel.—All requests for travel, funded by the Committee, for members and staff in connection with activities or subject matters under the general jurisdiction of the Committee, shall be submitted to the Chair for approval or disapproval. All travel requests should be submitted to the Chair at least five working days in advance of the proposed travel. For all travel funded by any other source, notice shall be given to the Chair at least five working days in advance of the proposed travel. All travel requests shall be submitted to the Chair in writing and include—

(1) The purpose of the travel.

(2) The dates during which the travel is to occur.

(3) The names of the locations to be visited and the length of time to be spent in each.

(4) The names of members and staff of the Committee for whom the authorization is sought. Travel by the minority shall be submitted to the Chair via the Ranking Member.

(b) Trip Reports.—Members and staff shall make a written report to the Chair within 15 working days on all travel approved under this subsection. Reports shall include a description of their itinerary, expenses, and activities, and pertinent information gained as a result of such travel.

When travel involves majority and minority members or staff, the majority shall submit the report to the Chair on behalf of the majority and minority. The minority may append additional remarks to the report at their discretion.

(c) Applicability of House Rules.—Members and staff of the Committee performing authorized travel on official business shall be governed by applicable laws, resolutions, and rules of the House and of the Committee on House Administration.

RULE 10.—FACILITY NAMING

(a) Facility Naming.—No Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) facility or property shall be named after any individual by the Committee unless—

(1) Such individual is deceased and was—

(A) A veteran who (i) was instrumental in the construction or the operation of the facility to be named, or (ii) was a recipient of the Medal of Honor or, as determined by the Chair and Ranking Minority Member, otherwise performed military service of an extraordinarily distinguished character;

(B) A member of the United States House of Representatives or Senate who had a direct association with such facility;

(C) An Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, a Secretary of Veterans Affairs, a Secretary of Defense or of a service branch, or a military or other Federal civilian official of comparable or higher rank; or

(D) An individual who, as determined by the Chair and Ranking Minority Member, performed outstanding service for veterans.

(2) Each member of the Congressional delegation representing the State in which the designated facility is located must indicate in writing such member's support of the proposal to name such facility after such individual. Evidence of a member's support in writing may either be in the form of a letter to the Chair and Ranking Member or co-sponsorship of legislation proposing to name the particular VA facility in question.

(3) The pertinent State department or chapter of each Congressionally chartered veterans' organization having a national membership of at least 500,000 must indicate in writing its support of such proposal.

(b) The above criteria for naming a VA facility may be waived by unanimous consent.

RULE 11.—MEDIA COVERAGE

(a) Media Coverage.—Any meeting of the Committee that is open to the public shall be open to coverage by radio, television, and still photography in accordance with the provisions of clause 4(f) of House rule XI as follows:

(1) If audio or visual coverage of the hearing or meeting is to be presented to the public as live coverage, that coverage shall be conducted and presented without commercial sponsorship.

(2) The allocation among the television media of the positions or the number of television cameras permitted by a Committee Chair in a hearing or meeting room shall be in accordance with fair and equitable procedures devised by the Executive Committee of the Radio and Television Correspondents' Galleries.

(3) Television cameras shall be placed so as not to obstruct in any way the space between a witness giving evidence or testimony and any member of the Committee or the visibility of that witness and that member to each other.

(4) Television cameras shall operate from fixed positions but may not be placed in positions that obstruct unnecessarily the coverage of the hearing or meeting by the other media.

(5) Equipment necessary for coverage by the television and radio media may not be installed in, or removed from, the hearing or meeting room while the Committee is in session.

(6)(A) Except as provided in subdivision (B), floodlights, spotlights, strobe lights, and flashguns may not be used in providing any method of coverage of the hearing or meeting.

(B) The television media may install additional lighting in a hearing or meeting room, without cost to the Government, in order to raise the ambient lighting level in a hearing or meeting room to the lowest level necessary to provide adequate television coverage of a hearing or meeting at the current state of the art of television coverage.

(7) If requests are made by more of the media than will be permitted by the Committee Chair for coverage of a hearing or

meeting by still photography, that coverage shall be permitted on the basis of a fair and equitable pool arrangement devised by the Standing Committee of Press Photographers.

(8) Photographers may not position themselves between the witness table and the members of the Committee at any time during the course of a hearing or meeting.

(9) Photographers may not place themselves in positions that obstruct unnecessarily the coverage of the hearing by the other media.

(10) Personnel providing coverage by the television and radio media shall be currently accredited to the Radio and Television Correspondents' Galleries.

(11) Personnel providing coverage by still photography shall be currently accredited to the Press Photographers' Gallery.

(12) Personnel providing coverage by the television and radio media and by still photography shall conduct themselves and their coverage activities in an orderly and unobtrusive manner.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 461. An act to strengthen the capacity and competitiveness of historically Black colleges and universities through robust public-sector, private-sector, and community partnerships and engagement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform; in addition, to the Committee on Education and Labor for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported that on February 12, 2019, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill:

H.R. 439. To amend the charter of the Future Farmers of America, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 52 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, February 14, 2019, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

168. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Trifloxystrobin; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2017-0530; FRL-9985-23] received February 8, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

169. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Trifluralin; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2017-0420; FRL-9983-89] received February 8, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

170. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants: Wet-Formed Fiberglass Mat Production Residual Risk and Technology Review [EPA-HQ-OAR-2004-0309; FRL-9988-79-OAR] (RIN: 2060-AT47) received February 8, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

171. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants: Surface Coating of Wood Building Products Residual Risk and Technology Review [EPA-HQ-OAR-2016-0678; FRL-9988-71-OAR] (RIN: 2060-AT71) received February 8, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

172. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Texas; Reasonable Further Progress Plan for the Houston-Galveston-Brazoria Ozone Nonattainment Area [EPA-R06-OAR-2017-0056; FRL-9988-61-Region 6] received February 8, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

173. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Clean Air Plans; 2008 8-Hour Ozone Nonattainment Area Requirements; San Joaquin Valley, California [EPA-R09-OAR-2018-0535; FRL-9988-40-Region 9] received February 8, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

174. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; South Carolina: Revisions to Prevention of Significant Deterioration Rules [EPA-R04-OAR-2018-0073; FRL-9989-22-Region 4] received February 8, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

175. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Wisconsin; Reasonable Further Progress Plan and Other Plan Elements for the Moderate Nonattainment Chicago Area for the 2008 Ozone Standards [EPA-R05-OAR-2017-0212; FRL-9989-23-Region 5] received February 8, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

176. 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; Maryland; Reasonably Available Control Technology (RACT) State Implementation Plan (SIP) Under the 2008 Ozone National Ambient Quality Standard (NAAQS) [EPA-R03-OAR-2018-0508; FRL-9989-15-Region 3] received Feb-

ruary 8, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

177. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; California; South Coast Serious Area Plan for the 2006 PM2.5 NAAQS [EPA-R09-OAR-2017-0490; FRL-9988-60-Region 9] received February 8, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

178. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 22-603, "Warehousing and Storage Eminent Domain Authority Temporary Act of 2018", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

179. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 22-596, "Senior Strategic Plan Amendment Act of 2018", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

180. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 22-597, "District of Columbia Education Research Practice Partnership Establishment and Audit Act of 2018", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

181. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 22-598, "Risk Management and Own Risk and Solvency Assessment Act of 2018", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

182. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 22-599, "Temporary Parking Permit Limitation Regulation Amendment Act of 2018", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

183. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 22-600, "District Historical Records Advisory Board Amendment Act of 2018", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

184. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 22-601, "Southwest Waterfront Park Bus Prohibition Act of 2018", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

185. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 22-602, "East End Health Equity Amendment Act of 2018", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

186. A letter from the Program Analyst, NHTSA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Federal Motor Vehicle Theft Prevention Standard; Final Listing of 2017 Light Duty Truck Lines Subject to the Requirements of This Standard and Exempted Vehicle Lines for Model Year 2017 [Docket No.: NHTSA-2016-0046] (RIN: 2127-AL72) February 8, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

187. A letter from the Ombudsman, Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Fees for the Unified Carrier Registration Plan and Agreement [Docket No.: FMCSA-2018-0068] (RIN: 2126-AC12) received February 8, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-

121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

188. A letter from the Ombudsman, Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Commercial Learner's Permit Validity [Docket No.: FMCSA-2016-0346] (RIN: 2126-AB98) received February 8, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mrs. LOWEY: Committee of Conference. Conference report on House Joint Resolution 31. Resolution making further continuing appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for fiscal year 2019, and for other purposes (Rept. 116-9). Ordered to be printed.

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. LANGEVIN (for himself, Mr. HURD of Texas, and Mr. ESPAILLAT):

H.R. 1153. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to direct the Secretary of Education to award institutions of higher education grants for teaching English learners; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

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

H.R. 1154. A bill to provide collective bargaining rights for public safety officers employed by States or their political subdivisions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. TITUS (for herself, Mr. MAST, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. ZELDIN, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. COHEN, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. TURNER, Mr. STAUBER, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. NORTON, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. POSEY, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. BEYER, Mr. SUOZZI, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. KATKO, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. CRIST, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. SOTO, Ms. BASS, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. WILD, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. WELCH, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. HURD of Texas, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. ESTES, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. LAMB, Mr. EVANS, Mr. NEGUSE, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. TONKO, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. SWALWELL of California, and Ms. JOHNSON of Texas):

H.R. 1155. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to prohibit the Secretary of Veterans Affairs from conducting medical research causing significant pain or distress to dogs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BACON (for himself, Mr. STAUBER, and Mr. RUTHERFORD):

H.R. 1156. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to improve the Law Enforcement Officer Safety Act and provisions relating to the carrying of concealed weapons by law enforcement officers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DESJARLAIS (for himself, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. BARR, Mr. COMER, Mr. BURCHETT, Mr. JOHN W. ROSE of Tennessee, Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee, Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. GREEN of Tennessee, and Mr. GUTHRIE):

H.R. 1157. A bill to amend the Horse Protection Act to provide increased protection for horses participating in shows, exhibitions, or sales, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MCCAUL (for himself, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. KATKO, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, and Mr. RATCLIFFE):

H.R. 1158. A bill to authorize cyber incident response teams at the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. CICILLINE (for himself, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, and Mr. YOUNG):

H.R. 1159. A bill to encourage the research and use of innovative materials and associated techniques in the construction and preservation of the domestic transportation and water infrastructure system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committees on Science, Space, and Technology, and Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SCHRADER (for himself, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. DEFazio, and Ms. BONAMICI):

H.R. 1160. A bill to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate segments of the Molalla River in the State of Oregon as components of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. CLEAVER (for himself and Mr. BANKS):

H.R. 1161. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to direct the Secretary of Education to develop a plain language disclosure form for borrowers of Federal student loans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. NAPOLITANO (for herself, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. ROUDA, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. VELA, Mrs. TORRES of California, Mr. CARBAJAL, Ms. HILL of California, Ms. TITUS, Mr. CISNEROS, Mr. HARDER of California, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, and Mr. SIRES):

H.R. 1162. A bill to establish a grant program for the funding of water recycling and reuse projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mrs. HARTZLER (for herself, Mr. BOST, Mrs. LESKO, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Mr. CORREA):

H.R. 1163. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the non-applicability of non-Department of Veterans Affairs covenants not to compete to the appointment of certain Veterans Health Administration personnel, to permit the Veterans Health Administration to make contingent appointments, and to require certain Veterans Health Administration physicians to

complete residency training; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. COLLINS of Georgia (for himself, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee, and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia):

H.R. 1164. A bill to direct the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts to consolidate the Case Management/Electronic Case Files system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FOSTER (for himself, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. SCHNEIDER, and Mr. CASTEN of Illinois):

H.R. 1165. A bill to modernize the National Air Toxics Assessment, the Integrated Risk Information System, and the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, and Mrs. BUSTOS):

H.R. 1166. A bill to support carbon dioxide utilization and direct air capture research, to facilitate the permitting and development of carbon capture, utilization, and sequestration projects and carbon dioxide pipelines, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Science, Space, and Technology, Natural Resources, and Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana (for himself and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER):

H.R. 1167. A bill to create a zero interest loan program for Federal and District of Columbia employees furloughed or excepted from such furlough during a lapse in Federal appropriations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. RYAN (for himself, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. CLARKE of New York, and Mr. SOTO):

H.R. 1168. A bill to advance STEM education, provide for improved worker, training, retention, and advancement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Energy and Commerce, Financial Services, Transportation and Infrastructure, Science, Space, and Technology, Natural Resources, Oversight and Reform, Foreign Affairs, and the Judiciary, 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. CICILLINE (for himself, Ms. OMAR, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. PHILLIPS, and Ms. NORTON):

H.R. 1169. A bill to provide for the adjustment of status of certain nationals of Liberia to that of lawful permanent residents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DEFazio:

H.R. 1170. A bill to enhance Social Security benefits and ensure the long-term solvency of the Social Security program; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Education and Labor, and Transportation and Infrastructure, 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. DEFazio (for himself, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. KATKO, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms.

TITUS, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. PAPPAS, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. SIREs, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. HECK, Ms. NORTON, Mr. WELCH, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. SOTO, and Mr. McEACHIN):

H.R. 1171. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to ensure that revenues collected from passengers as aviation security fees are used to help finance the costs of aviation security screening by repealing a requirement that a portion of such fees be credited as offsetting receipts and deposited in the general fund of the Treasury; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. KILDEE (for himself and Mr. DEFAZIO):

H.R. 1172. A bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to provide for automatic continuing appropriations, to withhold the pay of the President and Members of Congress during any period in which such automatic continuing appropriations are in effect, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations, and in addition to the Committees on Oversight and Reform, House Administration, and the Budget, 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. WILLIAMS:

H.R. 1173. A bill to require that \$1 coins issued during 2019 honor President George H.W. Bush and to direct the Secretary of the Treasury to issue bullion coins during 2019 in honor of Barbara Bush; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. CARBAJAL (for himself, Mr. BACON, Ms. STEFANIK, and Mr. TAKANO):

H.R. 1174. A bill to amend chapter 81 of title 5, United States Code, to create a presumption that a disability or death of a Federal employee in fire protection activities caused by any of certain diseases is the result of the performance of such employee's duty, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KIND (for himself, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. BRINDISI, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. REED, Mr. GOMEZ, and Mr. FERGUSON):

H.R. 1175. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reform taxation of alcoholic beverages; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LEVIN of Michigan (for himself, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. GALLEG0, Mr. KIM, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PAPPAS, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and Ms. WILD):

H.R. 1176. A bill to repeal the restriction on the use of funds by the Securities and Exchange Commission to ensure that shareholders of corporations have knowledge of corporation political activity; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. SPANBERGER (for herself, Ms. SHALALA, and Mr. BROWN of Maryland):

H.R. 1177. A bill to provide for continuing appropriations in the event of a lapse in appropriations under the normal appropriations process, other than for the legislative branch and the Executive Office of the President; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. SPANO (for himself and Mr. WALTZ):

H.R. 1178. A bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to provide for automatic con-

tinuing appropriations, to withhold the pay of Members of Congress during any period in which such automatic continuing appropriations are in effect, to prohibit the use of funds for the official travel of Members of Congress during any period in which such automatic continuing appropriations are in effect, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations, and in addition to the Committee on House Administration, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. ADAMS (for herself and Mr. McEACHIN):

H.R. 1179. A bill to amend title 54, United States Code, to establish within the National Park Service the African American Burial Grounds Network, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BEYER (for himself and Mr. RASKIN):

H.R. 1180. A bill to provide for a period of continuing appropriations in the event of a lapse in appropriations under the normal appropriations process, and to prohibit consideration of other matters in the House of Representatives if appropriations are not enacted; to the Committee on Appropriations, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, 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 Mrs. BUSTOS (for herself, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. COOPER, Mr. ROSE of New York, Mr. VAN DREW, Mr. HARDER of California, Ms. SHERRILL, Mrs. AXNE, Ms. WILD, Ms. HAALAND, Mrs. MCBATH, Mr. CASTEN of Illinois, Mr. MALINOWSKI, Mrs. LEE of Nevada, Mr. STANTON, Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas, Ms. HILL of California, Ms. TORRES SMALL of New Mexico, Mrs. CRAIG, Mr. O'HALLERAN, and Mr. CROW):

H.R. 1181. A bill to require certain individuals employed by the Federal Government to give 30 days written notice to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate for certain obligations or expenditures over \$5,000 to furnish or redecorate the office of such individual, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Ms. JUDY CHU of California:

H.R. 1182. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to ensure access to acupuncture services through the Department of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. JUDY CHU of California:

H.R. 1183. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to ensure access to qualified acupuncture services for military members and military dependents, to amend title 38, United States Code, to ensure access to acupuncture services through the Department of Veterans Affairs, to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage of qualified acupuncture services under the Medicare program; to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize the appointment of qualified acupuncturists as officers in the commissioned Regular Corps and the Ready Reserve Corps of the Public Health Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Armed Services, Veterans' Affairs, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. DEGETTE (for herself, Mr. Tipton, Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana, Mr.

CARTWRIGHT, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. KILMER, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. POCAN, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. WELCH, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. DEAN, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. TORRES SMALL of New Mexico, and Mr. GARAMENDI):

H.R. 1184. A bill to establish an Every Kid Outdoors program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committees on Agriculture, and Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. DELAURO (for herself, Mr. NEAL, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PAYNE, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. COHEN, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. WELCH, Ms. OMAR, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Ms. HILL of California, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. HASTINGS, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. NADLER, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. POCAN, Ms. MOORE, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mrs. MURPHY, Ms. SHALALA, Ms. FRANKEL, Ms. DEGETTE, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. RYAN, Mr. GOMEZ, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mrs. TORRES of California, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. KILMER, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. DEAN, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. SOTO, Mr. DOGGETT, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. TONKO, Mr. SARBANES, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. NEGUSE, Mrs. CRAIG, Mrs. HAYES, Mrs. TRAHAN, Mr. CRIST, Mrs. MCBATH, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. SABLON, Mr. BERA, Ms. ESHOO, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. EVANS, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Ms. WILD, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. TRONE, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. PRESSLEY, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. GALLEG0, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. BEYER, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. GONZÁLEZ of Texas, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. KIND, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. NORCROSS, Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL, Mr. MORELLE, Ms. SCANLON, Mr. HIMES, Mr. HORSFORD, Ms. MENG, Mr. RUSH, Ms. SHAKOWSKY, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Ms. SLOTKIN, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. WEXTON, Ms. STEVENS, Mr.

JEFFRIES, Ms. UNDERWOOD, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. ROSE of New York, Mr. MALINOWSKI, Ms. HOULAHAN, Ms. SCHRIER, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. KEATING, Mr. COX of California, Mr. SIRES, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. MCEACHIN, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. KIM, Ms. ADAMS, Ms. HAALAND, Mr. SMITH of Washington, and Mr. DELGADO):

H.R. 1185. A bill to provide paid family and medical leave benefits to certain individuals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DEUTCH (for himself, Mr. NADLER, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. TITUS, Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. BERA, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CASE, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. COOPER, Mr. CRIST, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. DESAULNIER, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. FRANKEL, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. LYNCH, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCEACHIN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MORELLE, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. PETERS, Ms. PINGREE, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. ROSE of New York, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. SIRES, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. SOTO, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. CISNEROS, Mr. NEGUSE, and Mr. GARAMENDI):

H.R. 1186. A bill to regulate large capacity ammunition feeding devices; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ESPAILLAT:

H.R. 1187. A bill to amend the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 to require congressional notification if relatives or financial associates of the President are granted security clearances contrary to the advice or recommendation of a background investigation or determination of an adjudicating agency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. GOLDEN (for himself, Mr. CASTEN of Illinois, Ms. SLOTKIN, Mr. CISNEROS, Mr. ROSE of New York, and Ms. PINGREE):

H.R. 1188. A bill to shorten monopoly periods for prescription drugs that are the subjects of sudden price hikes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico (for herself, Mr. SABLÁN, Mr. SAN NICOLAS, Ms. PLASKETT, and Mrs. RADEWAGEN):

H.R. 1189. A bill to repeal section 12616 of the Agriculture Improvement Act of 2018, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, 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. GOSAR (for himself, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. DUNCAN, and Mr. BABIN):

H.R. 1190. A bill to prohibit an alien who is not in a lawful immigration status in the United States from being eligible for post-secondary education benefits that are not available to all citizens and nationals of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Education and Labor, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GRIJALVA (for himself, Ms. DELAUNO, Mr. SERRANO, Mrs. TORRES of California, Mrs. RADEWAGEN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. CRIST, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. LUJÁN, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. GALLEGU, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. NORTON, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mr. MULLIN, Ms. MOORE, Mr. COLE, Ms. HAALAND, and Mr. SOTO):

H.R. 1191. A bill to amend section 520E of the Public Health Service Act to require States and their designees receiving grants for development and implementation of statewide suicide early intervention and prevention strategies to collaborate with each Federally recognized Indian tribe, tribal organization, urban Indian organization, and Native Hawaiian health care system in the State; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GROTHMAN (for himself, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. KING of Iowa, and Mr. DIAZ-BALART):

H.R. 1192. A bill to improve school safety; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HIMES (for himself, Mr. ROUDA, Ms. SHERILL, Mr. KILMER, Mr. GALLEGU, Mrs. LURIA, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. COOPER, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. WELCH, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. CASTEN of Illinois, and Mr. SCHRADER):

H.R. 1193. A bill to prohibit funds available for the United States Armed Forces to be obligated or expended for introduction of United States Armed Forces into hostilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Armed Services, and Rules, 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. KENNEDY (for himself, Mr. BANKS, and Mr. MOULTON):

H.R. 1194. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permit fellowship and stipend compensation to be saved in an individual retirement account; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KING of New York (for himself, Mr. RYAN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. NORTON, Mr. COLE, Mr. CARBAJAL, Ms. PINGREE, Mrs. MURPHY, Mr. CRIST, Mr. WELCH, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. MENG, Mr. PALLONE, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. COHEN, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mr. ROSE of New York, Mr. KILMER, and Mr. HIGGINS of New York):

H.R. 1195. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to include certain Federal positions within the definition of law enforcement officer for retirement purposes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. KING of New York (for himself, Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico, Mr. WELCH, Ms. WILD, Ms. GABBARD, and Mr. GARAMENDI):

H.R. 1196. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow an increased work opportunity credit with respect to recent veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LARSEN of Washington (for himself, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. NORTON, Mr. TONKO, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. HECK, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. KIND, Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. KILMER, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, and Mr. HASTINGS):

H.R. 1197. A bill to establish a pilot program to promote public-private partnerships among apprenticeships or other job training programs, local educational agencies, and community colleges, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. LEE of Nevada (for herself, Mr. HORSFORD, Ms. TITUS, and Mr. AMODEI):

H.R. 1198. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 404 South Boulder Highway in Henderson, Nevada, as the "Henderson Veterans Memorial Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mrs. LURIA:

H.R. 1199. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to conduct a study regarding the accessibility of websites of the Department of Veterans Affairs to individuals with disabilities; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. LURIA (for herself and Mr. BOST):

H.R. 1200. A bill to increase, effective as of December 1, 2019, the rates of compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities and the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation for the survivors of certain disabled veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LYNCH (for himself, Mr. TONKO, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. GALLEGU, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. COHEN, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. MCEACHIN, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. CRIST, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. HIMES, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. WELCH, Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. CARBAJAL, and Mr. MCGOVERN):

H.R. 1201. A bill to direct Federal departments and agencies to perform certain functions to ensure that climate change-related impacts are fully considered in the development of national security doctrine, policies, and plans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Armed Services, Foreign Affairs, Science, Space, and Technology, and Intelligence (Permanent Select), 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. MCHENRY:

H.R. 1202. A bill to reauthorize the Blue Ridge National Heritage Area; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. MITCHELL:

H.R. 1203. A bill to strengthen and enhance the authority to discipline officers and employees of the Federal Government for violating the Anti-Deficiency Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. MITCHELL:

H.R. 1204. A bill to amend title 44, United States Code, to require the Administrator of

the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs to review regulations, and for other purposes; Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, 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 Mrs. MURPHY (for herself and Mr. FITZPATRICK):

H.R. 1205. A bill to amend the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to prohibit an adjournment for a period of more than 12 hours in the event of a lapse in appropriations; to the Committee on Rules, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, 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 Mrs. RADEWAGEN:

H.R. 1206. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to clarify that noncitizen nationals of the United States who are children of United States citizens are eligible for United States citizenship, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. RADEWAGEN:

H.R. 1207. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to include United States nationals among the eligible employees of an EB-5 commercial enterprise, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. RADEWAGEN:

H.R. 1208. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to waive certain requirements for naturalization for American Samoan United States nationals to become United States citizens, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD (for herself and Mr. CALVERT):

H.R. 1209. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to ensure that non-animal methods are prioritized, where applicable and feasible, in proposals for all research to be conducted or supported by the National Institutes of Health, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. RUIZ (for himself, Mr. COOK,

Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. KILMER, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mr. PETERS, Mr. VELA, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. WEXTON, and Mr. CARBAJAL):

H.R. 1210. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to make reforms to the benefits for Public Service Officers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 1211. A bill to amend the Ohio & Erie Canal National Heritage Canalway Act of 1996 to repeal the funding limitation; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. THOMPSON of California:

H.R. 1212. A bill to amend section 1126 of title 41, United States Code, to provide for an exception for failure to deliver goods or complete work due to a lapse in appropriations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. THOMPSON of California:

H.R. 1213. A bill to provide compensation for Federal contractors impacted by a lapse in appropriations; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ (for herself, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. CISNEROS, Ms. MOORE, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, and Mr. SERRANO):

H.R. 1214. A bill to prohibit certain funds from being transferred or reprogrammed to plan, develop, or construct a new physical barrier along the Southwest border, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WALBERG:

H.R. 1215. A bill to amend titles II and XVIII of the Social Security Act to establish a Social Security Surplus Protection Account in the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund to hold the Social Security surplus and a Medicare Surplus Protection Account in the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund to hold the Medicare surplus, to provide for suspension of investment of amounts held in such Accounts until enactment of legislation providing for investment of the Trust Funds in investment vehicles other than obligations of the United States, and to establish a Social Security and Medicare Part A Investment Commission to make recommendations for alternative forms of investment of the Social Security and Medicare surpluses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WELCH (for himself, Mr. STAUBER, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. POCAN, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. BEYER, Mrs. CRAIG, Mr. COLLINS of New York, and Mr. GROTHMAN):

H.R. 1216. A bill to revise the authorized route of the North Country National Scenic Trail in northeastern Minnesota and to extend the trail into Vermont to connect with the Appalachian National Scenic Trail, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. GIBBS (for himself, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. WEBER of Texas, and Mr. DUNCAN):

H.R. 1217. A bill to amend the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 to prohibit a State from registering an individual to vote in elections for Federal office held in the State unless the individual provides documentary proof that the individual is a citizen of the United States; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. YOUNG (for himself and Mrs. RADEWAGEN):

H.R. 1218. A bill to establish the American Fisheries Advisory Committee to assist in the awarding of fisheries research and development grants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. DAVIDSON of Ohio, Mr. PERRY, Mr. HICE of Georgia, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. ROY, Mr. GOSAR, and Mr. GREEN of Tennessee):

H.J. Res. 45. A joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2019, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. WOMACK (for himself, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. HILL of Arkansas, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. CRAWFORD, and Mrs. RADEWAGEN):

H. Con. Res. 18. Concurrent resolution recognizing the rich history, heritage, and strategic

importance of the Republic of the Marshall Islands and the Marshallese population residing in the United States; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committees on Oversight and Reform, Armed Services, and Foreign Affairs, 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. JEFFRIES:

H. Res. 125. A resolution electing Members to certain standing committees of the House of Representatives and ranking Members on a certain standing committee of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. DESAULNIER (for himself and Ms. LEE of California):

H. Res. 126. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding the necessity to publically exonerate the African-American sailors of the United States Navy who were tried and convicted of mutiny in connection with their service at the Port Chicago Naval Magazine in Concord, California, during World War II in order to further aid in healing the racial divide that continues to exist in the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ENGEL (for himself, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. SHERMAN, and Mr. YOHO):

H. Res. 127. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives on the importance and vitality of the United States alliances with Japan and the Republic of Korea, and our trilateral cooperation in the pursuit of shared interests; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ESPAILLAT:

H. Res. 128. A resolution recognizing Black History Month and the contributions of Harlem to American history and culture; to the Committee on Education and Labor, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, and Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. FRANKEL (for herself, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. CICILLINE, and Ms. WILD):

H. Res. 129. A resolution condemning the Government of Saudi Arabia's continued detention and alleged abuse of women's rights activists; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LIPINSKI (for himself, Mr.

LARSEN of Washington, Mr. KILMER, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. TONKO, Mr. RUSH, Mr. RYAN, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. REED, Ms. SHERRILL, Mr. KEVIN HERN of Oklahoma, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. CASTEN of Illinois, Mr. GALLEGO, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mrs. LURIA, Mr. SIRES, and Ms. HOULAHAN):

H. Res. 130. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of Engineers Week; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, and in addition to the Committee on Education and Labor, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

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. LANGEVIN:

H.R. 1153.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. KILDEE:

H.R. 1154.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

By Ms. TITUS:

H.R. 1155.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. BACON:

H.R. 1156.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. DESJARLAIS:

H.R. 1157.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3. Congress shall have power to regulate commerce with Foreign Nations, and among the several states, and with Indian Tribes.

By Mr. MCCAUL:

H.R. 1158.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. CICILLINE:

H.R. 1159.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. SCHRADER:

H.R. 1160.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the authority to act under Article I, Section 8, clause 3—the Commerce Clause.

By Mr. CLEAVER:

H.R. 1161.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 and Clause 3 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution. [Page H8225]

By Mrs. NAPOLITANO:

H.R. 1162.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1, Clause 3, and Clause 18 of the Constitution.

By Mrs. HARTZLER:

H.R. 1163.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18; and Article VI, Clause 2 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. COLLINS of Georgia:

H.R. 1164.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. FOSTER:

H.R. 1165.

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 1 and 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. PETERS:

H.R. 1166.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana:

H.R. 1167.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S.C. Art. 1, Sec. 8, cl 18

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 1168.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 : “To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.”

By Mr. CICILLINE:

H.R. 1169.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. DEFAZIO:

H.R. 1170.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress)

By Mr. DEFAZIO:

H.R. 1171.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress)

By Mr. KILDEE:

H.R. 1172.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H.R. 1173.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 5 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution: “The Congress shall have the power . . . to coin Money, regulate the Value thereof, and of foreign Coin, and fix the Standard of Weights and Measures.”

By Mr. CARBAJAL:

H.R. 1174.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause I of the United States Constitution

By Mr. KIND:

H.R. 1175.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. LEVIN of Michigan:

H.R. 1176.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 1 of the Constitution.

By Ms. SPANBERGER:

H.R. 1177.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7

By Mr. SPANO:

H.R. 1178.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 9, Clause 7 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. ADAMS:

H.R. 1179.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8.

By Mr. BEYER:

H.R. 1180.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7 (the Appropriations Clause) of the U.S. Constitution

By Mrs. BUSTOS:

H.R. 1181.

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. JUDY CHU of California:

H.R. 1182.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article 1 of the United States Constitution

By Ms. JUDY CHU of California:

H.R. 1183.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article 1 of the United States Constitution

By Ms. DEGETTE:

H.R. 1184.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

clause 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution

By Ms. DELAURO:

H.R. 1185.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution and Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. DEUTCH:

H.R. 1186.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. ESPAILLAT:

H.R. 1187.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

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;

or

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.

By Mr. GOLDEN:

H.R. 1188.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico:

H.R. 1189.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 3 and 18 of the U.S. Constitution, which provide as follows:

The Congress shall have Power To [. . .]

To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes; [. . .]—And

To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. GOSAR:

H.R. 1190.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 4 (the Naturalization Clause) and Section 5 of Amendment XIV (the Enforcement Clause). In *Oregon v. Mitchell*, the Supreme Court declared that Congress may ban state actions

that violate the Fourteenth Amendment. Furthermore, in the Chamber of Commerce v. Whiting and Cox v. Shalala, the Supreme Court found that state laws are preempted if they conflict with federal law.

By Mr. GRIJALVA:

H.R. 1191.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Const. art. I, §§ 1 and 8.

By Mr. GROTHMAN:

H.R. 1192.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. HIMES:

H.R. 1193.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, clauses 11, 12, 13, 14, 18

By Mr. KENNEDY:

H.R. 1194.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 (relating to the power of Congress to provide for the general welfare of the United States) and Clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in congress).

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 1195.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 6

The Congress shall have Power . . . To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 1196.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. LARSEN of Washington:

H.R. 1197.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 1—All legislative powers hereingranted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

By Mrs. LEE of Nevada:

H.R. 1198.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 7 of the United States Constitution known as the Postal Clause or the Postal Power.

By Mrs. LURIA:

H.R. 1199.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 5 of Section 8 of Article 1 of the Constitution.

By Mrs. LURIA:

H.R. 1200.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 5 of Section 8 of Article 1 of the Constitution.

By Mr. LYNCH:

H.R. 1201.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress shall have Power . . . To make all Laws which shall be necessary and

proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. MCHENRY:

H.R. 1202.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, clause 2 provides Congress with the power to "dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory and other Property belonging to the United States."

By Mr. MITCHELL:

H.R. 1203.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 9, Clause 7 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. MITCHELL:

H.R. 1204.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mrs. MURPHY:

H.R. 1205.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 5, which enables each chamber to determine the rules of its proceedings.

By Mrs. RADEWAGEN:

H.R. 1206.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mrs. RADEWAGEN:

H.R. 1207.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mrs. RADEWAGEN:

H.R. 1208.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD:

H.R. 1209.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. RUIZ:

H.R. 1210.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

clause 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 1211.

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 Mr. THOMPSON of California:

H.R. 1212.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1

By Mr. THOMPSON of California:

H.R. 1213.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ:

H.R. 1214.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, 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.

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7

No money shall be drawn from the treasury, but in consequence of appropriations made by law; and a regular statement and account of receipts and expenditures of all public money shall be published from time to time.

By Mr. WALBERG:

H.R. 1215.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1—The Congress shall have power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

By Mr. WELCH:

H.R. 1216.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, 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.

By Mr. GIBBS:

H.R. 1217.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 4, Clause 1: The Times, Places, and Manner of holding Elections for Senators and Representatives, shall be prescribed by each state by the legislature thereof; but the Congress may at any time by Law make or such Regulations, except as to the Places of Chusing Senators

By Mr. YOUNG:

H.R. 1218.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, 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."

By Mr. BIGGS:

H.J. Res. 45.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I of the U.S. Constitution

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

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

H.R. 20: Mr. BROOKS of Alabama and Mr. TIMMONS.

H.R. 38: Mr. GUEST and Mr. FULCHER.

H.R. 51: Mr. SAN NICOLAS.

H.R. 93: Mr. SMITH of Washington.

H.R. 95: Mr. MEEKS, Mr. WILLIAMS, Ms. HAALAND, Ms. HOULAHAN, Mr. MALINOWSKI, and Mr. VARGAS.

H.R. 99: Mr. BOST.

H.R. 129: Mr. CASE.

H.R. 140: Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee.

H.R. 141: Mr. KEATING and Mr. SUOZZI.

H.R. 188: Ms. SHERRILL and Mr. DELGADO.

H.R. 205: Mr. GALLAGHER.

H.R. 210: Mr. RASKIN and Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 219: Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. ROONEY of Florida, Mr. MARCHANT, and Mr. HUIZENGA.

H.R. 230: Mr. ENGEL, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. NADLER, and Ms. WILD.

H.R. 262: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 276: Mr. WALDEN, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, and Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.

H.R. 296: Mrs. ROBY and Mr. BROOKS of Alabama.

H.R. 299: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. MCCAUL, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. HILL of California, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. LEVIN of California, Mr. RIGGLEMAN, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. PERRY, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. HUNTER, Mrs. LURIA, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. WEBER of Texas, and Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 303: Mr. COHEN, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mrs. RODGERS of Washington, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. TURNER, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. VELA.

H.R. 309: Mr. MORELLE.

H.R. 332: Mr. DEFazio.

H.R. 336: Mr. MAST, Mr. WALDEN, and Mr. FULCHER.

H.R. 339: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 365: Mr. SOTO.

H.R. 367: Mr. GIBBS, Mr. CLAY, Mr. COMER, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. GREEN of Tennessee, and Mr. RATCLIFFE.

H.R. 369: Mr. TURNER.

H.R. 372: Mr. CARBAJAL and Mr. GARAMENDI.

H.R. 400: Mr. NORMAN, Mr. KIM, and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.

H.R. 415: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ and Mr. MEEKS.

H.R. 437: Mr. CARTER of Georgia.

H.R. 478: Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 479: Mr. WEBER of Texas.

H.R. 489: Mr. HARDER of California.

H.R. 490: Mrs. ROBY.

H.R. 500: Ms. SLOTKIN and Mrs. TRAHAN.

H.R. 510: Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. POCAN, Mr. UPTON, Mr. RUSH, Mr. PASCRELL, Mrs. HARTZLER, and Mr. BYRNE.

H.R. 512: Ms. GARCIA of Texas.

H.R. 516: Mr. ALLEN.

H.R. 540: Mr. RUSH and Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 553: Mr. CISNEROS, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. GIANFORTE, Mr. STEWART, and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.

H.R. 555: Mrs. TRAHAN, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. SOTO, and Mr. KHANNA.

H.R. 573: Mr. BARR, Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania, Mr. COLE, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. WALTZ, and Mr. CLOUD.

H.R. 578: Mr. LYNCH.

H.R. 579: Mr. HUNTER.

H.R. 580: Mr. HUNTER.

H.R. 583: Miss RICE of New York, Mr. COLLINS of New York, and Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 587: Ms. WILD, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. GREEN of Tennessee, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. MARCHANT, Mrs. ROBY, and Mr. BISHOP of Utah.

H.R. 588: Mr. PETERS.

H.R. 612: Mr. WEBER of Texas and Mr. PALMER.

H.R. 613: Mr. NORMAN, Mr. BRINDISI, Mr. HIMES, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. LUETKEMEYER.

H.R. 621: Mr. LUETKEMEYER.

H.R. 625: Mr. BUDD.

H.R. 628: Mr. NORMAN, Mrs. HARTZLER, and Mr. CARTER of Georgia.

H.R. 635: Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 636: Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. JACKSON LEE, and Ms. TITUS.

H.R. 643: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY and Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 647: Mr. LOWENTHAL and Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 652: Ms. JUDY CHU of California.

H.R. 664: Mr. BUCHSHON.

H.R. 669: Mrs. WATERS and Mrs. BEATTY.

H.R. 671: Mr. HUDSON.

H.R. 689: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 692: Mr. STAUBER, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. TURNER, and Mr. CARTER of Georgia.

H.R. 693: Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. TURNER, Mr. DELGADO, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. PERRY, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. BRINDISI, Ms. WEXTON, Mrs. TRAHAN, Mr. WALTZ, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. EVANS, Mr. EMMER, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Mr. BROWN of Maryland.

H.R. 712: Mr. WALTZ, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. BRINDISI.

H.R. 714: Mr. GOODEN, Mr. BUDD, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. DAVIDSON of Ohio, and Mr. PALMER.

H.R. 720: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 724: Mr. SOTO, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. BUCHSHON, and Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 728: Mr. COLE, Ms. WILD, and Mr. O'HALLERAN.

H.R. 732: Miss RICE of New York, Mr. BRINDISI, Ms. HAALAND, and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.

H.R. 736: Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 740: Mr. KELLY of Mississippi.

H.R. 756: Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas.

H.R. 759: Mr. CLAY, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Ms. ESCOBAR, and Ms. GARCIA of Texas.

H.R. 762: Miss RICE of New York.

H.R. 784: Mr. WOMACK, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. MAST, Mr. PENCE, Mr. TIMMONS, and Mr. BURCHETT.

H.R. 787: Mr. TURNER.

H.R. 803: Mr. CRAWFORD.

H.R. 804: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 806: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 809: Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 810: Mr. LANGEVIN.

H.R. 811: Mrs. LESKO.

H.R. 813: Mr. HASTINGS and Mr. ESPAILLAT.

H.R. 820: Mr. QUIGLEY.

H.R. 824: Mr. POSEY and Mr. YARMUTH.

H.R. 837: Mr. HUDSON and Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 845: Mr. HARDER of California.

H.R. 847: Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. POSEY, Mr. HUIZENGA, and Mr. WRIGHT.

H.R. 850: Mr. BUCHSHON.

H.R. 854: Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. CICILLINE, and Mrs. MURPHY.

H.R. 856: Mr. WRIGHT, Mr. STAUBER, and Mr. GOSAR.

H.R. 870: Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. HASTINGS, and Ms. ADAMS.

H.R. 872: Mr. KATKO, Mr. CASTEN of Illinois, and Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 874: Mr. MEEKS, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. PETERS, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. RYAN, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. SOTO, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. KILMER, Mr. RUSH, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and Mr. CRIST.

H.R. 879: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 882: Ms. SCANLON.

H.R. 886: Ms. TORRES SMALL of New Mexico and Mr. VARGAS.

H.R. 889: Ms. HILL of California.

H.R. 900: Mr. SABLAN.

H.R. 915: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 919: Mr. SCHNEIDER.

H.R. 935: Mr. BYRNE.

H.R. 940: Mr. NORMAN.

H.R. 945: Mr. DEFazio and Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 946: Ms. PINGREE and Mr. COOPER.

H.R. 949: Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. TURNER, Mr. PALMER, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. MEADOWS, and Mr. MASSIE.

H.R. 951: Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas.

H.R. 958: Ms. HAALAND.

H.R. 961: Mr. MAST, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. RESCHENTHALER, Mr. DELGADO, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Ms. WILD, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. KATKO, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. RYAN, Mr. CALVERT, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 962: Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. COMER, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. WOMACK, and Mr. SPANO.

H.R. 978: Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. CISNEROS, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. DELAULO, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. SPEIER, and Mr. LANGEVIN.

H.R. 987: Mr. WELCH and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 989: Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. HARDER of California, and Ms. WILD.

H.R. 1002: Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and Mr. RYAN.

H.R. 1004: Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. YARMUTH, and Ms. TITUS.

H.R. 1007: Mr. SUOZZI and Mr. NORCROSS.

H.R. 1008: Mr. MITCHELL.

H.R. 1010: Mr. WELCH and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 1011: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 1012: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.

H.R. 1013: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.

H.R. 1019: Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. GOLDEN, and Mr. KENNEDY.

H.R. 1027: Mr. ESTES.

H.R. 1044: Mr. GOLDEN, Mr. THORNBERRY, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. BUCHSHON, Mr. GOODEN, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. SCHNEIDER, and Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 1049: Mr. WATKINS.

H.R. 1050: Mr. MALINOWSKI and Mrs. LURIA.

H.R. 1055: Mrs. TRAHAN.

H.R. 1059: Mr. WATKINS and Mr. WALKER.

H.R. 1066: Mr. YOHO and Mr. COX of California.

H.R. 1069: Mr. HASTINGS and Ms. MOORE.

H.R. 1073: Mr. HORSFORD, Ms. TITUS, and Ms. MENG.

H.R. 1077: Mr. CLOUD and Mr. BUDD.

H.R. 1080: Ms. LEE of California, Mr. PANNETTA, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. CISNEROS, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. LOWENTHAL, and Mr. SOTO.

H.R. 1108: Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. COHEN, Mr. COURTNEY, Mrs. CRAIG, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. FINKENAUER, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. KILMER, Mr. KING of New York, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. MALINOWSKI, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PAPPAS, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. ROUDA, Mr. RYAN, Mr. SRES, Mr. STANTON, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. TITUS, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, and Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 1109: Mr. POCAN, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. SAN NICOLAS, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. SERRANO, and Mrs. DINGELL.

H.R. 1126: Mr. RUTHERFORD.

H.R. 1134: Ms. TITUS.

H.R. 1135: Mr. JOYCE of Ohio.

H.R. 1140: Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, and Ms. TITUS.

H.R. 1142: Mrs. LOWEY, Mrs. TORRES of California, Mr. DESAULNIER, and Mr. FOSTER.

H.R. 1146: Mr. CASE, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Ms. MOORE, and Mr. LEVIN of Michigan.

H.J. Res. 2: Ms. ESHOO.

H.J. Res. 4: Mr. RICE of South Carolina.

H.J. Res. 20: Mr. RIGGLEMAN.
H.J. Res. 33: Mr. WELCH.
H.J. Res. 35: Mr. HIMES, Ms. PORTER, Mr. BRINDISI, and Mr. HIGGINS of New York.
H.J. Res. 44: Mr. SIRES, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. SHALALA, and Ms. WILSON of Florida.
H. Con. Res. 10: Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. RIGGLEMAN, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. BUDD, and Mr. CLINE.
H. Con. Res. 14: Mr. BEYER and Mrs. LURIA.
H. Con. Res. 15: Mr. DESAULNIER and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
H. Res. 23: Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. WELCH, Mrs. LOWEY, and Ms. TITUS.
H. Res. 33: Mr. TAKANO.
H. Res. 34: Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, and Ms. TITUS.
H. Res. 49: Mr. SPANO.
H. Res. 54: Mr. WATKINS, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, and Ms. TITUS.
H. Res. 58: Ms. HOULAHAN.

H. Res. 60: Mr. CARBAJAL, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. LAMB, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. KILDEE, Mrs. DEMINGS, Ms. TITUS, and Mr. LOWENTHAL.
H. Res. 72: Mr. FULCHER, Mr. COOK, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. BERGMAN, Mr. EMMER, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. SMUCKER, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. BANKS, Mr. GREEN of Tennessee, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. HAGEDORN, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mrs. MILLER, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. PENCE, Mr. KATKO, Mr. LONG, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. COMER, Mr. WALTZ, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. DUNN, Mr. FLORES, Mr. STEWART, Mr. GIANFORTE, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. TURNER, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. ARRINGTON, and Mr. STAUBER.
H. Res. 104: Mr. KILMER, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. HAALAND, and Mr. WATKINS.
H. Res. 106: Mr. COHEN, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. MOORE, and Mr. RASKIN.
H. Res. 110: Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. BANKS, Mr. DAVIDSON of Ohio, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Mr. KEVIN HERN of Oklahoma, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. GREEN of Tennessee, Mr.

MCKINLEY, Mr. WALTZ, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. KING of Iowa, and Mr. ROUZER.

H. Res. 112: Mr. DEUTCH and Mr. HASTINGS.
H. Res. 116: Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. TURNER, and Mr. HECK.

H. Res. 119: Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. BERA, and Mr. CASE.

H. Res. 124: Mr. VARGAS, Mr. HECK, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. YARMUTH, Mrs. TORRES of California, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mrs. LEE of Nevada, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, and Mr. MOULTON.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

H.R. 940: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.

NOTICE

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of February 13, 2019, in Book II.)



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 165

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 13, 2019

No. 28

Senate

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. GRASSLEY).

PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

Almighty God, our refuge and strength, Your Kingdom cannot be shaken. We praise You that more things are wrought by prayer than we can imagine. We are grateful for Your invitation to ask and receive, to seek and find, and to knock for doors to open.

May this prayer that opens today's session be a springboard for our lawmakers to communicate with You throughout the day. May they pause repeatedly during their challenging world to ask You for wisdom and guidance. Lord, empower the members of their staffs and all who labor for liberty to harness prayer power continuously.

We pray in Your powerful Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

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

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DAINES). Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

MEASURE PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—S. 464

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I understand there is a bill at the desk due for a second reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the title of the bill for a second time.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 464) to require the treatment of a lapse in appropriations as a mitigating condition when assessing financial considerations for security clearances, and for other purposes.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, in order to place the bill on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I object to further proceedings.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection having been heard, the bill will be placed on the calendar.

GOVERNMENT FUNDING

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, yesterday Chairman SHELBY, Ranking Member LEAHY, and their House counterparts continued finalizing their legislative proposal to fund the government. Their negotiated solution would wrap up this year's appropriations and avoid another partial government shutdown.

As our colleagues hammer out the final details, I would like to thank them again for their cooperative, bipartisan efforts that have brought us to this point. The agreement reached on Monday was achieved because the conference committee set aside far-left poison pills and utterly absurd demands. None of these radical non-starters was allowed to torpedo the process.

Notwithstanding weeks of over-the-top rhetoric from Speaker PELOSI, the agreement did not cave to the far-left demand that no more than a single dollar go toward new barriers on the southern border—no, indeed, it provides well over a billion such dollars.

The negotiators also prevented last-minute efforts to hamstringing the U.S. Immigrations and Customs Enforcement with an unprecedented statutory limit on their ability to detain criminal aliens in the interior of our country.

Instead, here is what their agreement does provide. It provides another significant downpayment on the President's plan to secure our Nation's borders with new physical barriers and keep American communities safe. It provides nearly \$1.4 billion for new barriers in the Border Patrol's highest priority areas—enough to build nearly twice as many miles as were funded last year. It gives ICE the capacity and the flexibility to continue responding to surges in illegal immigration. It continues to provide the President with appropriate reprogramming authority, so he can direct additional funding toward urgent homeland security priorities should circumstances require. Of course, in addition to all this, the legislation will wrap up all our outstanding regular appropriations bills and get the entire Federal Government funded the right way.

It goes without saying that neither side is getting everything it wants. That is the way it goes in divided government. If the text of the bill reflects the principles agreed to on Monday, it won't be a perfect deal, but it will be a good deal.

I hope that our colleagues will complete the process of turning these principles into legislation soon and final text that can become law before this Friday's deadline.

We can't let any unrelated, cynical, partisan plays get in the way of finishing this important process. I understand, for example, that Speaker PELOSI and House Democrats are apparently objecting, believe it or not, to a modest extension of the Violence Against Women Act. They want this authority to expire on Friday.

Republicans believe that we should follow standard procedure and extend

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



Printed on recycled paper.

S1285

this important legislation through the end of the fiscal year, which is about 7 months. There are new chairmen in this Congress of both the Senate and House Judiciary Committees, and a modest extension of this authority would allow them to work on a longer term reauthorization of this important law. In addition, a modest extension of this law is consistent with how this matter has been handled in the past. Every time a continuing resolution was necessary in the past Congress, Republicans made sure it included an extension of VAWA.

I don't know what cynical ploy my Democratic colleagues may be trying to pull here, but surely no political maneuvering should be worth letting the Violence Against Women Act lapse this Friday, 2 days from now. It is time to get this done.

H.R. 1

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, as I alluded to earlier this week, I have a feeling this conference is just getting started discussing Speaker PELOSI's signature bill, H.R. 1. I, for one, am eager to continue shining the spotlight on the Democrat Politician Protection Act and asking why, exactly, Washington Democrats are so intent on assigning themselves a whole lot more power over what American citizens can say about politics, how we can say it, and how we cast our ballots.

Remember, among the many fairly blatant power plays built into this legislation is a naked attempt to turn our neutral Federal Election Commission into a partisan weapon. The FEC is a body that, since Watergate and for obvious reasons, has had an even-numbered membership and equal division between the two parties. Enforcement and penalty require both parties to agree, or at least one Commissioner from one party has to agree with three Commissioners of the other party. This is meant to ensure that complaints are evaluated on their substance, not for purely political considerations.

I guess Speaker PELOSI and her colleagues are tired of playing fair and trying to persuade the old-fashioned way because the Democrat Politician Protection Act would take the FEC down to a five-member body and give sitting Presidents—listen to this one—it would give sitting Presidents the power to appoint the Chairperson. They would turn the FEC into a nakedly partisan body and give the sitting President the power to appoint the Chairperson—where his or her party would have a 3-to-2 advantage—who holds the keys to determine whom to investigate and what enforcement to pursue.

The evenness of the FEC is a vital way to ensuring that Americans' political speech and campaigns for public office are regulated fairly and evenhandedly. Of course, that needs to be done on a bipartisan basis, but the Democrats want to throw that right

out the window and carve out a partisan majority on this crucial Commission.

This proposal is outrageous enough on its face, but just wait until you hear about all the new things the Democrat Politician Protection Act would let this newly partisan FEC actually do.

First, they turn it over to the party of the President, so they have a clear majority to go after the minority. But let's see what they can do. There are incredibly vague new standards that seem tailor-made to give this partisan FEC the maximum latitude to penalize or silence certain speech. You begin to get the picture. Of course, this partisan FEC is going to want to silence the voices of its opponents.

Let me give a few examples.

The newly partisan FEC would be handed the ability to determine what kind of speech is "campaign-related"—growing its jurisdiction and widening its bureaucratic wingspan over more of the public discourse, including issues of the day and not just elections.

Private citizens, for example, would be required to make the government aware of times they spend even small amounts of money in engaging in First Amendment activities. Private citizens have to notify the government if they are going to engage in spending small amounts of money on First Amendment activities—on expressing themselves—or they will face penalties. More speech would fall into this category whereby Americans would have to dutifully notify Federal bureaucrats that they are speaking their minds or else pay a fine. To put it another way, it is free speech as long as you fill out government forms and mail a couple of carbon copies to Washington.

In other cases, the Democrats want to impose stunningly vague, broad, and potentially unconstitutional restrictions on the abilities of all kinds of advocacy groups—on all sides of the political spectrum—to exercise their constitutional right to speak out about elected politicians and their positions on substantive issues.

Let's go over that again because I know this is a technical subject.

Under the guise of cracking down on "super PAC coordination," the Democrats want to give a partisan FEC new powers to prohibit advocacy groups from weighing in on politicians' job performances and the issues of the day under a broad set of new conditions. Washington Democrats want individual American citizens, civic groups, trade associations, labor unions, and non-profits to face more restrictions, more hurdles, and more potential penalties for daring to have opinions about the political races that decide who goes to Washington in the first place.

Call me old-fashioned, but I remember when both political parties were more interested in trying to win debates than in trying to shut down debates. This will be an FEC designed to stifle free speech and tilt the playing field in the direction of the President's

party. I remember when constitutionally minded leaders on both sides of the aisle would have recoiled at efforts to chill or even to prohibit a private citizen's ability to speak.

Let's not forget, in every one of these cases, when these fuzzy, new lines and vague rules need enforcing, who has the final say? Why, it is the newly partisan Federal Election Commission that determines who gets to speak and who doesn't. My Democratic colleagues are trying to muddy the rule book and mount a hostile takeover of the referees all at the same time.

Let me just close with this. Back in 1974, as the creation of the FEC was debated here in this Chamber, California Democratic Senator Alan Cranston gave this warning: "The FEC has such a potential for abuse in our democratic society that the President should not be given power over the Commission." Wise words.

Back then, a California Democrat was warning against a partisan takeover of the American electoral system. It is the distinguished Member of the House from San Francisco, Speaker PELOSI, who is now, today, cheerleading for that very change.

The Democratic Party has changed its views on this subject a lot in the last 45 years, but the purpose of the FEC has not changed one bit, and neither has the importance of the First Amendment.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to resume consideration of the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of William Pelham Barr, of Virginia, to be Attorney General.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

GOVERNMENT FUNDING

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, we have a clear and obvious way to avoid another government shutdown in 48 hours. The conference committee has

done its job. It has forged a bipartisan agreement that would keep the government open through September as well as provide additional border security.

As with all bipartisan agreements, it is the product of compromise. Each side gave a little; each side got a little. The conferees deserve our praise for their hard work, their commitment, and their success.

This agreement is the last train leaving the station away from another dreaded government shutdown. The last time we were all in this situation, the President signaled his support for a government funding bill, only for him to retreat at the last possible moment—precipitating the longest shutdown in our history. It was the Trump shutdown, and he now seems to admit that again.

No one wants to see a rerun of that movie. The President must not repeat his mistakes of the recent past.

President Trump, sign this bill.

Neither side got everything it wanted in this bill, but both sides wanted to avoid another shutdown—Democrats and Republicans, House and Senate.

President Trump, sign this bill.

The parameters of the deal are good. It provides additional funding for smart, effective border security. Let me repeat that. It does not fund the President's wall, but it does fund smart border security that both parties support. It also provides humanitarian assistance and beefs up security at our ports of entry. Though it hasn't been discussed much during the negotiations, the passage of this agreement clears the way for the six bipartisan appropriations bills that have languished. These bills contain important priorities, including more support for infrastructure, housing, Tribal healthcare, the census, and money to combat the opioid crisis. I look forward to passing all of these appropriations bills, alongside the DHS agreement, this week.

One of the last things that has to be dealt with is the negotiating of a good compromise to fix some of the problems that have been created by the Trump shutdown. We are trying to get the conferees to approve a proposal to deal with Federal contractors. Thousands of Federal contractors have not been reimbursed from the 35-day shutdown. This issue is still hanging in the balance. The Republicans should join the junior Senator from Minnesota and the Democrats in approving this legislation as soon as possible.

The contractors, many of them just working people, are in the same boat as government employees, except they haven't gotten their backpay. They should. No one should stand in the way of that. It is just not fair to them. They were hostages, just like the government workers were hostages. So I hope we can include that in these final hours of negotiations. It is very important.

Now, the only remaining obstacle to avoiding a government shutdown is the

uncertainty of the President's signature. So I repeat my request: President Trump, say you will sign this bill. Remove the ax hanging over everyone's head. To make progress in our democracy, you have to accept the give-and-take. You have to accept some concessions. You have to be willing to compromise.

Any American President who says my way or no way does a real disservice to the American people. President Trump, in politics, to quote the Rolling Stones, "You can't always get what you want." It is time to put the months of shutdown politics behind us.

NOMINATION OF MICHAEL PARK

Mr. President, on another matter, today the Judiciary Committee is holding a confirmation hearing on the nomination of Mr. Michael Park for the Second Circuit Court of Appeals, which covers my home State of New York.

I have always assessed judges on three criteria: excellence, moderation, diversity. While Michael Park satisfies the first and third prongs of my test, he fails miserably on the second—modification.

Mr. Park has spent much of his career working in opposition to civil rights and seeking to advance the rightwing agenda that lies at the very core of the Federalist Society's mission. Mr. Park is currently working to defend the Trump administration's effort to insert a citizenship question into the 2020 census—a cynical effort to discourage people from responding to the census.

He has been on the frontlines of the effort to dismantle affirmative action policies in education. In 2012, he submitted an amicus brief to the Supreme Court, writing on behalf of the petitioner who sought to have the university's use of race, as one consideration among many, in the admissions process struck down as unconstitutional.

He is currently representing the plaintiffs in a suit challenging Harvard's affirmative action policy. He has worked to deny women's reproductive freedoms when he represented the State of Kansas against a challenge to its attempt to defund Planned Parenthood and ban it from participating in the State Medicaid Program.

In 2012, he submitted a brief to the Supreme Court in *NFIB v. Sebelius* urging the Court to strike down the entire Affordable Care Act. This nominee rather wants to get rid of the whole ACA.

If the American people knew the kind of nominees President Trump is nominating and the kind of nominees the Republican majority is supporting, so against everything they believe in—America believes in *Roe v. Wade*, America believes in keeping the ACA, America believes in voting rights—if they knew all these details, they would be appalled, and our Republican colleagues rarely bring these things to the floor legislatively. They know they would be roundly defeated, but it is sort of an end run—pick judges who in

the courts will uphold these unpopular positions.

Mr. Park has a long and detailed record of support for the most conservative legal causes. A judge is asked to interpret the law rather than make the law, to apply fairly the legal principles set forth by precedent, not reread the Constitution to fit the political cause of the moment.

Mr. Park's career does not give me the confidence that he can be an impartial arbiter on the Second Circuit. I will oppose his nomination, and I will urge my colleagues to do the same.

Now, in the not-so-distant past, my objection to this nomination would mean that the chairman of the Judiciary Committee would not move forward with the nomination out of respect for home State Senators in the blue-slip tradition—but not in this Congress, not with this Republican majority.

Since the election of President Trump, Senate Republicans, led by Leader McCONNELL, Chairman GRASSLEY, and now Chairman GRAHAM, have unceremoniously discarded the blue-slip tradition. My colleagues on the other side will say it is because we haven't worked with them in a timely manner to fill these vacancies, but let's not kid ourselves. This is about one thing and one thing alone—the desire of the Republican majority to ram through more of the Federalist Society's handpicked, hard-right judges.

Last Congress, the majority confirmed two judges over the blue-slip objections of Democratic Senators BALDWIN and CASEY. A third, Ryan Bounds, would have been confirmed over the objections of Senators WYDEN and MERKLEY if not for Senator SCOTT's principled objection to Bounds' past racist writings.

The practice continues, unfortunately, in this Congress. Last week, the Judiciary Committee voted along party lines to advance an additional four circuit court nominees over the blue-slip objections of five Democratic Senators—BROWN, MURRAY, CANTWELL, BOOKER, MENENDEZ—and in the coming weeks, the committee will move forward with two additional court nominees over the objections of Ranking Member FEINSTEIN and Senator HATCH.

Last Congress, we worked with the White House to move eight New York judges—one circuit, seven district—through the Judiciary Committee in a bipartisan way. That is how it should work. I would like to cooperate on New York judges this Congress, but the continued consideration of Michael Park, combined with the majority's clear intentions to ignore the blue-slip tradition, makes this very difficult, if not impossible. I know the leader is proud of what he is doing on judges. I don't think history will look very kindly on it; A, putting such hard-right judges, so against what the American people believe, in office. History will not look kindly on that as their decisions come down; but second, eliminating the last

vestiges of bipartisanship as we select judges.

NOMINATION OF WILLIAM BARR

Mr. President, finally, the Senate will soon resume debate on the nomination of William Barr to be the Attorney General. I oppose this for many reasons, and later today I will join my Democratic colleagues during debate time to lay out my opposition to this nominee.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I thank the leader for his comments. I want to just say that the Democrats on the Judiciary Committee agree with him, and on their behalf, I would like to make the following comments.

Last week, the Judiciary Committee voted on the nomination of William Barr to be Attorney General of the United States. All Democrats voted against the nomination. There are reasons.

There is no question that Mr. Barr is qualified. He previously served as Attorney General from 1991 to 1993, and he has had a long legal career, but the question before us is whether Mr. Barr is the right choice to lead the Justice Department, at this time, with this President, when there are currently several active investigations that implicate this President, his campaign, his advisers, and/or his inner circle.

The answer for me and the Judiciary Committee Democrats is no. Let me explain why. Five months before being named for the Attorney General position, Mr. Barr wrote an extensive 19-page, single-spaced memo in which he provided great detail and legal arguments for his view of the President's absolute authority. Mr. Barr then shared and discussed that memo with the White House Counsel and the President's defense lawyers.

In this memo, Mr. Barr outlined his views on Special Counsel Mueller's investigation into possible obstruction of justice, the unitary executive, and whether a President can, in fact, be indicted.

One example, Mr. Barr argued that Special Counsel Mueller should not be allowed to question the President about obstruction of justice—point 1.

He concluded that the law does not apply to the President if it conflicts with a broad view of Executive authority, and that view is often referred to as the unitary executive.

Under this belief, conflict of interest laws cannot and do not apply to the President of the United States because, as Mr. Barr writes in his memo, "to apply them would impermissibly 'disempower' the President from supervising a class of cases that the Constitution grants him the authority to supervise. Under the Constitution, the President's authority over law enforcement matters is necessarily all-encompassing."

Read the memo. This is on page 11.

Further, Mr. Barr asserted that "the Constitution, itself, places no limit on

the President's authority to act on matters which concern him or his own conduct."

Mr. Barr went on to explain that, in his view, President Trump would have virtually unlimited authority over the Executive branch. As he said in his memo, the President "alone is the Executive branch. As such, he is the sole repository of all Executive powers conferred by the Constitution. Thus, the full measure of law enforcement authority is placed in the President's hands, and no limit is placed on the kinds of cases subject to his control and supervision."

That is page 11 of the memo.

Importantly, based on these conclusions, Mr. Barr asserts that certain Presidential actions—including firing FBI Director James Comey or telling the FBI to go easy on Michael Flynn—is never obstruction of justice.

In fact, Mr. Barr even said that "the President's discretion in these areas has long been considered 'absolute,' and his decisions exercising this discretion are presumed to be regular and are generally deemed nonreviewable."

That is page 10 in the memo.

This is a stunning legal argument. Taken to its natural conclusion, Mr. Barr's analysis squarely places this President above the law. To argue that the President has no check on his authority flies in the face of our constitutional principles of checks and balances and should be concerning to Democrats and Republicans.

Mr. Barr's views about the power of the President are especially troubling in light of his refusal to commit to making the special counsel's findings and the report publicly available, and his refusal to agree to protect the other investigations into President Trump.

When I asked Mr. Barr about this at the hearing, he said, in his own words, that he would "make as much information available as I can consistent with the rules and regulations that are part of the special counsel regulations."

When others pressed him, he changed his answer to suggest that he may instead release a summary of the special counsel's findings. This is not acceptable. There is nothing in existing law or regulations that prevents the Attorney General from sharing the special counsel's report and underlying factual findings with the American public. Many of us believe this report is seminal to the Presidency, and the public must be able to read it.

In addition, as part of our oversight responsibilities, Congress routinely requests and receives confidential information related to closed investigations. In fact, recently Congress asked for and received investigative information, including transcripts of FBI interviews of witnesses involved in the examination of Secretary Clinton's emails. This matter should be treated no differently.

After Mr. Barr's hearing, I sent him two letters. First, I asked him to pro-

vide Congress and the American public with the full accounting of the Mueller investigation, including any report prepared by the special counsel himself.

Secondly, I asked him in writing to commit to protecting all investigations into matters surrounding President Trump and the 2016 election.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these two letters 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, January 17, 2019.

MR. BARR: I very much appreciated your responses to questions before the Committee and hearing directly from you on many important issues. As I noted during the hearing, ensuring access to Mueller's findings and recommendations—unchanged—is of utmost importance. To this end, I and others asked you about releasing the report as drafted from the Special Counsel. When I first asked you, you clearly stated you would provide the report. Specifically, I asked,

"Will you commit to making any report Mueller produces at the conclusion of his investigation available to Congress and to the public? And you responded, 'As I said in my statement, I am going to make as much information available as I can consistent with the rules and regulations that are part of the special counsel regulations.'"

I then asked, "Will you commit to making any report on the obstruction of justice public?" You responded, "That is the same answer. Yes."

Later as others pressed you on these answers you expanded by saying:

"As the rules stand now, people should be aware that the rules I think say that the Special Counsel will prepare a summary report on any prosecutive or declination decisions, and that that shall be confidential and shall be treated as any other declination or prosecutive material within the Department."

In fact the regulations state, "At the conclusion of the Special Counsel's work, he or she shall provide the Attorney General with a confidential report explaining the prosecution or declination decisions reached by the Special Counsel."

As you may be aware, there is nothing in the regulations saying the report should be "treated as any other" Department material, nor is there anything defining confidential. Finally, there is no language in the regulations indicating that Congress cannot have access—especially when the materials in question relate to a completed investigation.

It is also worth noting that in the most recent past practice, the Department has provided Congress with investigative reports and other materials, including notes and summaries of witness interviews. Specifically, with regard to the investigation into Secretary Clinton the Department provided investigative reports, as well as notes and summaries of witness interviews. As you testified "the country needs a credible resolution of these issues" which argues in favor of complete transparency and public disclosure of as much information as possible, consistent with national security and active law enforcement needs.

I would appreciate your response on this as quickly as possible, and prior to the Committee's consideration of your nomination in our Executive Business meetings.

Sincerely,

DIANNE FEINSTEIN,
U.S. Senator.

U.S. SENATE,

Washington, DC, February 7, 2019.

WILLIAM P. BARR,
Kirkland & Ellis LLP,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. BARR: I am writing to follow up on my January 17 letter about Special Counsel Mueller's investigation, and regarding other investigations that implicate the President's interests. As you know, you were asked numerous questions about both the Mueller investigation as well as investigations in the Southern District of New York, Eastern District of Virginia, and District of Columbia.

As raised at your hearing, it is imperative that all of these investigations be free from any interference and allowed to continue. In your June 2018 memo, you took the position that "no limit is placed on the kinds of cases subject to [the President's] control and supervision," including "matters in which he has an interest." While you testified that you would not stop these investigations, you qualified your answer by saying "if I thought it was a lawful investigation." When asked if the President could fire prosecutors on these cases, you responded that "the President is free to fire his, you know, officials that he has appointed."

This gives you, and the President, considerable discretion and power over these investigations. I therefore ask for your commitment that these investigations will be allowed to proceed without interference, and for an explanation of how you will safeguard their independence and integrity, if confirmed.

Thank you for your attention to these important matters.

Sincerely,

DIANNE FEINSTEIN,
U.S. Senator.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. I did not receive the courtesy of a response to either letter.

Here is a man seeking approval of his appointment. The ranking member of the Judiciary Committee sends him a letter asking two very valid questions, and there is no response. That told me something very loud and clear.

Over the past year, we have seen several other investigations arising out of the Southern District of New York, the Eastern District of Virginia, and the District of Columbia, where prosecutors are looking into crimes involving foreign donations into the Trump inauguration committee, money laundering, campaign finance violations, as well as possible efforts by Russian agents to assist the Trump campaign during the election. When asked about these investigations at his hearing, Mr. Barr refused to pledge they would be protected from interference. He refused to pledge that these valid investigations would be protected from interference.

For example, Senator COONS asked, "If the President ordered you to stop the [Southern District of New York] investigation in which someone identified as individual one is implicated, would you do that?"

Mr. Barr responded that "every decision within the department has to be made based on the attorney general's independent conclusion and assessment that it's in accordance with the law, so I would not stop a bona fide lawful investigation."

However, this qualification of "a bona fide, lawful investigation" is all important. In his 19-page memo, Mr. Barr clearly wrote this: "The full measure of law enforcement authority is placed in the President's hands, and no limit is placed on the kinds of cases subject to his control and supervision," including "matters in which he has an interest." I really see why he was nominated. This is the offering of complete protection from the law by the Attorney General—future Attorney General, if he should become one.

Mr. Barr went on to argue that if the President determined "an investigation was bogus, the President ultimately had legitimate grounds for exercising his supervisory powers to stop the matter." This would mean that the President could stop the Mueller investigation, which the President has repeatedly described as a "witch hunt" and "hoax."

It also means that if Donald Trump decided the Southern District of New York's investigation was, in Mr. Barr's words, "bogus," the President would have the right to stop the investigation. Think about that. Think about the ramifications of that.

When Senator BLUMENTHAL asked Mr. Barr during his hearing, "If the President fired a United States attorney, would you support continuing that investigation, even under the civil servants, the career prosecutors, who would remain?"

Mr. Barr replied, "Yeah . . . I believe, regardless of who or what outside the department is trying to influence what is going on, every decision within the department relating to enforcement, the attorney general has to determine independently that—that it is a lawful action."

Think about that. The Attorney General becomes the arbiter, independently, of what a lawful action comprises. But, again, according to this memo, firing a U.S. attorney, even if it implicates the President's own personal interests, is a lawful action by the President.

During this hearing, Mr. Barr stated that "the President can fire a U.S. attorney. They are a presidential appointment."

The meaning of this is clear: Prosecutors in these cases can be fired arbitrarily by the President of the United States under his plenary authority.

As I said at the outset, the question is whether Mr. Barr is the right person for the job at this time. The memo that I am quoting from I spent a full day reading and thinking about, and it was the most extreme case for Presidential power that I have ever read. In and of itself, it gives me cause to believe this is why—I could be wrong, but this is why he received that nomination.

Given the broad implications of Presidential power and unlimited control Mr. Barr believes this President has over law enforcement matters, I cannot support this nominee to serve as Attorney General. At this critical time in

our Nation's history, we must have an Attorney General who is objective and who is clearly committed to protecting the interests of the people, the country, and the Constitution—not the President.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

S. 47

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, we are doing a number of important things in the Senate this week.

Last night, we passed the Natural Resources Management Act. This is a bipartisan package of more than 100 individual bills that will help protect our natural resources, spur economic development, increase access to public lands, and much more.

I was very pleased that my Custer County Airport Conveyance Act, which I introduced with the other Members of the South Dakota delegation, was included in this bill. This legislation will give Custer County Airport full ownership of the land on which it operates and allow the airport to make improvements to its facilities.

Custer County Airport supports business and recreational aviation and fire suppression efforts in the Black Hills region, and I am pleased that this bill will increase the airport's ability to serve this area of South Dakota.

I am grateful to Chairman MURKOWSKI for her leadership on this important lands package, as well as to Ranking Member MANCHIN and all of those who worked on these bills at the committee level.

NOMINATION OF WILLIAM BARR

Mr. President, last night, the Senate moved forward on William Barr's nomination to be Attorney General. We will have the final vote on that nomination later this week.

The President made an outstanding choice with Mr. Barr. Mr. Barr is eminently qualified to be Attorney General. In fact, he has already been Attorney General—under President George H.W. Bush. He also served as Assistant Attorney General in the Office of Legal Counsel at the Department of Justice and as Deputy Attorney General.

He has won respect from both sides of the aisle. He has been confirmed by the Senate without opposition—not once, not twice, but three times. He was unanimously confirmed as Attorney General under George H.W. Bush in a Democrat-controlled Senate. Then-Judiciary Committee Chairman Joe Biden described him as "a heck of an honorable guy."

Senator LEAHY also spoke at that time, expressing his belief that Mr. BARR would be "an independent voice for all Americans."

Today, Mr. Barr continues to earn respect from Democrats. The ranking member on the Judiciary Committee noted in January:

He's obviously very smart. He was attorney general before. No one can say he isn't qualified.

Mr. Barr is extremely smart and eminently qualified. He would be a judicious, thoughtful, and independent Attorney General, whose allegiance would be to, as he said, "the rule of law, the Constitution, and the American people." I hope the Senate will quickly confirm him in a bipartisan fashion.

GOVERNMENT FUNDING

Mr. President, the final order of business this week is funding the government. I am very pleased and encouraged that Chairman SHELBY and his counterparts have reached an agreement "in principle" to fully fund the government and fund important border security measures.

No one wants another government shutdown. I am very glad Democrats abandoned their efforts to force a cap on the number of individuals that Immigration and Customs Enforcement could detain in the interior of the country. If Democrats' enforcement cap had been adopted, Immigration and Customs Enforcement would have been forced to release criminals already in detention onto our Nation's streets. I am pleased that Democrats decided to separate themselves from the radical anti-border-security wing of their party. Instead, the deal will now give Immigration and Customs Enforcement the flexibility it needs to address surges of illegal immigration at our southern border.

I am also very glad Democrats moved from their insistence on zero funding for physical barriers at the border. Barriers are an essential element of border security, and I am pleased this compromise will allow 55 new miles of physical barriers in the Rio Grande Valley's sector, which is a high-priority area for the Border Patrol. That is double the number of new miles provided in fiscal year 2018 and nearly three times as many as would have been available under a continuing resolution.

I thank Chairman SHELBY and Members of both parties who have been working on a funding and border security deal, as well as the staffers who have worked nights and weekends, to help develop this agreement. I look forward to reviewing the final language and voting on a final funding and border security package later this week.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

GOVERNMENT FUNDING

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I appreciate the bipartisan conversation that is going on with the chair, and I hope more of that will go on. That really is a little bit of why I rise today, because I hope and pray that if there—while we have many legitimate policy dif-

ferences in this body, one thing we ought to have absolute, complete agreement on is that the United States of America cannot afford another government shutdown.

The last shutdown, which President Trump was so proud to initiate, cost our economy—and this is the lowest estimate we could find so we don't look like we are overstating—an estimated \$6 billion.

The truth is, that number hardly reflects the human cost of this self-inflicted disaster our country was led into. A recent survey found that 62 percent of Federal workers depleted most or all of their emergency savings, 42 percent of Federal workers took on debt to pay bills or other expenses, and 25 percent tapped their retirement accounts. If you tap your IRA, you pay tax penalties, and you get none of that reimbursed.

Listen to this: 25 percent of our Federal workers who were the victims of this shutdown—25 percent of our Federal workers, during this shutdown, had to visit a food bank. If you work for the United States of America, the greatest Nation in the world, and you are asked to show up to work without pay, you should not have to visit a food bank.

I spent most of my career in the private sector, and I am proud of those activities, but I know very few folks who work for any of my companies who would have continued to show up day in and day out to do their jobs if they were going for 35 days without pay—and 35 days without pay where, frankly, you had some Members of the so-called board, the Congress, who showed no appreciation at all for their suffering and many who said they didn't mind if that shutdown continued indefinitely.

Those fellow Americans are Federal workers, contractors, private businesses that support Federal installations or the campground outside the Shenandoah National Park or the restaurant outside Petersburg National Battlefield—not just Federal employees, folks in the private sector as well endured tremendous hardship because the President decided to use their livelihoods as a bargaining chip. That can't happen again.

While I want to always try to be optimistic and appreciate the bipartisan agreement that has been reached by the budget negotiators, unfortunately, we find ourselves in the same spot right now—potentially just days away from another Trump shutdown.

The President said he is not happy, but he won't say whether he will sign the bipartisan deal that came from the conference committee. Let's be clear. The uncertainty itself is having a negative impact on the operation of the Federal Government and costing taxpayer dollars each and every day that this cloud hangs over the government. Agencies are already interrupting investigations and canceling trainings and meetings. They are being forced to

act as if the government will once again be shut down at the end of this week. This is just plain mismanagement of government by the Trump administration. It is another example of the disrespect this White House has shown to our Federal workforce.

In Virginia, over the past few weeks, Senator KAINE and I have spent a lot of time listening to Federal workers. We heard from Federal workers who had to pull their kids out of daycare and send them away to relatives because they couldn't meet those daycare expenses if they weren't getting paid and folks who missed student loan payments or literally had to choose between their medications and paying rent. Now, these workers have started to receive some of their backpay, and many of them have not received all of their backpay from the shutdown.

The truth is, those Federal workers who drew down their savings or incurred a tax penalty from taking money from their IRA or who took an advance on their credit card are not made whole by receiving backpay because they have incurred penalties that will never be made up, beyond the psychic damage that is taking place with their families.

But even if we accept that most of the Federal workers will ultimately get their backpay, that is not the case for thousands of Federal contractors in Virginia and around the country. Quite honestly, the nightmare is not over.

The President's decision to finally reopen the government didn't magically undo 35 days of missed pay. Unfortunately, no one from the White House could be bothered to meet with any of these folks, whether it be Federal workers or contractors who were hurt by this government shutdown. If they had, they would know how much pain this President's shutdown continues to inflict on Federal contractors, particularly low- and middle-income workers. I spent the last couple of months, the last month and a half listening to these folks describe the anxiety of not knowing when their next paycheck will come or if it will come at all.

Sometimes when we think about Federal contractors, we think about high-priced folks, many of whom do a good job working for our government, many in my State. Sometimes that is the image of a Federal contractor. I wonder if most of the Members of this body realize that the people who clean the toilets at the Smithsonian or serve the food at the cafeteria in the Smithsonian are Federal contractors, and for the 35 days of the government shutdown—they have no recourse at this moment in time. They are struggling as we speak, and they will continue to struggle if Congress doesn't take advantage of this opportunity—if we get this deal signed by Friday and keep the government open—to make good on our commitment to those contractors as well. If we end up with the alternative and the government shuts down again, these folks' lives—at least their economic lives—will be in jeopardy.

A number of small businesses—women-owned businesses, minority businesses, veteran-owned businesses—that tried, through this last 35-day shutdown, to keep their workers on payroll had to take that money out of their business pockets to try to make ends meet. But after a couple of weeks, a lot of them couldn't afford to do that. Those businesses have shut down. Years and in certain cases decades of work down the drain, not because they did something that was mismanagement, not because they did something that was irresponsible, not because they weren't providing the taxpayers with the full value of their work, but because we here in Congress and the White House couldn't come to a common agreement on the most basic responsibility of government, which is to keep the doors open and the lights on.

I held a roundtable recently with a contractor in Springfield, VA. A contractor there named Barbara told me she is behind on her rent and had to take her granddaughter out of daycare because she can't pay the bills. Now, she is glad she is back at work, but that 35 days with no pay—unless we rectify that with this deal that may come to pass before the weekend, she is still left in the cold. Another at that same roundtable told me she had to choose between food and medicine.

A couple of weeks ago, I met a contractor named John, an Afghanistan veteran, who was picking up groceries at the food bank in Arlington because the shutdown wiped out his savings. We had some press, but John didn't want to go on camera. He was a little bit embarrassed that he had to pick up food at the food bank. This is someone who is a veteran. This is someone who continued to serve in terms of protecting the country. Thirty-five days without pay. With the status quo—he will never get those lost earnings back if we don't rectify that this week.

Another contractor named Joseph, who works as a custodian at the Department of the Interior, told me this:

We work just as hard as anyone else. We need our backpay so we can catch up on our bills and survive.

The remarkable thing is, for some of these janitors and custodial workers, on buildings that were open, they had to continue to work and still don't get backpay.

One of the most heartbreaking things was listening to these contractors talk about the shame—the shame of being treated as if their work does not have value. The truth is, these folks take pride in their work because they love their country. That same contractor, Joseph, says he thinks of the building he cleans as the President's house, and he works hard because he wants to make it shine every day. What a disgrace that this government can't even honor his service with back wages so that he can pay his bills and get his personal finances in order.

Many other contractors take pride in their work because it represents their

independence. Over 45,000 disabled Americans work as Federal contractors through the AbilityOne Program. I know this program is very successful in Delaware. The Senator from Delaware will speak on it shortly.

I have met contractors who are double amputees, veterans with PTSD, and folks with physical and intellectual disabilities. They are able to live normal lives and contribute to society because of these Federal contractor jobs. For many of them, these jobs are more than about pay. It is about respect. It is about being valued and part of a community, part of a team at the offices they work in. They suffer more than just about anyone when their lifeline—that source of income, independence, and dignity—is cut off because of a government shutdown.

I will close with something a Federal contractor named Constance told me last week. Even though she and her team of custodians still face tremendous financial hardship, she told me that she remains hopeful. She is hopeful because she and her coworkers are now back to work, and she is hopeful because people in this Chamber are finally starting to listen to folks like her.

I share her hope that the Senate will have the decency and the basic humanity to make sure, one, that we don't close down this government come Friday, and two, that when we come to this deal, we take that moment—and I see colleagues from both sides of the aisle. We have gotten the CBO score. It is scored to make sure the backpay for the contractors, with an emphasis toward low-income contractors, under \$50,000—the cost would be at \$1 billion. That is the CBO score. We ought to make sure that these people's lives—that the work they do is valued.

I hope, as we have this bipartisan deal to avoid the shutdown, that we can also make it right for the folks who oftentimes many of us don't see—who clean the buildings, serve the food, many folks from the disabled community—who rely upon us to do the right thing.

Congress should pass this backpay for Federal contractors legislation. The President should sign it, and if the President doesn't, the Congress should override his veto.

Let's make sure, as we did with Federal workers, that they will always be assured that they will get their backpay. Let's make sure that contractors get that same decency. It is time to do the right thing.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

NOMINATION OF WILLIAM BARR

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I rise today to offer briefly my remarks on the nomination of William Barr to serve as Attorney General of the United States.

This past Thursday, when the Judiciary Committee of the Senate considered him, I was absent, being the co-

chair of the National Prayer Breakfast. I would like to offer my conclusions briefly here on the floor.

I have weighed carefully over several weeks William Barr's nomination to serve as the next Attorney General. Initially, I have to say, I was greatly encouraged that the President nominated a nominee whose service had included leadership roles in the Justice Department, including Attorney General of the United States.

However, I believe my responsibility to assess Mr. Barr's candidacy requires me to consider his entire record, including his recent writings, his statements, and his work, and to focus on his ability to actually meet the test of our current time. Having met with him in person, having questioned him during the Judiciary Committee's confirmation hearing, having reviewed his record, and having reviewed his written answers to questions submitted for the record, I ultimately believe Mr. Barr does not meet this test. I am not confident that he will uphold the Attorney General's critical role in defending the Department of Justice as an institution and in ensuring that the special counsel's investigation proceeds with independence and, by so doing, restores the trust of the American people in the rule of law.

In weighing his nomination, the memo Mr. Barr chose to author in June 2018—and to submit—criticizing the special counsel's investigation into obstruction of justice, I concluded was significant and could not be ignored. Mr. Barr tried to narrow or minimize the import of this memo by saying it was a specific application to a particular statute. The fact remains that his memo is rooted in and embraces an exceptionally broad theory of executive power that could threaten not only the special counsel's investigation but a lot of our current understanding of the scope and reach of Executive power.

When I asked him if he had sent other lengthy, detailed legal memos he had researched and written himself to the Department of Justice as a private citizen, he could only cite that one memo from this year, dealing critically with the special counsel's investigation.

At his nomination hearing in the committee, I sought simple and concrete assurances from Mr. Barr that he would give the special counsel's ongoing investigation the independence and separation from partisan politics it needs and deserves. In some instances I was genuinely encouraged by his answers. I was glad to hear a forceful answer from Mr. Barr that he would not fire the special counsel without cause and would resign rather than do so, if so ordered.

On other issues, however, he failed to give the sort of simple and clear commitment that former Attorney General Elliot Richardson gave at his confirmation hearing before the Senate Judiciary Committee during the period of an

important investigation in the 1970s. Mr. Barr would not commit to following the guidance of career DOJ ethics officials on whether he should recuse himself. He would not commit to deferring to special counsel Mueller's investigative decisions. Finally, he would not commit to making special counsel Mueller's final report public. In essence, Mr. Barr is asking the American people and those of us who represent them to trust him to do the right thing. There are reasons to believe that he will, but there are, as I have laid out briefly, reasons to be gravely concerned that he will not.

Something my predecessor here in the Senate, Senator Joe Biden, expressed in voting to confirm him back in 1991, was his grave concerns about his expansive view of Executive power, but that was a very different time in our history, with a different Court and a different context.

I think we must be clear-eyed about the moment our country faces and the Attorney General's potentially pivotal role in ensuring the integrity of the rule of law and the institutions of our democracy. I believe it is my responsibility in the Senate to protect the special counsel investigation, to ensure that other ongoing Federal investigations are not interfered with because of a narrow or partisan purpose, and to safeguard the rule of law.

If Mr. Barr is confirmed, I hope he will prove me wrong. I hope he will demonstrate to the American people of all parties and backgrounds that he will put the interests of our democracy above the moment and partisan priorities. I hope he will prove to be a terrific, solid, and reliable steward for the ongoing investigation. Special Counsel Mueller is leading into Russian interference in the 2016 election. If so, I will gladly put aside our policy differences to work with him for the good of the American people during this critical time, but I regret I have reached the conclusion that I cannot support his nomination this week.

Thank you, Mr. President.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

BORDER SECURITY

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, on Monday, I was in El Paso, TX, to talk with some of my constituents about the challenges that exist along our south-west border and how we can work together to address them.

It is almost surreal to have people here in Washington, DC, who have never been to the border and whose, perhaps, only supposed knowledge is from novels they have read or movies they have seen. Having spent quite a bit of time along the border of Texas and Mexico, myself, I can tell you it is a unique part of our country and certainly a unique part of my State.

The people you learn the most from are not the elected officials who serve here in Washington but rather from the Border Patrol, the sheriffs, the mayors,

and countless others who live and work along the border. They can provide, I think, the kind of expert knowledge that we need in order to address the challenges that exist.

What they tell me and what I have learned is that there is no one-size-fits-all, because you can look at urban environments, like El Paso, or you can go out to Big Bend, which has thousands-of-feet-high cliffs overlooking the Rio Grande. Obviously, a physical barrier in one place, like in highly trafficked urban areas, is one situation, but putting it atop a 3,000-foot cliff is another. So no one-size-fits-all solution works.

That is why it is important to listen to the stakeholders who live and work in these communities, and this is key to actually doing something with the feedback they provide. What I have constantly been reminded of is that border security is a combination of three parts: physical barriers in some hard-to-control locations, personnel, and technology. What is best for a high-trafficked urban area, as I said, is probably much different than what is good for the vast expanses between the ports of entry. Figuring out what we need or where we need it is not a decision that ought to be micromanaged in Washington. It should come from the experts who know the threats and challenges along every mile of the border.

While I was in El Paso, we also talked—as we must—about the important role the border plays with our economy. Border communities in Texas depend on people and goods moving legally through our ports.

For example, in Laredo, TX, alone, about 14,000 trucks pass each day through the ports of entry. It is one of the largest if not the largest land-based port in the United States. These goods need to move legally through our ports, and any disruption in legitimate international commerce can have a swift impact on these communities.

For the people of El Paso, for example, border security means much more than just safety. It means economic security as well. Just as it is important to keep the bad actors out, it is equally important to promote efficient transit through our ports for legitimate trade and commerce.

On Monday, I also had a chance to reconnect with my friend Mayor Dee Margo, the Mayor of El Paso. Among other things, we talked about the importance of ensuring that in our efforts to create a strong border, we are not neglecting our ports of entry.

In recent months, a number of El Paso Sector Customs officers have been sent to other high-need areas along the U.S.-Mexico border. The personnel shortage has resulted in increased wait times for both pedestrian traffic and commerce. Certainly, fewer CBP agents mean a reduced vigilance in terms of screening out contraband and other things that we don't want coming into the country. The goods moving through the ports in El Paso fuel not just the local economy, as I said, but

also that of the entire State of Texas—and, I would argue, of the Nation. I share the mayor's concerns on the harmful impact these slowdowns at the ports of entry can have.

As we debate the importance of securing our borders to stop the illegal movement of people and goods, we shouldn't neglect the importance of facilitating legal movement through our ports. We need to do both, whether that means providing additional funding for infrastructure improvements or scanning technology to make sure the ports of entry aren't exploited by drugs in vehicles or other places where they are hard to find. In the absence of scanning technology, if we are unable to find them, the cartels win, and the American people lose. We also know that in addition to that technology, we need additional personnel.

I hope my colleagues listen to the feedback that we have all gotten from the experts and these local stakeholders and take seriously the economic impact on our ports of entry as well.

As I said yesterday, I look forward to reviewing the details of the funding agreement struck by the conference committee, and I hope that, in addition to physical barriers where appropriate, it reflects these principles of smart border security, because when we listen to the experts—the law enforcement officials who work along the border and in the communities—that is when we move in the right direction, spending money in a responsible and smart way rather than just pursuing political agendas from Washington.

NOMINATION OF WILLIAM BARR

Mr. President, we are also going to be voting—perhaps today, maybe tomorrow—on the nomination of William Barr to serve as the next Attorney General of the United States. The role of Attorney General is unique in the President's Cabinet because while you are a political appointee of the President, you are also the Nation's chief law enforcement officer and, obviously, are obligated to put your highest loyalty in upholding the rule of law.

I asked Mr. Barr about this unique role during his confirmation hearing. He told me that over the years he has received a number of calls from people who were being considered for appointment to the position of Attorney General. He told them that if they wanted to pursue any political future, they would be crazy to accept the job of Attorney General. He said: "If you take this job, you have to be ready to make decisions and spend all your political capital and have no future because you have to have that freedom of action." He assured me that he is in a position now in his life where he can do what he needs to do without fear of any consequences.

I was glad to hear that because I believe that is the most fundamental quality of an Attorney General. The Department of Justice must be able to operate above the political fray and

prioritize the rule of law above all else, and to do that it needs a strong and principled leader like Bill Barr—particularly, on the heels of Loretta Lynch's and Eric Holder's administrations as Attorneys General of the United States during the Obama term of office, where we know that, unfortunately, politics pervaded the actions not only of the Department of Justice but also the FBI in things ranging from the Hillary Clinton email investigation to the counterintelligence investigation of some of the people associated with the Trump campaign.

Of course, this isn't the only reason he is the right person for the job. We know that he can faithfully execute the duties of the office because he has done it before.

More than two decades ago, President George Herbert Walker Bush recognized the talent in this promising young attorney and nominated him to three increasingly important positions in the Department of Justice. For all three positions, Assistant Attorney General for the Office of Legal Counsel, Deputy Attorney General, and, finally, Attorney General, he was unanimously confirmed by the Senate. I would hope that he would be unanimously confirmed as Attorney General once again, but I have my doubts.

After hearing Mr. Barr speak about his views of the role of Attorney General, I have no question as to why not a single Senator opposed his nomination during those three previous confirmation votes. He spoke of the importance of acting with professionalism and integrity, of ensuring that the character of the Department of Justice is maintained and can withstand even the most trying political times, and of serving with independence, providing no promises or assurances to anyone on anything other than faithfully administering the rule of law.

When Mr. Barr was nominated for Attorney General the first time, then-Judiciary Chairman Joe Biden noted that Mr. Barr, a nominee from the opposing political party, would be a "fine Attorney General." I agree, and I thank Mr. Barr for agreeing to serve, once again, this country in this critical position. I look forward to voting yes on his nomination.

I would just add that I am saddened by the way the politics of the moment—the desire to defeat any legislation or oppose any nominee by this President—has led some of our colleagues across the aisle to oppose this nomination. I don't know whether it is out of fear of the most radical fringe of their political party or by their antipathy for this President, but it is regrettable.

I do believe, however, that Mr. Barr will be confirmed, as he should be, as the next Attorney General of the United States. I look forward to casting a "yes" vote on that nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. President, once again, I would like to respond to the

Senator from Texas as he continues to hold the position that the Democrats on this side of the aisle simply oppose all of the President's nominees because they happen to be this lying President's nominees. That is not the case at all.

Donald Trump has consistently thought to nominate people to his Cabinet who he believes will do his bidding and protect his interests. Once confirmed, if these Cabinet Secretaries displease him, out they go—Jeff Sessions, Jim Mattis, Rex Tillerson.

The President believes William Barr will be an Attorney General who will protect him. Why does the President believe that? Because William Barr auditioned for this position. How? Mr. Barr wrote a highly unusual and factually unsupported, unsolicited 19-page memo to the Sessions Justice Department, arguing that Special Counsel Robert Mueller should not be permitted to interrogate the President about obstruction of justice. Nobody asked him to weigh in.

He admits he didn't have any facts or inside information, and, in fact, Deputy Attorney General Rod Rosenstein chose not to discuss the matter with him, but Mr. Barr felt compelled not only to put his views in writing and send them to the Department of Justice, but he also made sure the President's lawyers knew his views. His memo sent a clear message to this President that he would protect Donald Trump from the Mueller probe.

Once Donald Trump did nominate him for Attorney General, after having earlier offered him a job as his personal attorney—virtually the same job in Donald Trump's mind—Mr. Barr came to the Judiciary Committee and continued to signal his willingness to shield Trump from scrutiny.

First, he refused to commit to follow the advice of career ethics officials on the question of recusal from the Trump investigations. He didn't want to make the same mistake Jeff Sessions did and open himself up to Presidential humiliation, no matter what the ethics experts recommended.

Second, he refused to commit to make public Special Counsel Mueller's report. In both instances, he said he wanted to keep his options open, leave himself room to make his own decisions, and trust his ultimate judgment.

While these answers were reassuring to the President, they certainly were not to those of us who want an Attorney General independent of a President who does not believe the rule of law applies to him. When asked at his hearing, Mr. Barr should have affirmatively committed to allowing all active investigations to continue until the prosecutors say they are done. That includes the special counsel's investigation, as well as the probes being conducted by, again, at least three U.S. attorney's offices. Instead, he gave his usual equivocal response.

Of course, these are all active investigations having to do with Mr. Trump

and his activities. Barr's position on these investigations is consistent with his views on the unitary Executive. He has long endorsed a view that the President is an all-powerful Executive, restrained by very little, least of all by Congress. This is a very dangerous view for the Attorney General to have, especially at a time when we have a President who attacks and undermines the rule of law.

Mr. Barr's views on the Trump investigations and the unitary Executive aren't the only reason he should not be confirmed as Attorney General. His agreement with this administration's immigration policy also, in my view, disqualifies him. There was no daylight between Donald Trump and Jeff Sessions on immigration. Mr. Barr has given every indication that he will follow the lead of Jeff Sessions and of Matthew Whitaker in aggressively implementing, basically, Stephen Miller's extreme immigration policies.

As George H.W. Bush's Attorney General, Barr played a key role in the Justice Department's policy in the early 1990s of detaining HIV-positive Haitian refugees at Guantanamo Bay. These refugees were held in prison-like living conditions and denied medical treatment until a Federal court ruled that their indefinite detention was illegal.

More recently, in November 2018, Mr. Barr cowrote an op-ed with the title "We Salute Jeff Sessions," full of praise for Sessions' tenure at DOJ, including on immigration. Mr. Barr praised Sessions for "attack[ing] the rampant illegality that riddled our immigration system, breaking the record for prosecution of illegal-entry cases," and increasing prosecution of "immigrants who reentered the country illegally" by 38 percent.

These statements are deeply concerning because as Attorney General, Mr. Sessions implemented policies that are abhorrent and in direct opposition to American values.

Sessions instituted the zero-tolerance policy—a stain on our Nation that resulted in thousands of children being separated from their families, many of whom may never be reunited. This country, under Jeff Sessions, made instant orphans out of thousands of children. That is hardly a value that I think any of us can support.

At his hearing, Mr. Barr also embraced key aspects of the Trump-Miller immigration agenda, including endorsing Donald Trump's vanity wall; attacking cities that refused to undermine their own anti-crime efforts by cooperating with the Federal Government's draconian policies; agreeing with the Trump administration's atrocious treatment of legal asylum seekers; joining President Trump in criticizing judges for blocking the President's Muslim travel ban; and astoundingly, refusing to say whether birthright citizenship is guaranteed by the Constitution, telling me, when I asked him this, that he hadn't "looked at that legally." What is there to look at?

The Fourteenth Amendment plainly states that all persons “born or naturalized in the United States . . . are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside.” Nullifying birthright citizenship would violate the Constitution and impact millions, but it is certainly something the President wants done.

Mr. Barr’s record and position on some of DOJ’s other important responsibilities, such as enforcing civil rights laws, defending laws enacted by Congress, and protecting established constitutional rights, are unacceptable to me in the Nation’s top law enforcement officer.

Some examples include: Mr. Barr’s refusal to admit that voter fraud is incredibly rare and his focusing on so-called voter fraud problems rather than voter suppression problems. States are very busy continuing to pass laws that should be attacked as a silly veiled effort at voter suppression, but that is not where Mr. Barr is; his stand that LGBTQ people are not protected from employment discrimination under Federal civil rights laws, contrary to what the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission and two Federal courts have held; his personal involvement in two challenges to major premises of the Affordable Care Act; his record of belief that *Roe v. Wade* was wrongly decided, including his statement that this landmark Supreme Court case guaranteeing a woman’s right to choose, as he put it, was a “secularist” effort to “eliminate laws that reflect traditional norms.” At a time when the newest Trump-appointed Justices on the Supreme Court have demonstrated a hostility toward a woman’s constitutional right to an abortion, such an anti-choice Attorney General is a danger to women.

In some of his academic writings, William Barr expressed his dismay at the moral decay of American society, but when I asked him at his hearing, he testified that he didn’t have any problems with a President who lies every single day and has undermined so many of America’s most important institutions such as the FBI, the Justice Department, and the intelligence community.

An Attorney General is a member of the President’s Cabinet and is entitled to enforce the administration’s policies, but in this instance, the policies this President pursues are often pushed beyond the constitutional breaking point and just as often are plain cruel; i.e., the separation of children from their parents at the border, making them instant orphans.

The Attorney General’s independence is critical in normal times, but it is absolutely essential in these times that are anything but normal that his independence cannot be questioned. Sadly, I cannot say that.

I cannot support William Barr’s nomination. I urge my colleagues to vote against his confirmation.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LANKFORD). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DURBIN. What is the pending business before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Barr nomination is pending before the Senate.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I rise to speak about the nomination of William Barr to be the next Attorney General of the United States.

Mr. Barr has an admirable record of public service in his career. He has dramatically more qualifications and experience than many of his predecessors and, certainly, the Acting Attorney General. We can see he brings more experience to the job.

I respect Mr. Barr and his family. I have told him as much to his face. He has a wonderful family, and he brought them with him to the hearing, and many of them have chosen public service careers, as he has.

I carefully reviewed his record, trying to consider him in not only the context of this awesome responsibility of being Attorney General, but at this awesome moment in history.

When it comes to the ongoing investigation of President Trump’s campaign by Robert Mueller, I fear that Mr. Barr has said and done things that raise questions about his objectivity. He has clearly indicated to President Donald Trump and to all of us how he would oversee this investigation if he is confirmed. Just look at the unsolicited—unsolicited—19-page memo that William Barr sent to Special Counsel Mueller’s supervisors and to the Trump legal defense team just in June of 2018.

It is notable that Mr. Barr did not send this memo to Special Counsel Mueller himself, and he did not make it public.

This was the only time Mr. Barr had sent a memo like this to the Justice Department, and he did not disclose in his memo that he had personally interviewed with the President the previous year about serving on the President’s defense team.

This memo is critical for its substance. In it, Mr. Barr argued that Bob Mueller, the investigator, the special counsel, should not be permitted to ask the President any questions about obstruction of justice, even though Mr. Barr’s analysis focused only on one narrow obstruction theory.

The memo calls into serious question Mr. Barr’s ability to impartially oversee the obstruction of justice issues in the Mueller investigation at a moment in history when that is an essential question. Mr. Barr has made no commitment to recuse himself from such questions. That is worrisome.

That William Barr would volunteer a 19-page legal memo with dramatic efforts at research and verification, give this to the President’s defense team and to Mr. Mueller’s supervisors at the Department of Justice, and basically make arguments diminishing the authority of the special counsel to move forward in the investigation raises a serious question about his impartiality.

Just as important, I am alarmed by Mr. Barr’s continued hedging about what he will do when Mr. Mueller completes his investigation and has a presentation of his conclusions, his evidence, and his findings.

Make no mistake. Special Counsel Mueller’s findings and conclusions should be shared with the American people and with the U.S. Congress. Current Department of Justice regulations and policies allow for such a release. I am concerned that Mr. Barr will exercise his discretion under those regulations narrowly and issue a cursory report that does not take the findings of the Mueller investigation in their entirety and make them available to the American people. This investigation is too critical to seal its result in some vault at the Department of Justice.

I believe we can trust Bob Mueller to be impartial and unbiased. I don’t know if he will find the President or people around him guilty of wrongdoing beyond the indictments and convictions that have already come down or whether he will conclude that there is no further responsibility or culpability, but I trust his findings, whatever they are. He is a true professional.

It is important, after we have gone through a year or two of investigation, that the American people hear the details, hear the information that may be part of the Mueller investigation.

I am also concerned that Mr. Barr will continue his predecessor’s harsh approach on immigration instead of charting a different course.

It was just last year, I believe in April in 2018, when the Attorney General Jeff Sessions announced something called the zero-tolerance policy.

Do you remember it?

The zero-tolerance policy said that the U.S. Government would forcibly remove infants, toddlers, and children from their parents at our border.

The inspector general’s reports say that it had been going on for a year before it was publicly announced.

Twenty-eight hundred children were removed from their parents. What happened to them next is shameful. There was no effort made to trace these children and the parents who were forced to give them up.

It was only when a Federal judge in San Diego stepped forward and required the Department of Homeland Security and Department of Health and Human Services to make an accounting of how many children were still not united with their parents that they took the effort to do so months—months—after those children had been separated from their parents.

I saw those kids in an immigration court in Chicago in a large office building that you would never guess was a court building in the Loop in Chicago. There it was, the immigration court taking up most of one floor in this office building. People were stacked three and four deep in the corridors, waiting for their hearing. But the judge—and she was a good person, a real professional—couldn't get her hearing underway. She had a problem with those who were appearing before her court that day. The problem was this: She had said that before they could start the proceeding, those who were appearing had to sit down. One of the clients who was in there for a hearing that day had some difficulty. I was there to witness it. The difficulty was she was 2 years old. She wasn't tall enough to crawl up in that chair without somebody lifting her.

The other client who had a hearing that day, who had been removed under this zero-tolerance policy, was a little more skillful. He spotted a Matchbox car on the top of the table, and this 4-year-old boy got up in the chair to play with it.

Those were two of the clients before this immigration judge in this office building in the Loop in Chicago. They had been forcibly removed from their parents, and they were up for a hearing. It was in August.

As a result of the hearing, as with most of the hearings, they said: We are going to postpone this until we get further evidence. The next hearing will be in December—December.

I would ask any parent, any grandparent: What would you think about being separated from that little girl, that 2-year-old girl, whom you love so much, for 6 months, 8 months, 9 months?

That was the policy of this Trump administration with zero tolerance—a policy created and announced by Attorney General Jeff Sessions.

So when I asked Mr. Barr: You are going to take over this job. What is your view on this type of policy? Sadly, I didn't get a direct answer.

I am concerned that in many respects Mr. Barr could continue the harsh approach to immigration that we have seen by the Trump administration instead of charting a different course, a course more consistent with America's values and history.

We are in fact a nation of immigrants. Throughout American history, immigration has strengthened and renewed our country. I stand here today, the son of an immigrant girl who came to this country from Lithuania at the age of 2. Her son grew up and got a full-time government job right here in the Senate. It can happen. It is my story. It is my family's story. It is America's story.

When I listened to the diatribes by this President in the State of the Union Address about immigrants coming to this country—of course there are bad people. We don't want any of them

in this country, and if they are here, we want them to leave. But think of all of the good people who have come to this country and made America what it is today. The President dismisses those folks, doesn't take them as seriously as he should, as far as I am concerned.

I want to know if this Attorney General, Mr. Barr, subscribes to the President's theories on immigration. For the past 2 years, President Trump and Attorney General Jeff Sessions did everything in their power to make America's immigration policy harsh and unwelcoming.

Mr. Barr's comments and history make me fear that he will bring the full weight of the Justice Department to advance the President's anti-immigration agenda. Mr. Barr has refused to disavow the cruel and un-American zero-tolerance policy, which I just described, that led to thousands of children being forcibly removed from their parents, and he has fully and repeatedly echoed President Trump's call for a border wall after the debate we have been through over the last several months, falsely arguing that it will help to combat the opioid epidemic. That is a ludicrous argument. In fact, the Drug Enforcement Administration, which Mr. Barr would supervise, has found that the vast majority of deadly narcotics coming into America through the Mexican border are coming in through ports of entry. They are not being carried in backpacks by people scaling fences. That is where our security efforts should be made, not with some medieval wall.

Mr. Barr also falsely and repeatedly was critical of our asylum laws for a host of problems. Our asylum laws, which have historically had broad bipartisan support until this President came along, simply ensure that we honor our legal and moral obligation to provide safe haven to families and children who are fleeing persecution.

Who are these families seeking asylum and refugee status in the United States? You can find members of those families right here on the floor of the United States Senate. You can find three Cuban-American U.S. Senators—one Democrat and two Republicans—whose families came here as refugees from Castro's Cuba. Are we having second thoughts now about whether they are a valuable part of America? I am not. These people, these Cuban-Americans, have become an integral part of our Nation. They were once refugees and asylees. Now, they are party of America's future, and we are better off for it.

I could tell that story so many different ways. Soviet Jews trying to escape persecution in the old Soviet Union and the Vietnamese who stood by us and fought by our men and women in uniform during the Vietnam war, who had to escape an oppressive regime, came to the United States as refugees and asylees. We are now seeing under President Trump the lowest level of refugees in modern memory.

We are walking away from our obligation to the world.

And Mr. Barr called for withholding of Federal funds to force cities to cooperate with the Trump administration's immigration agenda, even though courts have repeatedly struck down that approach.

Perhaps most troubling is Mr. Barr's comment to me that he thinks it is absolutely appropriate for the Attorney General to change the immigration rules to help advance a President's campaign. He said he did it to help the campaign of President Bush in 1992. The idea of an Attorney General letting campaign politics drive immigration enforcement is unacceptable regardless of the President.

I am also concerned with the views Mr. Barr expressed on something known as the unitary executive theory and his expansive view of Presidential power. He put it bluntly in that 19-page memo I mentioned before, when he said the President alone is the executive branch. We need an Attorney General who recognizes the need for checks and balances, but he did not believe that this President should be held accountable for many of the actions he has taken. I may be naive, but I don't believe any American is above the law, including the President of the United States.

This is not an ordinary time in the history of the Justice Department. President Trump has criticized the Judiciary, individual Federal judges, our intelligence Agencies, and the Department of Justice when they continued an investigation into his campaign. He has undermined their independence and integrity with his storm of tweets every single day.

William Barr said he sees the Attorney General as "the President's lawyer"—in his words—but the chief law enforcement officer of the United States is supposed to be the lawyer for the people of the United States. We need an Attorney General who will lead the Justice Department without fear or favor and who will serve the Constitution of the American people even if it means standing up to a President.

If he is confirmed, I hope Mr. Barr will prove me wrong and that he will be a good Attorney General who came at the right moment in history, but I have not received the reassurances I was looking for from him to give him a vote to reach that position. I will be voting no on the Barr nomination.

I see my colleague and friend Senator LEAHY on the floor. I will withhold two other statements for the RECORD to yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I applaud the Senator from Illinois, the senior Senator from Illinois, for his comments. He knows what it is to have immigrants in your family, as do I. I was fortunate to have a little more understanding as my paternal grandparents immigrated to Vermont from Italy,

and my wife's parents immigrated to Vermont from French-speaking Canada. I still struggle with the Italian I knew as a child. I have done a little better with French, in order to speak to Marcelle's family. But I see the diversity that came of it. I see it in our State of Vermont, and I hope our country is better for it. So I thank the Senator from Illinois.

The last time William Barr was before the Senate was 28 years ago, during the George H.W. Bush administration, and I voted for him to be Attorney General. I did so despite having some reservations that I shared with him and the Senate at the time. Mr. Barr and I did not see eye to eye on many issues. We did not then, and we do not now. But he was clearly qualified for the position, and he had earned the confidence of the Senate. So I felt free to vote for him.

I am concerned by some of the remarks that Senator DURBIN has referred to which seem to indicate that Mr. Barr may feel that he is the lawyer for the President, not only the Attorney General of the United States. He is there to represent everybody—everybody—and to make sure the laws are upheld for everybody.

Now we find ourselves considering his nomination under extraordinarily different circumstances than we did when my friend President Bush had nominated him. Multiple criminal investigations loom over the Trump Presidency. In fact, these investigations may ultimately define the Trump Presidency, and the President has reacted to it with apparently the only way he knows how. He just attacks relentlessly. He doesn't respond to them, but attacks. That includes attacking investigators, witnesses, even the justice system itself. That also includes firing both the FBI Director and his previous Attorney General for not handling one of the investigations as the President wanted, but instead as the law required.

The President views the Justice Department as an extension of his power. He has repeatedly called on it to target his political opponents. He has even reportedly told his advisers that he expects the Attorney General to protect him personally. I have been here with eight Presidents. I have never known a President, either Republican or Democrat, to have such an outrageous and wrong—wrong—view of the Department of Justice.

The integrity of the Justice Department has not been so tested since the dark days of Watergate. Yet when the Judiciary Committee considered the nomination of Elliot Richardson to be Attorney General in the midst of that national crisis, nominated by Richard Nixon, the nominee made numerous, detailed commitments to the committee. Mr. Richardson did so, in his words, to "create the maximum possible degree of public confidence in the integrity of the process." That same principle applies equally today.

Indeed, that may be the only way the Justice Department escapes the Trump administration with its integrity intact. In large part due to the relentless politicizing of the Department by the President, millions of Americans will see bias no matter which way the Department resolves the Russia investigation. Because of seeing such bias, our country is diminished. The justice system is greatly diminished. In my view, the Department has only one way out—transparency. The American people deserve to know the facts, whatever they may be. That requires the special counsel's report, and the evidence that supports it, be made public.

Unfortunately, despite efforts from both Republicans and Democrats in the Senate, Mr. Barr has repeatedly refused to make that commitment. Worse, much of his testimony before the Judiciary Committee left us with more doubts. Will Mr. Barr allow President Trump to make a sweeping, unprecedented claim of Executive privilege that allows him to hide the report? Will Mr. Barr, relying on a Department policy to avoid disparaging uncharged parties, not disclose potential misconduct by the President simply due to another policy to not indict sitting Presidents? We don't know the answer, but we do know that Mr. Barr's testimony on these issues could lay the groundwork for potentially no transparency at all.

Mr. Barr also repeatedly refused to follow the precedent of Attorney General Jeff Sessions and commit to follow the advice of career ethics officials on whether he needs to recuse himself from the Russia investigation. He even declined my request to commit to simply sharing their recommendation with the Judiciary Committee. That is critical because there is reason to question whether an appearance of a conflict exists.

Prior to his nomination, Mr. Barr made his unorthodox views on the special counsel's obstruction of justice investigation very clear. He did that with a 19-page memo sent directly to the President's lawyers. Mr. Barr spoke dismissively about the broader Russia investigation. He even claimed that a conspiracy theory involving Hillary Clinton was far more deserving of a Federal investigation than possible collusion, and this was notwithstanding the fact that, by that time, that conspiracy had been debunked. He was asked, in effect, whether this memo was a job application, because it is difficult to imagine that these views escaped the attention of the President. That makes it all the more critical that Mr. Barr follow the precedent of prior Attorneys General and commit to following the advice of career ethics officials on recusal.

I am also concerned that, if confirmed, Mr. Barr would defend policies that I believe are both ineffective and inhumane. We heard Senator DURBIN speak eloquently about the horrible, horrible program of separating families

at the border, and I think the Nation is still reeling from that systematic separation. But, in light of that, Mr. Barr praised Jeff Sessions for "breaking the record for prosecution" of the misdemeanor offenses that forced families to be separated. In other words, on a misdemeanor, you take the child away from the parents and separate them. Nobody seems to know where everybody goes after that.

Ask a 4-year-old: What are your parents' name? They will say, in whatever language: Mommy and daddy.

Where do you live?

We live in the house next to so-and-so.

They don't know the addresses. They rely on their parents, and now they have been separated from them.

It makes me think Attorneys General should be able to stand up for the rule of law. I remember a time when former Acting Attorney General Sally Yates stood up for the rule of law. She refused to defend President Trump's first iteration of his Muslim ban as a deeply flawed order. It was stained with racial animus, that even applied to individuals who were lawful permanent residents and had valid visas. Mr. Barr described Ms. Yates's decision as "obstruction" and a "serious abuse of office."

My God, this country should not have religious tests. If we did, my grandparents would not have been able to come to this country.

Relevant to each of my concerns is Mr. Barr's extremely broad views of executive power. He is an advocate of the unitary executive theory, believing that the Constitution vests nearly all executive power "in one and one only person—the President." He has said that an Attorney General has "no authority and no conceivable justification for directing the department's lawyers not to advocate the president's position in court." This expansive view of a President's power would concern me no matter whose administration it was. In fact, if you go way back in history, it conflicts with Supreme Court Justice James Iredell's observation in 1792 that the Attorney General "is not called the Attorney General of the President, but Attorney General of the United States."

I find Mr. Barr's deferential view of Executive power especially concerning. We already know much of what President Trump intends to do. It includes taking billions of dollars that Congress has already appropriated and diverting it toward a wasteful and ineffective vanity wall. What would Mr. Barr do when confronted with such an order? He has essentially told us: Mr. Barr has argued that Congress's appropriations power provided under Article I, Section 9 of the Constitution is "not an independent source of congressional power" to "control the allocation of government resources." That would come as great news to everybody—Republicans and Democrats—who has been an appropriator in any session of Congress.

He even believes, that if a President “finds no appropriated funds within a given category” but can find such money “in another category,” he can spend those funds as he wishes so long as the spending is within his broad “constitutional purview.” Such views should concern all of us here—Republicans and Democrats alike—who believe, as the Founders of this country believed, that Congress possesses the power of the purse.

Unfortunately, I fear that Mr. Barr’s long-held views on Executive power would essentially be weaponized by President Trump—a man who we know derides any limits on his authority. Over the past two years, we have seen the erosion of our institutional checks and balances in the face of creeping authoritarianism. That can’t continue.

In conclusion, let me be clear. I respect Mr. Barr. I voted for him when President George H. W. Bush nominated him. As Attorney General, I do not doubt that he would stand faithfully by his genuinely held convictions, but I fear this particular administration needs somebody who would give him a much tighter leash, as Attorneys General have in the past. So because of that, I will vote no on Mr. Barr’s nomination.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, while Senator LEAHY is still on the floor, I want to thank him for his extraordinary work on the conference committee to try to resolve our budget impasse. I know he has been working night and day. He has shared with many of us the work he has been doing on behalf of getting a budget that reflects the will of this body and of the House, and hopefully it will be completed before midnight on Friday.

So I want to personally thank the distinguished Senator, the senior Senator from Vermont, Mr. LEAHY, for the work he has done to keep the government open, to provide security for our borders, and to make sure we get all of our appropriations bills done.

Mr. LEAHY. Thank you.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed as in morning business.

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

BLACK HISTORY MONTH

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, 54 years ago, 600 nonviolent protesters set off to march from Selma to Montgomery, AL, to protest the disenfranchisement of Black voters in the South.

They got as far as the Edmund Pettus Bridge when they saw police officers lined up on the other end, waiting with tear gas, clubs, and dogs. The iconic bridge stood between the police and protesters like a physical barrier between hope and violence, democracy and second-class citizenship.

Although the 13th, 14th, and 15th Amendments—which cemented into law the freedom, citizenship, and vot-

ing rights of Black Americans—passed nearly 100 years earlier across the country, literacy tests, poll taxes, violence, and intimidation stood in the way of this constitutional promise. This was especially true in Alabama.

According to the 1961 Civil Rights Commission report, at the time of the famous protests, fewer than 10 percent of the voting-age Black population was registered in Alabama’s Montgomery County. This infamous march from Selma was intended to right the wrong and to shine light on the injustice of all the many laws that kept voting from being accessible to Black Americans.

For months leading up to it, a community of activists—led by Martin Luther King, Jr., and of course our esteemed colleague Representative JOHN LEWIS—carried out voting registration drives and nonviolent demonstrations, all against the resistance of the local government and members of the Ku Klux Klan. These efforts laid the groundwork for the march from Selma, which ended with Alabama State troopers attacking the protesters.

The images of the State-sponsored violence were shown across the country, galvanizing the American public in favor of voting rights in a day that has since become known as Bloody Sunday.

Five months later, on August 6, 1965, the Voting Rights Act was signed into law. The bill is one of the crowing victories of the civil rights movement and for our American democracy.

This monumental legislation outlawed the malicious barriers to the polls and held States accountable for the discriminatory obstacles imposed on citizens who sought to fulfill their constitutional right. It opened doors for Black citizens across the South to register, to cast a vote, or to run for office in higher numbers than ever before.

As we celebrate this February as Black History Month, we must remember that Black history is American history. We must remember that too often in our Nation’s past, the work to create a more perfect Union has fallen upon the shoulders of Americans whose full rights of citizenship were discounted simply because of the color of their skin. The right to vote is a fundamental American tenet. Yet it has historically been denied to men and women of color.

We must remember that when we tell stories of those who fought and struggled to secure voting rights in our Nation’s past, it is because their stories serve as a precursor to our own.

Today voting rights are still under attack. Many who survived the brutal attack on Bloody Sunday and lived to see the passage of the Voting Rights Act have also lived to see the same monumental bill weakened by the 2013 Shelby County Supreme Court decision.

They have watched our President and Republican legislators tout myths of voter fraud to justify strict voter ID

laws, partisan gerrymandering, and limited access to voting information. These efforts undoubtedly disadvantage Black Americans more than most and put a scourge on the system that defines our democracy. It is an insult to those who were robbed of their freedom and oftentimes their lives to create a more equal future.

One such example of modern voter disenfranchisement can be found in the fact that the United States denies voting rights to citizens with felony convictions. We are one of the exceedingly few Western democracies that permanently strip citizens of their right to vote as a punishment for their crimes.

Let’s be clear. We are not talking about voting rights for felons currently incarcerated; we are talking about voting rights for those who have served their time and have since been released, attained jobs, raised a family, paid taxes, and moved on with their lives. Under the current law in 34 States, these individuals are still denied the right to vote, and that is simply unfair and undemocratic.

Black History Month demands that we bring this injustice to light because felony disenfranchisement disproportionately affects men and women of color. One out of thirteen Black Americans is currently unable to vote because of a prior conviction for which they have already served time—a rate that is more than four times greater than the non-Black Americans.

Right now, in total, more than 2 million Americans are unable to vote because of prior convictions, despite having already served their time and paying their debt to society. That is why this year I will again be introducing the Democracy Restoration Act, a bill that would restore voting rights to individuals after they have been released and returned to their community.

I am committed to seeing this legislation passed. My hope is that Black History Month inspires all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join me.

We must also combat efforts to intimidate and disenfranchise voters. That is why last year I introduced legislation that would prohibit and penalize knowingly spreading misinformation, such as incorrect polling locations, times, or the necessary forms of identification. This Deceptive Practices and Voter Intimidation Act will prohibit and penalize intentionally and knowingly spreading misinformation to voters that is intended to suppress the vote, including the time and place of an election and restrictions on voter eligibility.

Reliably, these tactics always seem to target minority neighborhoods and are blatant attempts to reduce turnout. Such tactics undermine and corrode our very democracy and threaten the integrity of our electoral system.

In Stacey Abrams’ response to the State of the Union last week, she said that “the foundation of our moral leadership around the globe is free and fair

elections, where voters pick their leaders—not where politicians pick their voters.” This is precisely why I have chosen to speak out about voting rights this month—because this issue defines our moral and democratic character as a nation and because it is an area where we still have so much work left to do.

Casting a vote is one of the most basic and fundamental freedoms in any democracy, and Congress has the responsibility to ensure the right is protected.

Congress has the responsibility to remove barriers to voting and make it easier for people to register to vote, cast their vote, and make sure their votes are counted. No one can appreciate the need for us to meet this responsibility better than Black Americans whose collective story is one of triumph over racist laws and undemocratic norms.

On Black History Month, Congress must vow to follow their example and work together across party lines to make voting easier, fairer, and more accessible to all.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROMNEY). The Senator from Minnesota.

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

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

NOMINATION OF WILLIAM BARR

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I want to join my colleagues today in making some brief remarks on William Barr's nomination to serve as Attorney General of the United States.

I had the opportunity to meet with Mr. Barr one-on-one in my office. We had a very good meeting, and we talked in some detail about securing our elections from foreign interference, something that is a major priority of mine, and we really are close in passing a bipartisan bill, which Senator LANKFORD and I have, called the Secure Elections Act. We just need a little help and support from the administration.

We also talked about modernizing our antitrust enforcement to fit the challenges that we have today and to make our laws as sophisticated as the trillion-dollar companies we are now seeing and the mergers we are seeing all across the United States. So we had a good discussion about that.

We also talked about his family and working in the Justice Department. During the hearing, I gave an opportunity for him to talk to those workers who were, through no fault of their own, furloughed or not getting paid, and he clearly showed respect for the people in the Justice Department. I appreciate all of that. I think that is important to have in an Attorney General.

But I have some serious concerns about this nominee. I had already announced I was opposing him during our Judiciary Committee vote, but I have some serious concerns when you look at the context in which he has come before us.

His nomination comes at a time when there are investigations by a special counsel and multiple U.S. attorney's offices in New York into campaign finance violations and an attempt, as we know, by a foreign adversary to interfere in our elections. This special counsel's investigation has led to indictments or guilty pleas from over 30 people and three companies, including seven former advisers to the President.

These investigations, as we know, go to the heart of the integrity of our elections, our government, and our institutions, and it is why it is essential, first of all, that Special Counsel Mueller and the U.S. attorney's offices be allowed to finish their work free of political interference.

The President, as we know, has made past statements and sent out tweets about Attorney General Sessions: I am critical of him for allowing these investigations to go forward. This is the context we are in. He has made it very clear as to what he is looking for in an Attorney General. He wants someone who will be his lawyer. He wants someone to use the Justice Department, in a way, to protect him.

I think this should worry us because, yes, the Attorney General works for the President, but, more importantly, who the Attorney General really works for are the people, the people of the United States.

The Attorney General of the United States is the people's lawyer and pledges to uphold the rule of law and apply the law equally no matter who you are.

Mr. Barr has made clear, one, that he respects Mr. Mueller, which I truly appreciate. He said that both in my private meeting and on the record at the hearing. But he has also said that he intends to take over supervision of the special counsel's investigation.

He wouldn't commit, at his nomination hearing—despite having written that 19-page memo, he wouldn't commit to following the advice of career ethics lawyers at the Department about whether he should be recused.

Why did that concern me? Well, because he had actually commended the Deputy Attorney General for following those rules, and he had commended Senator and then-Attorney General Sessions for following these rules. So that concerns me.

We know that if he is confirmed, he will be in a position to oversee the special counsel's budget, the scope of the investigation, and he will, ultimately—and this is key—receive the results of investigation under law.

He will get to decide whether the results are released to the public or, perhaps, as he suggested during the hear-

ing, are not released at all, and that is in addition to those related investigations he will oversee. These U.S. Attorney's investigations don't have the special counsel regulations to protect them, so he is in direct line to oversee those.

Even though many of my colleagues asked him to pledge to make Special Counsel Mueller's report public, he wouldn't commit to do so. He always had a way to kind of dodge a commitment to do so, instead of, in my mind, making a full-throated endorsement of releasing that report.

If he is confirmed, he will also have room to make his own interpretation of what the law allows. In fact, as Attorney General, he can make the Department's rules and regulations and issue guidance that would make the difference between transparency and obscurity. That is why we have to look at his judgment on this particular issue.

Maybe if we were in a different time, in a different moment, we would be talking about things like the opioid epidemic and what the Attorney General is doing, which is very important, and I know he does care about that; or we would be devoting our moment, which I wish we could be doing, to anti-trust and upgrading the way those laws are enforced and what we should do; or we would be talking, which we should be doing, about the SECOND STEP Act and not just the FIRST STEP Act.

All of those questions were asked in the hearing—immigration reform, very important issues—but we are where we are. We are where we are, and we have to look at his judgment to see what kind of Attorney General he would be at this time with respect to law and order, which, to me, right now, is not just about law and order in our communities—very important—but it is also about law and order when it comes to our entire justice system.

Like many of the nominees from the President, Mr. Barr has demonstrated, just as Justice Kavanaugh did, just as Justice Gorsuch did, an expansive view—an unprecedentedly expansive view of Presidential power. We don't have to look far to see how those views would impact the special counsel's investigation.

Just a few months before he was nominated as a private citizen—I don't have many constituents who would do this, but, for some reason, Mr. Barr decided to send in this 19-page memo as a private citizen. It was no ordinary memo. This memo was 19 pages, single-spaced, and addressed to the leadership of the Justice Department, but it was sent to all of these people—conservative activists and all kinds of people all over the place, the lawyers at the White House Counsel's office, and the President's personal lawyers. I don't think my constituents would really have their addresses or emails, but it was sent to all of these people.

It argued that a portion of the special counsel's obstruction of justice inquiry was “fatally misconceived.” He

said that it was based on a legally insupportable reading of the law.

Now, that makes you pause. How can we be sure, how can we think he can impartially evaluate the special counsel's investigation if, before he has even seen its result, he writes extensively that part of it, not all of it, was legally insupportable and fatally misconceived?

It is not just those statements that are troubling. He goes on to state, not for the first time, his alarming views about the President's powers. Here is one of them: "[T]he President's law enforcement powers extend to all matters, including those in which he had a personal stake."

Mr. Barr doesn't cite laws or cases from the Supreme Court or the history of our Nation's founding or even the Federalist Papers when making his claims. He just says it as if it is obvious.

Let me be clear about what he means by this. Mr. Barr believes that a President gets to supervise an investigation into his or her own conduct. As a former prosecutor, I know that it is a fundamental value in our country that no one—no one—is above the law, and it is a fundamental principle in our legal system that no one should be a judge in their own case, not even the President of the United States.

I also have grave doubts about Mr. Barr's respect for Congress, a coequal branch of government, and our duty to provide oversight of the executive branch.

Mr. Barr is a proponent of the unitary executive theory, which is the idea that the President has expansive powers, even in the face of Congress's constitutional duties. His writings on the topic raise serious questions about how Mr. Barr will approach congressional oversight of the administration.

I am concerned that Mr. Barr will rely on the broad interpretation of Executive power to support the White House's reported efforts to exert Executive privilege to prevent the release of the special counsel report, its findings, or its conclusions.

If that happens, Congress must be ready to assert our responsibility to make sure the public and, especially, State election officials who are working to secure our elections have the facts about what happened.

How are we going to fix this in the next election if we don't know what happened? How are we going to have accountability for our government if the public is shut out in viewing what happened?

This is not the time to install an Attorney General who has repeatedly espoused a view of unfettered Executive power. Congress cannot abdicate its responsibilities or shirk its duties—not when it comes to national security, foreign relations, the budget, or, as is key today, oversight into law and order.

A few years ago, I went to Atlanta to make a speech, and, of course, I took a

little trip over to the Carter Presidential Library. Of course, I wanted to see this library—I had never seen it—to learn more about President Carter, but as a Minnesotan, I really wanted to look for all the Mondale memorabilia. I may have been the only one there looking for Joan's dress and other things related to the Mondale half of the Carter-Mondale team.

One of the things I noticed that to me was most prominent was a quote of Walter Mondale's etched on the wall. At the time, I liked it. I thought it was simple. I wrote it down, and I put it in my purse. But I never knew how relevant it would be today. The quote came from Mondale's reflections on his service with President Carter after they had lost their reelection but had served their country for 4 years. He said:

We told the truth. We obeyed the law. We kept the peace.

I believe that is the minimum standard we should expect of any administration. We told the truth. We obeyed the law. We kept the peace. Every President faces great challenges, many of which are unforeseen and require difficult decisions, but at the minimum, an administration should tell the truth, obey the law, and do all they can to keep the peace.

That is where I will end. What concerns me about this nominee is not the vast experience he has or the work he would do on a few of the things that I mentioned; it is his views on Executive power, his views on Congress's power to be a check and balance to the Executive, his views on what the Executive can do right as we face this crucial time in history, when coming right at us is this major report from the special counsel. I want someone who will make sure that whoever is in the White House obeys the law and tells the truth.

Sadly, I cannot support this nominee. I do hope that I am wrong in some of my conclusions based on what I have read and heard. I would like nothing more.

I appreciate so much the work of Rod Rosenstein as Deputy Attorney General and many of the other people in the Justice Department who have worked with him to allow this investigation to continue. I hope that will be the case if this nominee does go through this Chamber, that he will do the same.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

S. 429

Mr. PETERS. Mr. President, cyber attacks are one of the greatest threats to our national security today. As our world becomes increasingly connected, bad actors are trying to infiltrate our most critical networks, from our military systems and our electrical grid to our financial institutions and our small businesses.

We face a rising number of cyber attacks that have the potential to expose

our sensitive, personal information or disrupt nearly every aspect of our lives. These cyber security vulnerabilities cut across every industry. Whether you are a small business trying to protect your customers' credit card details, a doctor's office with private medical insurance information, or even a sophisticated tech startup that needs to safeguard your customers' passwords, cyber security protections are absolutely vital to your success.

We have seen the dangerous consequences of attacks that exposed the private data of millions of Americans—from companies like Equifax and Target to Federal Agencies like the Office of Personnel Management and the IRS. Government Agencies of all sizes are at risk of a breach that could jeopardize the sensitive information they are trusted with, and these threats will only continue to grow.

We need a skilled cyber workforce of professionals to shore up our cyber protections, fortify our legacy systems, and build new and innovative infrastructure with safety and security in mind. Despite the glaring need for more cyber security professionals, we face a serious shortage of highly trained cyber experts to fill these positions. Estimates indicate there is a global shortage of approximately 3 million desperately needed cyber security professionals, including nearly half a million in North America, where government and the private sector are competing to hire the best talent.

The Federal Government faces serious challenges in this competition. Agencies often cannot offer the same top salaries and benefits that Silicon Valley uses to entice and to retain employees. Our cyber workforce is on the frontlines of every aspect of our digital security, and we need policies that address that reality and sustain and grow our ranks.

While thousands of dedicated public servants choose to work in government because they are motivated by the mission of serving our country, there is more we can do to grow the pool of cyber workers and recruit them to government service. Congress has made strides in recent years to improve incentives and attract skilled cyber professionals to join the ranks.

Moving forward, we can make cyber positions in government more attractive by providing cyber professionals with unique opportunities to enhance their careers while they help protect our country's security. That is why I introduced the Federal Rotational Cyber Workforce Program Act with Senator HOEVEN. Our bipartisan legislation helps the Federal Government develop an integrated cyber security workforce that retains high-skilled employees by establishing a civilian personnel rotation program specifically for cyber professionals. It is based on similar joint duty programs for the military services and the intelligence community.

The Rotational Cyber Workforce Program will provide civilian employees in

cyber roles opportunities to enhance their careers, broaden their professional experience, and foster collaborative networks by experiencing and contributing to the cyber mission beyond their home Agencies. By offering these kinds of dynamic and rewarding opportunities, this legislation will help retain highly talented cyber professionals and strengthen our government's security by developing greater interagency awareness and collaboration.

I am pleased that this morning the Homeland Security and Government Affairs Committee unanimously approved this legislation. It moves us closer to closing the cyber security workforce gap.

In addition to taking commonsense steps like we did today in committee, Congress needs to look ahead and plan for long-term solutions to ensure that we always have a strong, competitive pool of cyber security talent to draw on. We need policies that encourage students of all ages and educational levels to seek out STEM fields, such as computer science, so they are prepared to fill these in-demand jobs and be our first line of defense against these emerging and rapidly evolving threats.

I look forward to continuing to work with my Republican and Democratic colleagues to get this bill signed into law and to advance other commonsense legislation that strengthens our Nation's cyber capabilities and safeguards the weakest links in the cyber security chain from harm.

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

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

TAX FILING SEASON

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I come to the floor for two reasons: No. 1, to speak about the tax bill of 1 year ago, and then, for a longer period of time, to address the issue before the Senate, which is the nomination of Mr. Barr.

The tax filing season began just over 2 weeks ago. Despite the disruption of the temporary partial government shutdown, the IRS is reporting to the Nation that all systems are go. Tax returns are being processed as normal, and refunds are being sent out. While there are lingering effects from the shutdown, overall, the IRS and Treasury have done a pretty good job of minimizing the effects of the shutdown on tax filers.

This season is receiving additional scrutiny as it is the very first time that tax filers are filing under the tax cuts and reforms enacted last year. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle and some in the media appear to be obsessed with finding anything they can

manufacture to declare the filing season under the new law a failure. Of course, that is after only 2 weeks of tax filing—not a long enough period of time to draw too many conclusions.

Case in point: Last week the IRS released preliminary filing data covering the first weeks of the filing season. Immediately, naysayers began focusing on data that suggests that tax refunds in the first week were down slightly over last year, as well as focusing on anecdotal social media posts. Never mind that the current refund numbers are based on only a few days of data, or that refund statistics can vary widely from one week to the next. Never mind that most of the social media posts are unverified. Many have the markings of a coordinated effort by liberal activists who have regularly used hashtag “GOP tax scam” to attack the law on Twitter, despite a vast majority of taxpayers paying less in taxes.

Yet our journalists, who are well educated and ought to know better, fall for it—hook, line, and sinker—including such tweets in articles with no questions asked or verifying the veracity of these claims.

To be fair, oftentimes buried deep in such articles, well below a sensational headline, is an attempt to demonstrate some semblance of unbiased reports, noting that under the tax law, most taxpayers will see tax cuts. That is right. Most taxpayers will see tax cuts. You most assuredly wouldn't know this from the headlines bemoaning a reduction in tax refunds, but the vast majority of taxpayers experienced a tax cut last year, and will this year, as well.

Every analysis—from the non-partisan Joint Committee on Taxation to the right-leaning Tax Foundation, to the liberal Tax Policy Center—demonstrates that taxpayers are sending less of their hard-earned money to Washington this year.

As an example, an Iowa family of four with the State's family median income of around \$75,000 stands to see their tax bill cut by more than half, or about \$2,100 in savings. This is real tax relief that began appearing in many taxpayers' paychecks at the start of 2018. That is a very important point. The government could have chosen to deprive this taxpayer of this extra \$2,100 last year until they filed their taxes during this tax season.

This may have been the best thing to do if you are someone who starts with the assumption that their money would be better off in the hands of the government interest-free. But I do not believe that is the best thing to do.

I believe taxpayers know better how to spend their hard-earned money than Washington does. It should be up to the individual taxpayer whether it is in his or her interest to put that extra \$2,100—or about \$175 a month—in a savings account or spend it on buying school supplies for their children or maybe even making a car payment. That is a decision 157 million taxpayers can make and not 535 Members of Con-

gress or the bureaucrats who are out spending the money.

In early 2018, Treasury and the IRS implemented updated withholding tables to give taxpayers that option of deciding whether to save or spend and what to spend it on or how to save it.

A chief priority for the new withholding tables was accuracy. The IRS' goal was to help taxpayers get the right amount withheld from their paycheck. However, common sense ought to tell us that no withholding table will ever be perfect—at least not perfect for 157 million different taxpayers. If they were, there would be no need for tax refunds. Only what was necessary to satisfy a taxpayer's tax obligation would need to be taken from their paychecks.

But that is unlikely. Every taxpayer is affected a little differently under the Tax Code based on their personal circumstances, and some taxpayers' incomes may fluctuate throughout the year. This makes exact withholding based on general tables nearly impossible. As a result, the amount of a taxpayer's refund is unlikely to be exactly the same as it was under the old law compared to our new law. Yes, some taxpayers may see a smaller refund, but others may see a larger refund. The size of one's refund tells you nothing about whether a specific taxpayer benefited from last year's tax law.

Given this fact, the best way for any taxpayer to see how tax reform affected their bottom line is to compare this year's tax return with last year's tax return, rather than making that judgment based upon what the refund is.

Tax preparers and tax return software often will provide an analysis comparing the current and previous year's tax return. I encourage taxpayers to compare the total amount of taxes paid this year with the total taxes paid last year, or, if your income materially changed from last year, compare your effective tax rate. That is the taxes paid as a percentage of your adjusted gross income. If your tax preparer does not already provide you with this information, simply ask them for that information.

If taxpayers take this approach, the vast majority will see that their tax bill has gone down. This is what matters, not the size of their refund. The size of the refund tells you nothing beyond the degree to which a taxpayer has overpaid their taxes over the course of the year. I hope Americans will take the time to check so they know the real effects that last year's tax cuts had on their lives and their family.

NOMINATION OF WILLIAM BARR

Mr. President, I will now turn my attention to the vote that will happen shortly today or tomorrow on William Barr to be Attorney General for the United States.

Mr. Barr is a highly accomplished attorney and an experienced public servant with an outstanding record. The

Justice Department needs good, effective leadership, and we should act quickly to fill this top spot.

I believe that Mr. Barr will be a good leader for the Justice Department as he has demonstrated in the past. In my opinion, at his Judiciary Committee nomination hearing, Mr. Barr was very candid with Senators. I believe he did his best at answering questions on his views on a wide variety of topics, as well as addressing concerns, including my own.

For example, at the beginning of this confirmation process, I had concerns regarding Mr. Barr's prior negative statements on a subject that I have been working on for 4 years with Senator DURBIN and Senator LEE—criminal justice reform.

In particular, I was concerned about a 1992 Justice Department report released when he was Attorney General entitled "The Case for More Incarceration." That title ought to tell you that he is tough on law enforcement. I was also concerned about a letter he signed in 2015 opposing the bill that we then entitled the Sentencing Reform and Correction Act of 2015. Obviously, if I think we need criminal justice reform for the first time in a generation, and the Attorney General puts out a letter against the part of it that Senator DURBIN and I were working so hard on—by the way, the President signed that just before Christmas—then, I think it is legitimate that I ask him these questions.

As Attorney General, Mr. Barr will be responsible for implementing the recently passed FIRST STEP Act of 2018, which 89 Members of this body supported. These Members also worked tirelessly for its passage. The FIRST STEP Act is the title of the bill that I call criminal justice reform. This is why one of my first questions during his confirmation hearing was to directly and clearly ask Mr. Barr if he would commit to fully implementing the FIRST STEP Act, considering the fact that he had written a letter 3 years ago against the concept.

His answer was very clear and convincing to me, and that was one word—"yes." He went on to say: "I have no problem with the approach of reforming the prison structure and I will faithfully implement the law." Later in the hearing, other Senators pointed to Mr. Barr's past stances on criminal justice and sentencing reform. Those Members asked for Mr. Barr's current views on the subject. They also asked for assurances that Mr. Barr would dutifully implement the FIRST STEP Act, just like I asked that question.

Mr. Barr expressed his current misgivings about high sentences for drug offenders established in the 1990s. Each time, he answered very clearly that he would dutifully implement the FIRST STEP Act and work to ensure that the intent of Congress was realized. Mr. Barr's answers regarding the FIRST STEP Act relieved my concerns of his past statements.

While I will continue to use the oversight powers of Congress to ensure that the FIRST STEP Act is applied and implemented as required by law, I believe Mr. Barr's testimony, and I look forward to working with him on both the implementation of the current law and future steps in criminal justice reform.

I want to go on to another issue of importance to me, which was Mr. Barr's position on the False Claims Act. If you remember my participation in the False Claims Act, going back to 1986, that act has brought in \$59 billion of fraudulently taken money from the Federal taxpayers. Leaders and top prosecutors of both sides of the aisle have now praised the law as the most effective tool the government has to detect, to prosecute, and actually to recover public money lost to fraud. Most of the \$59 billion has come as a result of patriotic whistleblowers who found the fraud and brought the cases at their own risk.

To let you know why I am concerned about Mr. Barr's opinion, in the past he was extremely critical of the False Claims Act, even after it was signed by President Reagan. He called it unconstitutional. At one time, he said it was an "abomination." So at his nomination hearing, I pointedly asked Mr. Barr whether he believed the False Claims Act is unconstitutional. He said: "No, Senator. It's been upheld by the Supreme Court."

Mr. Barr also stated that he would fully and faithfully implement this very important law. He acknowledged the benefits of the False Claims Act and said: "I will diligently enforce the False Claims Act."

I also asked Mr. Barr about his stance on something called the "Granston Memo." That memo provides a long list of reasons that the Justice Department can use to dismiss False Claims Act cases. Some of these reasons are pretty vague, such as "preserving government resources." Just think as to how that can be used by some faceless bureaucrat to avoid some issue, like maybe he doesn't want to go after fraudulent money or doesn't like some whistleblower. Obviously, those words could mean anything the government wants it to mean.

Of course, the government ought to be able to dismiss, obviously, meritless cases, but we don't want to give broad discretion to the administration without good justification. Even when the Justice Department declines to participate in a False Claims Act case, the whistleblower can and, in many cases, still does recover taxpayers' money.

Although Mr. Barr had not yet read the memo, he pledged to sit down with me if problems arose. These are positive steps and positive statements. However, actions speak louder than words. So I want Mr. Barr to know that I am going to monitor aggressively how he enforces and protects the False Claims Act to ensure that he follows through on his promises.

On another matter, during his confirmation hearing, I pressed Mr. Barr

about transparency with regard to the special counsel's report. I made very clear that I want the report to be made public because taxpayers deserve to know what their money is being spent on—in this case, maybe \$25 million to \$35 million. I am not sure we have an exact figure, but it is a lot of money. The only way the American taxpayers and Congress can hold the government accountable is through transparency.

You have heard me say many times that transparency brings accountability. Of course, there are some traditional reasons for withholding certain information even in a special counsel's report, such as national security or people's privacy, but there should be as much transparency as possible regarding the release of the report.

During his hearing, Mr. Barr said that he would place a high priority on transparency, particularly with Mueller's report, and there is no reason to think that Mr. Mueller will not be allowed to finish his work. Mr. Barr told me and other members of this committee that he would "provide as much transparency as [he] can consistent with the law and the Department's longstanding practices and policies." There is a lot of room there for him to work within, I suppose, and to still be honest in these answers. At this point, I can tell you I have no reason to doubt Mr. Barr's sincerity or his commitment to transparency and the law.

If he is confirmed, I will be sure to hold Mr. Barr to his word on transparency. Yet I also realize that there are some differences of opinion around here on what is currently required under the Justice Department's special counsel regulations. That is why Senator BLUMENTHAL and I recently introduced S. 236, the Special Counsel Transparency Act. This bill would require by statute that a special counsel provide a report to Congress and the American people at the conclusion of an investigation, not just Mueller's special counsel report but special counsels' reports into the future. This is commonsense transparency and accountability under any administration, not just under the Trump administration. I look forward to working with my colleagues and Mr. Barr, if he is confirmed, on this important legislation.

I also pressed the nominee on a number of other issues that were related to transparency and accountability, including the Freedom of Information Act—or, as we call it around here, FOIA—and the Foreign Agents Registration Act. Around here, we refer to that as FARA. When I served as chairman of the Judiciary Committee, I helped to steer the FOIA Improvement Act of 2016 into law, which creates a very important point—a "presumption of openness" standard. The Justice Department oversees the Federal Government's compliance with FOIA. So that is why we discussed it with Barr. It is critical that the nominee, if confirmed to lead the Justice Department, takes FOIA and transparency seriously.

When you talk about a presumption of openness, it ought to be this simple: Any of the public's business ought to be public, and you presume it to be public. Let the government give a justification as to why it ought to be kept secret or not be open to the public under the Freedom of Information Act.

I asked Mr. Barr if he agreed that FOIA were an important tool for holding the government accountable. Naturally, he said yes. I also asked the nominee if he would commit to ensuring the faithful and timely implementation of the 2016 FOIA amendments. He said: "Yes, we will work hard on that." I also think that the entire FOIA process would be improved if Americans didn't have to fight tooth and nail for disclosure in the first place. Let me repeat that—fight tooth and nail for disclosure. That is why we have a presumption of openness when it comes to the Freedom of Information Act.

Getting the public's information out to the public automatically should be a top priority. So I asked Mr. Barr if he would help to advocate for the more proactive disclosure of government records. Again, he said he would. I appreciate Mr. Barr's assurances. Of course, as I have said so many times during these remarks on different issues, I expect to hold him true to his word.

Then, I went to the Foreign Agents Registration Act, or FARA. I asked him about the importance of it. My oversight work has highlighted the Justice Department's historically lax enforcement of that act. I think we had a hearing on it and found out that since 1937 there have been fewer than a dozen prosecutions under it. Now, all of a sudden, with Russia, Ukraine, and Turkey and a lot of other places, it has come to my attention that there are a lot of people who even recently haven't registered under it. On the other hand, I will bet people are hastening to register very fast.

Yet the law has some shortcomings. In an age in which we are witnessing more foreign government efforts to influence the American public and policymakers, we should see more transparency and more enforcement against bad actors, not less enforcement. So I asked Mr. Barr if he agreed that FARA was an important national security and accountability tool, and he said yes.

I asked Mr. Barr if he would be sure to make FARA enforcement a top priority under his leadership. Again, he said he would.

I also asked Mr. Barr if he would commit to working with me on my bill to improve FARA. This bill before Congress is called the Disclosing Foreign Influence Act, and it seeks to better ensure transparency and accountability. Again, he said yes. Again, Mr. Barr can expect that I will hold him to his word.

I also asked Mr. Barr about his position on antitrust enforcement—specifi-

cally, whether he would ensure that healthcare and prescription drug antitrust issues would be a top priority for the Justice Department.

The nominee responded: "Competition is an important factor in containing the costs of healthcare" and that he would "work with the Antitrust Division to ensure appropriate and effective criminal and civil enforcement to protect Americans' interests in low-cost, high-quality healthcare." He stated that if confirmed, antitrust enforcement in the healthcare and pharmaceutical sectors "will remain a priority" for the Justice Department.

I also expressed to the candidate my concerns about agriculture competition. He indicated that enforcing the antitrust laws in the agriculture sector will remain a priority.

The topics I just discussed are just some of the areas that I asked Mr. Barr about at the confirmation hearing and in written questions for the record, and my Judiciary Committee colleagues questioned Mr. Barr at length on a variety of topics. I take Mr. Barr at his word. I don't believe he would bow to any kind of pressure, even from the President, if he thought there were a problem with the legality, constitutionality, or ethics of an issue. He is an excellent nominee—extremely competent and experienced.

Mr. Barr previously led the Justice Department and has proven his strong leadership abilities. Recall that back in 1991 the Senate Judiciary Committee unanimously reported Mr. Barr's nomination to be Attorney General under President George H.W. Bush. Can you believe it? The Senate confirmed him by a voice vote.

What has changed after 25 years?

I don't know, except that there is something some people think is wrong if a person by the name of Trump nominates somebody to some office. The only difference I can see is that even in the last 25 years, he has proven himself to be in the private sector what he did so well as a public servant. He is a very capable attorney and a straight shooter. He is willing to engage in productive discussions with Congress. That is a key quality that we want in anybody who runs the Justice Department, and I have had enough trouble with the Justice Department.

I hope he will respond to my requests for oversight information more than the Democrats and Republicans had who preceded him. He is committed to working with me on my oversight requests, and I think my colleagues know that that is a responsibility that I take seriously.

He will uphold the law and the Constitution. Mr. Barr deserves our support, and one can tell from my remarks that I am, obviously, proud to vote for him.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PERDUE). The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, as the former chairman of the Judiciary Com-

mittee, the Senator from Iowa, has just pointed out, the Senate will soon vote on the nomination of William Barr to serve as Attorney General.

As has also been pointed out, this is, undoubtedly, one of the most qualified nominees to come before the Senate in his having already held the same position under President George H.W. Bush. He has also served as an intelligence analyst at the CIA, as an Assistant Attorney General in the Department of Justice's Office of Legal Counsel, and as Deputy Attorney General before he served as Attorney General.

His confirmation hearing lasted more than 12 hours, during which time he and other witnesses answered hundreds of questions on a wide variety of issues he might confront as Attorney General. He was straightforward and forthcoming. He earned high praise even from the ranking Democrat on that committee—our colleague, Senator FEINSTEIN from California—who said:

He's obviously very smart. He was Attorney General before. . . . No one can say he isn't qualified. I was thinking last night, obviously Mr. Barr is qualified. He is bright. He is capable.

She could have said more, but one of the things she said after that is, "I won't be voting for him."

This is an important job for the American people. There are a lot of jobs out there to be filled. It is hard to argue that any of them are more important than this one, but it is also hard to argue that there is not something wrong with a process where that is the comment that could be made, followed not too long after that by: I won't be voting for him.

Senator GRASSLEY pointed out that the last time Bill Barr was confirmed to be Attorney General, it was by voice vote. It seems as if that must have been a long time ago. It hasn't been that long ago; it is just the way the Senate used to work. That is why the Rules Committee that I chair voted out a Senate resolution earlier today dealing with this issue. This should not be the problem that it is. It shouldn't be an issue, but, frankly, the nomination process is broken.

In every election in this country, one thing has been certain: At least one party will not be happy with the result. I certainly understand why our Democratic colleagues weren't happy with the results of the 2016 election. There have been elections I have not been happy about and some that I have been happier about than others even when I was happy. This is a process that makes it easy not to be pleased with what voters decide to do, but that doesn't give you the right to stand in the way of what voters try to do, and that is exactly what our friends on the other side of the aisle have done.

Over the past 2 years, we have had unprecedented obstruction when it comes to just trying to put a government in place, unprecedented obstruction to confirming a President's nominees.

During the first Congress President Trump was in office, the previous 2 years, he submitted 1,136 nominees for jobs across the Federal Government. During that same period of time, President Obama submitted 1,132 nominees.

By the way, President Trump is sometimes criticized for not getting the nominees up here quickly enough. He actually got four more nominees up during that period of time than President Obama did, but the Senate confirmed 920 of President Obama's nominees during that first 2 years, and the Senate only confirmed 714 of President Trump's nominees—barely half for President Trump and about 70 percent, 75 percent for President Obama. There is a nearly 200-person difference, but more important, maybe, than the difference is the obvious effort for us not to be able to get other work done.

At the end of the last Congress, we returned the largest number of nominees from any President since Ronald Reagan. There are really only two reasons for that. One is to, frankly, stall the confirmation process and make it difficult for the President to do the job of being President. If you don't get the people to help you do the job you are elected to do, you can't do the job as effectively as you would otherwise.

We just had a government shutdown, which I think all of us were disappointed by. That is bad policy. We don't want to repeat it again. We didn't want to repeat it that time. But we have a partial shutdown of many of these Agencies and parts of the government every single day because we don't have the people necessary to put the rules in place.

There was a lot of discussion during the government shutdown about farmers who weren't able to get the loan guarantees they needed because the office was closed. Well, to some extent, it is the same way when the door is open but the people aren't there, when the door is open but the rules for the new farm bill haven't been issued, and when the door is open but the trade regulations that need to be made for the tax bill aren't out there.

The other reason, by the way, the second reason, is just to use up floor time. There are only so many things we can do here on the Senate floor. The majority leader is fond of saying that the most precious commodity in the Senate is floor time. If we are required to drag out this process, as the minority has insisted we do for the last 2 years, things don't happen otherwise.

During the first 2 years of the Trump administration, there were 128 cloture votes right here—128 cloture votes. That is where a Democrat—usually the minority leader—insists that we are going to have to get a majority of votes to even have the debate on a candidate. Once you file that, that takes a day before you can even begin to have the debate, and then the debate is 30 hours. So half a week is gone before the week starts just trying to confirm one person for one thing. That could be as

important as a Supreme Court Justice, or it could be the lowest level of confirmation in any of the Agencies of government.

By the way, those are the people who haven't been put in place because obviously lifetime judges matter, and both parties would prioritize that.

There have been 128 cloture votes. In the first 2 years of the past three Presidents, there were cloture votes a total of 24 times—24 times. That is an average of 8 compared to 128. There is a lot of difference between 8 and 128.

Because the tradition of the Senate—as a matter of fact, I think if President Bush were on here, President George H. W. Bush—that number was zero. No time. And that was much more traditional, up until that time, than now.

When President Reagan was President, once a nominee got out of committee, it was an average of 5 days before that nominee had a vote here on the Senate floor. It was normally the same kind of voice vote that Senator GRASSLEY mentioned that Bill Barr had the last time. The average was 5 days. With President Trump, it was 55 days before a nominee could get a vote once they got out of committee.

Remember, if you have agreed to serve in one of these jobs, you have given all of your financial information, you have given all of your personal information, and you have been investigated through and through. You have appeared before a committee, and they have asked you every question they could think of to ask you. They have voted you out of that committee. And then 24 people, at the end of last year, were sent back to the White House, at the end of that conference—I think it was over 24 people, over two dozen people—who had been waiting 1 year to become maybe the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Interior.

This will not work. This is not how our system is supposed to work, and we need to move forward. And it is not like when this happens—when these 128 cloture votes happen—there is a huge debate. There are 30 hours, plus the intervening day, but that doesn't mean there is any big debate. In fact, usually there is almost no debate at all on these nominees. When the nominees were voted on, 48 percent of the nominees got over 60 votes and 37 percent of the nominees got over 70 votes. So clearly this is not about holding back somebody who could be confirmed; it is about using up time that should be used for other things.

There are two jobs in the Senate. One of them is the personnel business. One of them is confirming people the President nominates. But the other is the legislating business. The other is the funding the government business. The other is the talking about foreign policy business. The other is talking about the economy and trade and taxes. Every hour we spend on this is an hour we can't spend on that.

The resolution we passed out today was one I introduced with my colleague

from Oklahoma, Senator LANKFORD, who has been working on this issue for 2 years now, and others of us have as well. We introduced this bill to cut the amount of time back to what had been a temporary standing order when Republicans were in the minority, and we agreed to this temporary standing order. The Democrats were in the majority. There was a Democrat in the White House. We agreed to essentially this same framework: 2 hours for most nominees, 30 hours for circuit judges and Supreme Court Justices and Cabinet officers. Seventy-eight Senators voted for that temporary order.

Usually when you do you a temporary order, it is to see if it works. Well, it worked, but we didn't do it again. So we are now saying, let's make that temporary order a permanent part of the way the Senate approaches this part of its job. We are moving in that direction. We had a debate this morning in committee. The time we are spending on the floor—if there is a nominee who needs 30 hours, they are almost certainly going to be in that category that gets 30 hours. If there is a nominee who would be in the 2-hour category, they are going to have been through committee, they are going to have been thoroughly vetted, and the committee will have decided they should be reported out. We need to get back to where 5 days after that, the Senate lets this person go on to fill a job that is, in all likelihood, not going to last beyond one administration and maybe not even that.

It won't be long before nobody is willing to sign up if a year later, after you have put your life on hold, you find out that the Senate somehow can't get to the job you have agreed to serve on because we have to take time that the Senate never took before.

I hope my colleagues on both sides of the aisle look at that standing order that could change our rules in a way that allows people who are willing to serve to be thoroughly vetted, thoroughly questioned, and then voted on. This can't happen unless they get voted on. Clearly, the current process of voting on people is a process that has been abused.

While the Senate is a place that recognizes the rights of the minority, those rights have only been upheld when the minority viewed them for what they are—rights of the minority rather than tools of the minority to obstruct the elected Government of the United States of America and the work of the Senate.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

S. 47

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, we have finally completed our work on S. 47, the Natural Resources Management Act. We had a good day yesterday. We had a good day here in the U.S. Senate. We passed this significant bill—really, a landmark piece of legislation—out of the Senate by a vote of 92 to 8. That is pretty strong. You don't see a lot of that in the Senate anymore—every now and again, and this was one of those every now and agains. I appreciate all the work.

We have now sent this over to the House of Representatives, and it has some good momentum. We are looking forward to being able to work with the House. I encourage them to move quickly on this important measure and see it enacted into law.

I want to take just a few moments this afternoon, while I can, to thank so many who have been key in getting us to this point. I want to start my comments with acknowledging the former ranking member of the Energy and Natural Resources Committee, Senator CANTWELL from Washington. We have spent a lot of time together. We have spent a lot of time over the years working on these lands bills. We did it in the public forum through the committee process. We had hearings on hundreds of bills. We worked to refine and reach agreement on them and to report them from committee. So there was all of that process, which went on throughout the committee, and then the two of us sitting down with our staffs on noncommittee time, just working through these particulars, in many meetings in my office and in her office. We really did this on a bipartisan basis. We stuck together. There were times when the prospects for this package did not look so good, and then there were moments when it looked even worse than not so good. But we kind of pulled one another along. I think that is a tribute to the commitment we made as colleagues and partners in this to advance not just to a message but to a product. I truly think that is a tribute to Senator CANTWELL and her willingness to work together to find a path forward.

Then we weren't able to finish things at the end of the year. Senator CANTWELL moved over to another committee, and I had an opportunity to pick up with Senator MANCHIN. He picked up.

Here he comes in, a new ranking member, and he has a bill to help manage on the floor with some 100-plus bills. But he helped us in a way that I am most, most grateful for. He kept us on track and helped us secure a very strong final tally here.

I am also very grateful to my other corners, the chairman and ranking member of the Natural Resources Committee on the House side, Chairman GRIJALVA and Ranking Member BISHOP. I thank them for their exceptional, exceptional work on this package and look forward to working with them as we finish this out.

Next on my list are Leader MCCONNELL and Senator SCHUMER. The minority leader is here. We had a conversation on the floor just about where he is sitting—this was back in December. But the two leaders gave their commitment to take this bill up early this year. They kept that commitment. They made it happen. I thank them for what they did in recognizing that this public lands, resources, and waters bill deserved early attention in this new Congress.

I mentioned on the floor that there were many colleagues on both sides: Senator HEINRICH, Senator GARDNER, Senator DAINES from Montana, Senator WYDEN from Oregon, all of whom have been great partners here on the floor.

It is important to briefly mention the staffs, who put in the long hours—the work and the family life they gave up.

The first person on my list to recognize is my deputy chief counsel, Lucy Murfitt, who is truly an expert, a true expert on the lands issue. She has poured her heart and soul into these issues, and it is no exaggeration to say they would not have happened without her efforts.

I also thank my staff director, Brian Hughes; my chief counsel, Kellie Donnelly; the members of my lands team, Annie Hoeffler, Lane Dickson, and Michelle Lane; our communications team, Nicole Daigle, Michelle Toohey, and Tonya Parish; our support staff, including Melissa Enriquez and Sean Solie; then Brianne Miller and Isaac Edwards, who basically kept the committee running while everyone else was focusing on this bill.

While I am proud of my team, we had great partners on the other side of the aisle. Sarah Venuto and Lance West joined the committee with Senator MANCHIN, and they have been great to work with. Sam Fowler, David Brooks, Rebecca Bonner, Bryan Petit, Camille Touton, Mary Louise Wagner, and Amit Ronen also played key roles.

Then on the House side, we had David Watkins and Brandon Bragato of Chairman GRIJALVA's staff, along with Parish Braden and Cody Stewart, who has now left the Hill, of Ranking Member BISHOP's staff.

I have to give a shout-out for the floor staff. Laura Dove and her team were fabulous. We also appreciate our Parliamentarians, Elizabeth McDonough and Leigh Hildebrand; Terry Van Doren with Leader MCCONNELL; and Aniela Butler at the Senate Budget Committee.

Two of the individuals who probably put the most time into this package, Heather Burnham and Christina Kennelly, are in the Office of Senate Leg Counsel. I also thank Janani Shankaran, Kim Cawley, and Aurora Swanson at CBO.

Great members, great team—we could not have done this great work without them.

To Senator SCHUMER, I say thank you for allowing me to complete this in its entirety. I appreciate your indulgence.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, let me thank the chair of the Energy Committee, the senior Senator from Alaska, for the wonderful work she always does around here. She has the respect of Members on both sides of the aisle. She tries to do the right thing and ends up there so often. This lands bill wouldn't have happened without a lot of the people she mentioned, but at the top of the list would certainly, certainly, be the senior Senator from Alaska.

Once again, I tip my hat to the junior Senator from Washington State, who worked so long and hard on this. The two of them were a great team, and JOE MANCHIN filled in when he became ranking member. We are all very glad that this wonderful lands bill, with so many good things in it, will, barring any unforeseen mishap, become law very soon.

NOMINATION OF WILLIAM BARR

Mr. President, I rise this afternoon to address the nomination of Mr. William Barr to be the next Attorney General of the United States.

We take all these nominations very seriously. Each member of the President's Cabinet holds immense influence within our government, with the power to affect the lives of millions. At this moment in time, the Attorney General might be the very most critical of all of the Cabinet officials in our government.

Not only will the Attorney General assume the traditional responsibilities of the office, but the next Attorney General would also oversee one of the most sensitive investigations in our Nation's history—the special counsel's investigation into Russian influence in the 2016 elections. Just to say those words, “Russian influence in the 2016 elections,” makes your hair stand on end a little bit.

Under normal circumstances, the position of Attorney General demands an individual of unimpeachable integrity, impartiality, and independence. Under these circumstances, that bar is more important and probably higher than ever. Why? Because as we have all seen, President Trump has demonstrated utter contempt for the rule of law. He has expressed a view of the Department of Justice that is completely counter to the history of this grand Department as an independent Agency of the law. Rather, he views the Justice Department as an Agency that should protect him personally and one he can compel to protect his friends and prosecute his enemies. That sounds like a third-world country, not the United States of America.

In the process of attempting to discredit the special counsel's investigation, the President has run roughshod over the norms of the executive branch's relationship with the Justice Department. President Trump has demeaned the public servants of the Justice Department. He has questioned its

motives, up to and including the up-grading and belittling of the former Attorney General on Twitter—an Attorney General that he himself appointed.

As the special counsel continues to investigate the connections between the most senior members of the Trump administration and the Kremlin, it is an extraordinarily important and extraordinarily dangerous moment for the Justice Department. That is the maelstrom into which the next Attorney General will step.

Certainly, Mr. Barr is intelligent. Certainly, Mr. Barr has experience. In fact, he already did the job. Let me say that I have always respected his public service and believed him to be a good man, but what so many of us find lacking in Mr. Barr's nomination this time around is his fundamental lack of awareness about the moment we are in.

Only a few months ago, it was uncovered that he authored an unsolicited memo to the Justice Department criticizing—criticizing—the special counsel's investigation. He wasn't involved with the Justice Department in any capacity at the time. He was a private attorney. He could not have had access to any of the facts in the case. Yet he decided to write this memo, which, in addition to making un evidenced claims about the investigation, outlined an extremely broad—in my judgment—overreaching vision of Executive power. Writing that memo showed poor judgment and, worse, it showed bias at a time when the country could not afford either in its Attorney General.

I felt the memo alone was disqualifying at a time when we have a President who scorns the rule of law, but I believed Mr. Barr deserved the chance to change my mind so I met with him privately a few weeks ago. Our conversation focused on three questions.

First, I asked him very directly if he would recuse himself if the ethics officials at the Justice Department said he should. He would not commit to doing this. Instead, he said he would make his own decision.

Second, I asked him if he would release the special counsel's full report on Russian influence in the 2016 election, with, of course, appropriate redactions that the intelligence services would require. His response was to say: "I'm for transparency." That is not good enough.

He is a good lawyer. Everyone knows when you can make an ironclad commitment or when you have words that seem good but don't make such a commitment. To say you are for transparency doesn't say very much. I asked for an unequivocal and public commitment to release the report. He would not give that assurance.

Finally, I asked Mr. Barr to commit that he would not interfere in any way with the special counsel's investigation, whether by denying subpoenas, limiting the scope of the investigation, or restricting funding. He referred to the special counsel regulations and said he wanted to see Mueller finish his

investigation. Again, that is not good enough—not with any President and certainly not with this one.

With this President, we need an Attorney General who can assure the Senate and the American public that he will stand up to a President who is dead set on protecting his political interests above all norms and rules of conduct. The President wants a Roy Cohn to be his Attorney General, but this moment calls for another Elliot Richardson.

The next Attorney General must be a public servant in the truest sense, with the integrity, the force of will, and the independence to navigate the Justice Department—and maybe our democracy—through treacherous waters.

Mr. Barr's attitude of "leave it to me" is not good enough—not for any nominee and certainly not for a nominee President Trump has chosen.

The authorship of the memo, followed by the inability to commit to release the report or let the investigation continue unimpeded—those are three strikes. Mr. Barr should be out. He does not recognize or appreciate the moment we are in. Again, his "leave it to me" attitude does not measure where we are with a President like this.

Now, I hope I am wrong. I hope Mr. Barr, who we know is likely to be confirmed—our Republican colleagues show none of the independence that is required—will rise to the occasion, but I remain unconvinced that Barr is prepared to meet this moment. So I will be voting, with strong conviction, no on this amendment. I hope Mr. Barr disproves my view, but his words make me very much worried that this will not happen.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COTTON). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BOOKER. Mr. President, I rise today to speak on the nomination of William Barr to be the next Attorney General of the United States of America.

Last Thursday, I voted against his nomination in the Senate Judiciary Committee, as did nine of my fellow Committee Members. I voted against his nomination because of some very serious concerns I have with his record on everything from criminal justice to environmental justice, to defending the economic rights of Americans, the rights of immigrants, LGBTQ rights, and women's rights.

I want to go through those concerns here on the floor today, but I also want to be clear that Mr. Barr has been nominated at a time of extraordinary challenge when it comes to defending rights in this country. This is a crisis.

We are in a moment in history when, after years of attacks on civil rights by this President and Attorney General Jeff Sessions, some of our most fundamental democratic principles—the rule of law, separation of powers, equal protection under the law—are hanging in the balance. We now face a full-blown crisis when it comes to rolling back the rights of Americans.

From community to community across the country, we see what it looks like when the Department of Justice fails to pursue justice for all Americans.

It looks like hate crimes in this country are on the rise for the third year in a row but a Department of Justice that rolls back protections for LGBTQ Americans instead of strengthening them.

It looks like more than one-third of all the LGBTQ youth in the country missing school because they feel unsafe but a DOJ that refuses to fight for them and protect them against State laws that target transgender students.

It looks like unchecked voter suppression of Black Americans in Georgia, Native Americans in North Dakota, and the voter ID and voter purge laws across the country that tried to target and suppress minority voters but a Justice Department that has stood by and failed to take on one single voting rights case during the last 2 years.

It looks like communities that are being poisoned by corporate polluters pushing their costs of doing business onto neighborhoods least able to defend themselves, making their land and air and water toxic but a DOJ that has made it easier for polluters to get settlement agreements while cutting its own enforcement capacity to hold those corporate polluters accountable.

It looks like corporate malfeasance continuing to target the most vulnerable while DOJ enforcement of corporate penalties drops by 90 percent during the first 2 years of the Trump administration.

It looks like doubling down on the failed war on drugs, which is known to be not a war on drugs but a war on the American people—disproportionately low-income Americans, disproportionately mentally ill Americans, disproportionately addicted Americans, and disproportionately Black and Brown people—which is exactly what Jeff Sessions did when he directed all Federal prosecutors to "charge and pursue the most serious, readily provable offense" and seek the highest penalties in nonviolent drug crimes.

It looks like unarmed Black men being killed by officers in their own homes and backyards, Americans of color being disproportionately stopped and arrested without adequate systems of accountability, but having a DOJ that limits the use of consent decrees that can prevent systemic abuses of power by law enforcement and can actually help to make law enforcement better, more accountable, more effective, rebuilding and repairing the trust

between law enforcement and communities necessary to create safe and strong communities.

Of course, it looks like children fleeing violence, being ripped from the arms of their parents, of their mothers at the southern border, 6-year-olds being thrown into cages, and an untold number of children who still have not been reunited with their families because of the DOJ's so-called zero-tolerance policy.

Right now we see a Justice Department whose leadership over the past 2 years has failed countless communities, from low-income Americans who are being victimized by large corporations with bad actors to individual Americans who are trying to have their basic, fundamental rights protected.

The Justice Department has failed the American people, and, most of all, it has failed to seek that ideal we all hold dear, which is equal justice under the law. That is why, at this moment in history, during this crisis of conscience, during this crisis of moral leadership, we need an Attorney General who grasps the urgency of the moment, who is aware of the impact of the Department of Justice on communities across this country, and who is willing and prepared to protect our most fundamental rights in every community for every American. That is the ideal of justice; that is the ideal of patriotism.

What is patriotism but love of country? You cannot love your country unless you love your fellow country men and women. What does love look like in public? Justice, justice, justice.

I appreciate that Mr. Barr took the time to sit down and meet with me. It was after the hearings; yet at my request, he finally agreed to come and meet with me. There was no staff in the room. It was an honorable gesture—a gesture of courtesy. We had a chance to have dialogue about his record, his experiences, his perspectives as well as mine. I appreciate that. It is a constructive first step.

I appreciate his willingness to listen to me and talk about his record of mass incarceration. I even appreciate his willingness to accept the book I gave him—I hope he reads it—titled “The New Jim Crow” by Michelle Alexander.

I continue to have concerns about Mr. Barr's ability and willingness to be the kind of Attorney General this country needs at this pivotal moment in American history. I am concerned because throughout his career, time and again, and during his confirmation process, Mr. Barr has demonstrated not only that he holds troubling views but also that he has an alarming lack of knowledge about the crises that make our justice system so broken right now, at a time when the United States continues to lead the globe, to lead the planet Earth and all of humanity in the sheer number of people we incarcerate.

One out of every four people incarcerated on the planet Earth is right here

in the United States, the land of the free. One out of every three incarcerated women on the planet Earth is right here in America, the land of the free. I say, again, that they are not the wealthy; they are not the privileged. As my friend Bryan Stevenson says: We have a nation that treats you better if you're rich and guilty than if you're poor and innocent.

Since 1980, our prison population in this country alone has grown on the Federal level by 800 percent. You can tell a lot about a nation by whom they incarcerate. In Russia they incarcerate political prisoners. In Turkey they incarcerate members of the media. In this country we incarcerate the poor. We incarcerate Americans with mental illnesses, Americans with disabilities, Americans who are survivors of sexual assault, Americans who are struggling with addiction, people who have faced harm and need help, who often in the system get hurt and experience retribution and not restorative justice. We have a nation where we are locking people up for doing things that two of the last three Presidents admitted to doing.

Mr. Barr has a record of actively pushing the policies that have led to mass incarceration, that have driven up our Nation's prison populations at a time when we need an Attorney General who is willing to follow the lead of this body, which passed criminal justice reform.

When Mr. Barr served as Attorney General during the first Bush administration, he literally wrote the book on mass incarceration. He commissioned a report titled “The Case for More Incarceration” and wrote the forward endorsing it. He is an architect of the criminal justice system that is so disproportionate—out of proportionality—that is ruthless, doing things that other countries, until this body acted, called torture, like juvenile solitary confinement.

At his hearing, Mr. Barr said he recognized that some things have changed over the last quarter century, but he failed to explain how his views on criminal justice have actually evolved. He was describing more of what he was seeing this body and others do, but he didn't talk about his own evolution. He didn't say: Hey, that was my perspective then, and it has changed now.

On the issue of implicit racial bias, I asked him if he acknowledged its well-documented existence in our criminal justice system. Implicit racial bias has been pointed out by both sides of the aisle in this body, by big city police chiefs and a former FBI Director. Time and again, it has been documented by university studies. It is actually in our Justice Department's policies to train people in implicit racial bias. This isn't something that is new. This is something we understand.

When asked about it, Mr. Barr said:

I have not studied the issue of implicit racial bias in our criminal justice system. . . . Therefore, I have not become sufficiently fa-

miliar with the issue to say whether such bias exists.

I find this incredibly alarming. There are widely documented instances of racial disparities throughout our criminal justice system from police stops to sentencing, to charges. Racial bias exists even in our school pipeline; with Black kids and White kids having committed the same infractions in school, African-American kids are more likely to be suspended for them.

There is no difference, for example, between Blacks and Whites in the United States of America for using drugs—no differences for Blacks, Whites, Latinos. We have a drug problem in America, and it is equally seen, regardless of race. Whites are more likely than Blacks, in many studies, to deal drugs. Yet, despite this, we live in a country where Blacks are about three times more likely to be arrested for using drugs and almost four times more likely to be arrested for selling drugs.

What does it do when you apply a justice system to certain communities and not to others? It has a multiplier effect of impact. It affects voting rights because States still eliminate the right to vote for nonviolent drug charges. It is called felony disenfranchisement. It affects economic opportunity because if you have one criminal conviction for doing the same things that past Presidents have admitted to doing and Members of this body have admitted to doing, then you can't get a job, you can't get business licenses. Doors are shut to you; opportunity is closed. When you have a justice system that disproportionately impacts certain Americans, those communities then face serious, serious consequences.

As a Villanova study shows, overall, we would have about 20 percent less poverty in America if our incarceration rates were the same as those of our industrial peers. Poverty is more inflicted on those communities of color when they are more likely to be arrested, charged, and convicted because of the existence of implicit racial bias.

But the nominee for the top law enforcement position in our country says he is not sure “whether such bias exists.”

This should be deeply troubling to all Americans because we believe in an ideal of equal justice under the law. This should be troubling to all Americans because we believe, as King said, “Injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere.”

This should be deeply troubling to all Americans because there is a deep lack of faith that people have in our criminal justice system. They are losing faith that they will receive equal treatment.

When the justice system does not operate in good faith, it is hampered in doing its most sacred duty.

Right now there is a lack of belief that people will be treated fairly, a lack of belief that the system works

the way it is supposed to. Mr. Barr's response and his record show me that he will do nothing to address these legitimate concerns in communities all across this country. At a time when he could be a leader, a champion, a light of justice and hope for those who have lost hope, for those who have lost faith, for those who feel left out and left behind, he almost doubles down with a dangerous lack of knowledge about what we all know exists.

If confirmed, Mr. Barr would also be charged with implementing what this body collectively has done to start to reform, for the first time in American history, mass incarceration and increased sentencing.

For the first time since 1994's crime bill, we in this body, with wisdom and in a bipartisan way, have started to go back to more proportionate sentencing. Through the FIRST STEP Act, this body put more justice back into our justice system. It is the first step, but it is the first step in the right direction in decades in our country's history.

I am proud of what we did together. The bipartisan criminal justice reform that this body just passed into law, by an overwhelming vote, is incredible, but it is critical that the FIRST STEP Act be fully and fairly implemented by the Justice Department. Mr. Barr has not demonstrated his commitment to the law or to fixing any part of the broken criminal justice system I have outlined.

Then, of course, we have industries, from the private prison industry to phone companies charging exorbitant fees in prisons and jails, making a profit off of these injustices, making a profit off policies that penalize and criminalize low-income communities and communities of color and that target refugees of color.

What is happening in our country's criminal justice system today is a human rights crisis. Think about a justice system right now that has people sitting in prison for months before they even get a trial because they can't afford bail or a lawyer. We have a human rights crisis in this country.

We need an Attorney General who recognizes the problem and has a willingness to do something about it, not one who says they are not sure we even have a crisis. This is an extraordinarily challenging time in our history. This Nation was formed under ideals of justice and fairness and equality. It was formed at a time when we mutually pledged to each other—as it says in our Declaration of Independence—“our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor.” This is a country where we are all in this together. This is a country where our values and ideals have to be real for all and not just a select few.

After 2 years, we have seen the Justice Department's relentless attacks on basic fundamental rights by our President and Attorney General. We now need an Attorney General who will work to uphold the values that are most in danger. We need an Attorney

General who will fight for equal justice for all, not just the privileged few. We need an Attorney General who knows the difference between ensuring justice is done and does not automatically seek the harshest penalty in every case, with a blind eye to circumstances, or facts, or extenuating circumstances.

We need an Attorney General who will stand up for all of our children, LGBTQ rights, for voting rights, environmental justice, and a fairer justice system. We need an Attorney General who will refocus on the mission of the Department of Justice in seeking justice for every young person who is afraid to go to school because of prejudice and policies that discriminate. We need one who is seeking justice for every elderly man who lived through Jim Crow only to be blocked from exercising his voting rights because of racially targeted voter ID laws.

We need an Attorney General who is seeking justice for Americans who have become entrapped in our broken criminal justice system, whether it is a kid from a community like the one I live in who is being targeted by our ineffective drug laws or kids who have been picked up on the southern border and thrown into a privately run detention center.

We need an Attorney General who is seeking justice for communities whose soil, air, and water are being polluted by massive corporations and that feel no one will fight for them. We need an Attorney General who will live up to the purpose of the Justice Department. This is the call of our country. This is the leadership we need. This is the Attorney General we must insist on, one who will seek justice for everyone in every community from the gulf coast to the Great Lakes, from sea to shining sea.

Mr. Barr has not demonstrated that he understands the fierce urgency of this moment in our history and the imperative for the Attorney General to be deeply disturbed by injustice and to urgently seek justice. For this main reason, I will be voting against his nomination, but if confirmed, I will perform my constitutional duty and provide oversight and accountability. I will continue to work to ensure that our Justice Department lives up to its demands.

I hope this Attorney General, should he be confirmed, learns, sees the vulnerable, understands the challenges of the meek, and understands communities in crisis; that he gets to know people; that he reaches out and sits down with folks to learn and to develop a more courageous empathy, but I will not wait on that.

I will fight every day to make sure our Justice Department seeks justice. If Mr. Barr tries to double down on the failures of a broken criminal justice system, tries to roll back basic rights, or fails to protect voting rights and civil rights, I will fight against his efforts at every step. I will fight for jus-

tice that doesn't just take the side of the powerful few but seeks justice for all Americans. That is our obligation—all of us. Whether you sit in this body or you sit in communities across this country, we have gotten to where we are because we all sought justice. Even if it didn't affect our families directly, we knew the call of our country must be about all of us understanding that injustice for one is an injustice for all.

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

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

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, in just a matter of hours, we are expected to vote on the nomination of William Barr to be Attorney General of the United States. This office is one of paramount importance to the people of this country, and as a former U.S. attorney, the chief Federal prosecutor in Connecticut, I have deep respect—indeed, reverence—for this office and the legal authority it commands and the moral powers it embodies.

So the stakes of this nomination, especially at this point in our history, could not be higher.

I believe William Barr should not be confirmed, and it has more to do with the role of the Attorney General of the United States than with his specific positions or policies on issues where we may disagree.

I do disagree with William Barr on positions he has taken on civil rights, women's healthcare, reproductive rights, and the powers of the Presidency.

At this moment in time, at this hour of our history, an imperial Presidency, such as envisioned by many of the doctrines that William Barr has espoused, in my view, would be an absolute catastrophe. Giving the President the power, in effect, to override statutes or refuse to enforce them or disregard Supreme Court precedent, especially with this President, would be a recipe for disaster.

An imperial Presidency at any point in our history is unwise. At this moment in our history, it would be catastrophic. That view of a unitary Executive and all that comes with it is one of the reasons I would have reservations about this nominee, but for me, the transcendent issue—as it was with Jeff Sessions, our former colleague—is whether this nominee will be the people's lawyer or the President's lawyer. Will he put first the interests of the American people or of President Donald Trump? Will he have foremost in mind the public interests or the personal interests of the President who appointed him?

Unfortunately, I am left with deep concerns, doubts, and questions that

are disqualifying. The best example is his position on the release and disclosure of the special counsel's report. There were doubts—and there continue to be—among some of my colleagues about whether he will, in fact, allow the special counsel to do his job. He said that he would resist firing the special counsel and that he would allow Robert Mueller to finish his investigation, but he was pretty careful to avoid specifically committing that he would permit subpoenas to be issued, indictments to be brought, resources to be provided, and other essential factors that go into the effectiveness of the special counsel.

Even giving him the benefit of the doubt on those issues, there remains his refusal to commit that he will provide the evidence and findings of the special counsel directly to Congress and directly to the American people. For me, that refusal to commit is one of the factors that are disqualifying.

The American people want transparency for the special counsel, as they do in their government generally. Just yesterday, the Washington Post released a poll indicating that 81 percent of Americans believe the Mueller report should be released. That number includes 79 percent of Republicans. The simple, stark fact is, the public has a right to know. The American people paid for the special counsel's report. They deserve to know everything that is in it, and they deserve not only the conclusion but also the findings of fact and his prosecutorial decisions and the underlying evidence that he considered in making those decisions. The clear specter arises that he will choose to bring no indictment against the President or other officials and that there will be no disclosure of the report, which would be tantamount to a cover-up. What we may be watching is the Saturday Night Massacre in slow motion.

The reason this issue is of such paramount importance to this nomination relates to the obligation that the Attorney General has to promote transparency. In his responses to me, he said he would follow all the rules and regulations without delving into all the words and technical issues relating to those rules and regulations. The simple fact is, they provide near complete discretion to the Attorney General.

The American public has a right to see the Mueller report, not the Barr report. We have a right to see not what William Barr in his discretion permits us to know but, in fact, what the findings and evidence are—the Mueller report, not the Barr report. My fear is that despite his very vague references to wanting transparency, his refusal to commit to making that report public reveals his state of mind: that he will abridge, edit, conceal, redact parts of the report that may be embarrassing to the President. In effect, he will act as the President's lawyer, not as the people's lawyer.

During a hearing, I asked William Barr point blank, if he were presented

with evidence beyond a reasonable doubt that the President committed a crime, would he approve an indictment. He declined to answer the question directly or clearly. He pointed to two Office of Legal Counsel opinions saying that a sitting President cannot be indicted. I asked what he thought, not what the OLC thought. Would he permit an indictment against a President if presented with incontrovertible evidence of criminal wrongdoing? And he said he saw no reason to change the policy embodied in those OLC memos. The assumption is wildly held that Robert Mueller will follow those OLC memos, and William Barr confirmed those assumptions.

There is also Department of Justice policy that prosecutors do not speak publicly about people they are investigating but are not prepared to indict. I followed those policies as U.S. attorney. I know them well. In the normal case, they are fully applicable, but these two policies taken in combination lead to a truly frightening outcome: If the President cannot be indicted but has committed crimes, the American people may never know. That is, in effect, tantamount to a coverup. The American people may never know about that proof beyond a reasonable doubt. They may never see those findings in evidence. They may never have the benefit of the full report. Even though it may leak in dribs and drabs, in parts, they will never have the full and complete picture.

That is why I believe so strongly in the legislation that Senator GRASSLEY and I have offered to require transparency. It is called the Special Counsel Transparency Act. It would require that there be a report. If the special counsel is transferred or fired or if he resigns or at any point completes his investigation, there would be a report, and it would be required that that report be provided to the American people. It would be mandatory, not discretionary.

I believe this issue is a transcendent one in this era—the public's right to know the truth about the 2016 election and the President's responsibility for any obstruction of justice or any collusion with the Russians. Again, it is about the public's right to know and about the Attorney General's responsibility for enabling the public's right to know. His answers were evasive and deeply troubling, and instead of providing straightforward and forthcoming answers, he was, in effect, evading and avoiding the question.

In addition to the special counsel's investigation, there are at least two U.S. Attorney's Offices—the Southern District of New York and the Eastern District of Virginia—that have concurrent investigations into Trump campaign activities during this same period of time and beyond. In the Southern District of New York, the President has been essentially named as an unindicted coconspirator. He is individual No. 1, an unindicted cocon-

spirator. That is a distinction he shares with only one other President—Richard Nixon.

The unencumbered continuation of these investigations is of vital public interest. That is why I asked Mr. Barr whether he would impose any restrictions on these prosecutors. Again his answer was evasive and deeply troubling. Instead of issuing a simple no, he stated that the Attorney General has the responsibility and discretion to supervise U.S. attorneys, and he declined to say that he would defer to them. He declined in the hearing, and he did again in our private meeting. That answer gives me no confidence that, if confirmed, William Barr will avoid interfering in the investigations now underway in those two additional jurisdictions, where, in fact, they may pose an even more dire danger that his culpability will be revealed and perhaps prosecuted. It should not give the public any greater degree of confidence either.

On other issues—the emoluments clause, for example. When I asked him, he said: I haven't even looked up the word "emolument." That is a direct quote. There are a number of very high-profile cases against the President involving the emoluments clause of the U.S. Constitution because the President has been violating it. The chief anti-corruption provision in Federal law is the emoluments clause. Litigation is underway. Decisions have been rendered in the district courts in favor of the standing of 200 of us Members of Congress who have challenged the President's lawbreaking. I am proud that that case—*Blumenthal v. Trump*; *Blumenthal and Nadler v. Trump*—is proceeding. William Barr has a responsibility to know about that case and to say whether he would recuse himself from it since he was appointed by the defendant in that case, and if not, what justification there can be for continuing to make decisions about it.

Again, William Barr is a distinguished attorney. He has a strong background and qualifications. He served in this position before. He has very impressive credentials. He and I differ on issues of policy, but the main question relates to disclosure and transparency, to fidelity and priority, to the American people's interests—putting them unquestionably above the President's. Because I have such deep reservations and concerns about his determination to do so, I will oppose him as Attorney General, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. BLACKBURN). The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. MANCHIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to enter into a colloquy with the Senators from Ohio, West Virginia, Virginia, and Pennsylvania.

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

S. 27

Mr. MANCHIN. Madam President, once again, I stand here on behalf of our hard-working and patriotic coal miners. We have been here before, and we are going to stay here until we get the job done.

Right now, retired coal miners' healthcare, pensions, and black lung benefits are on the chopping block again, and, once again, there are 1,200 new coal miners and dependents who will lose their healthcare coverage due to coal company bankruptcies. This could happen later this month if the court, as expected, allows Westmoreland to shed their Coal Act liabilities.

This has happened time after time because of the bankruptcy laws—the inadequate bankruptcy laws—to protect the hard-working men and women who do all the work.

At the end of last year, Westmoreland indicated they would provide 8 months of healthcare funding to the UMWA, but there was a condition. It was dependent upon the sale of certain mines for which they have received no qualified bids, according to documents filed in court.

Our broken bankruptcy laws are about to let another coal company shirk their responsibilities and get out of paying for healthcare and pensions the coal miners have earned and deserved. They have worked for this. They have negotiated. They are not asking for a handout. They are asking to get what they paid for, what they negotiated for, and what they didn't take home to their families.

We have to keep our promise that was signed into law in the Krug-Lewis agreement. This goes back to 1946—1946. It is the only one of its kind. The agreement makes sure we protect our patriotic coal miners' healthcare and pensions.

We have the chance today to pass my bill that was cosponsored with my colleagues, the American Miners Act, that will ensure that none of these coal miners or their beneficiaries would lose their healthcare, pensions, or black lung benefits.

The American Miners Act uses the same funding mechanism that the Miners Protection Act did to protect retired miners' healthcare. It is the same funding mechanism Congress has used time and again to protect our miners' hard-earned healthcare after our bankruptcy courts have ripped them away. This is not going to be a drain on the Treasury. It does not cost the taxpayers money. We have pay-fors, and this will be taken care of, as we have taken care of our healthcare benefits.

I am asking you to keep the promise just the way we did when we passed the Miners Protection Act and saved the healthcare for 22,600 miners. We need to finish this job. Save the healthcare of these miners suffering from new bankruptcies, protect the pensions of 87,000 miners nationwide, and do it by passing the American Miners Act, which would also ensure the future of

the Black Lung Trust Fund, a lifeline for the growing number of miners with black lung.

I don't know if you all understand the background or if you have heard about what happened, but with the passage of the bills we are working on, it cuts the black lung fund from \$1.10 down to 50 cents. You would think that if you were reducing it, we had found a cure, and there is less need for the money to save our coal miners and to heal them. That is contrary to what is happening. If anything, it is exacerbating, and it is growing quicker, faster, and younger people are getting this horrible disease more than ever before.

What we are asking for—my colleagues on both sides of the aisle—is to join us here today to demonstrate our commitment to our promise. That is all it is.

I am asking the President of the United States, President Trump, please join in, Mr. President. I know you know the miners. I know you have spoken eloquently about the miners and your support for the miners. This is one way to truly support the miners, to make sure they get what they worked for and what they have earned—what they worked for and what they have earned. We have it paid for. It does not add one penny to the Nation's debt. Everything is ready to go. Please call Senator MCCONNELL and tell him to put this on the agenda. You put it on the agenda, Mr. President, and you have Senator MCCONNELL put in the amendment—a Senator from Kentucky who has an awful lot of coal miners in his State also. I will assure you we will get it passed, and we will do the job we should have done a long time ago for the people and families who have given everything they have, who have patriotically committed themselves to the energy this country has needed, and who have defended this country every step of the way.

With that, I yield to my friend from Ohio, Senator BROWN.

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, I say thank you to Senator MANCHIN. We are joined by Senator CAPITO, Senator WARREN, and I know, in spirit, a number of others. I think Senator CASEY will be here in a few minutes. I join them to remind this body—it is a constant reminder—that more than 86,000 miners—86,000 miners—are on the verge of facing massive cuts to the pensions and healthcare they earned.

This body doesn't always remember what collective bargaining is all about. Collective bargaining is when union members sit down and give up wages today to have something for the future, to have healthcare and to have retirement in the future.

Of those 86,000 miners, 1,200 miners and their families could lose their healthcare this month because of the Westmoreland and Mission Coal bankruptcies. The bankruptcy courts could allow these corporations to “shed their liabilities,” which is a fancy way of saying walk away from paying miners

the pensions and the healthcare benefits they absolutely earned.

Senator MANCHIN is working to fix this. I thank him for his efforts, and I thank others in this body. We know the mine workers aren't alone. The retirement security of hundreds of thousands of teamsters, ironworkers, carpenters, bakery workers, and so many other retirees is at risk.

We know this affects, in my State alone, 250 businesses, mostly small construction and transportation companies, 60,000 workers in my State alone, and the health of communities. Mine worker communities are especially hurt by this because so many of them live in the same community—local stores and local businesses.

As we know, Congress pretty much tried to ignore these workers and these retirees. Senator MANCHIN and I saw that day after day and week after week, but they fought back. We saw workers rally. They rallied in very hot weather on the Capitol lawn, and they rallied in very cold weather on the Capitol lawn. They rallied. They called. They wrote letters. We have seen those camo UMWA T-shirts around the Capitol. Many of them are veterans. They fought for their country. We owe it to them to fight for them.

We made progress on the bipartisan Pensions Committee that Senator MANCHIN and I sat on. Thanks to Senator PORTMAN, also from my State, and members of both parties who put in months of good work in good faith on this.

I am committed to these miners and workers. We will not give up. That is why I brought Rita Lewis as my guest to the State of the Union Address down the hall last week. Rita Lewis is the widow of Butch Lewis, the teamster who died from a heart attack a couple of years ago, in large part, we think—she thinks, his family thinks brought on by the pressure of fighting for his union, his Teamsters 100—1 million members around the country.

It is about the dignity of work. When work has dignity, we honor the retirement security people have earned.

As I said, people in this town don't always understand the collective bargaining process. People give up money today to earn those pensions. If you love your country, you fight for people who make it work, people like these mineworkers.

Mr. MANCHIN. Madam President, I want to mention one more thing and then I will turn it over to my colleague, my friend from West Virginia, Senator CAPITO.

The reason this is so urgent, our miners' pensions are in dire need. It goes first. They come to insolvency by 2022. What happens is we are one bankruptcy away—one bankruptcy from one coal company—of this thing tumbling down in 2019. When it starts tumbling, then you have the Central States that will come right behind it, the PBGC becomes insolvent, and then we have serious problems. That is why we are

working with urgency for this to be adopted and fixed now.

With that, I want to go ahead and turn it over to my friend and colleague, the Senator from West Virginia, Mrs. CAPITO.

Mrs. CAPITO. Madam President, I am really pleased to be here to join in the colloquy with my fellow Senators, Mr. MANCHIN, Senator BROWN from Ohio, and Senator WARNER from Virginia.

This is important. This is really important. I could say I look around the room, and it is important to us, but it is important even more granularly to some other folks who are right here watching what we are doing.

Many of us have worked together previously in order to save retiree health benefits for 22,000 retired miners in 2017, following the bankruptcies of Patriot, Alpha, and Walter Resources. Today we are back together to advocate for another over 1,000 retirees and beneficiaries whose healthcare is impacted by the Westmoreland Coal bankruptcy, as Senator MANCHIN described.

It is also critical that we redouble our efforts to find a solution to the 1974 UMWA Pension Fund. If we do nothing—if we do nothing, which I don't believe is an option—this pension fund, which provides 83,000 current beneficiaries with their pensions, will be insolvent by 2022. That is getting close, and insolvency can come even sooner, depending on market conditions.

So combined with the 20,000 people who have a vested right to future benefits, more than 100,000 people are covered by this pension plan. As Senator MANCHIN said, these are hard-working people who were promised and who, in the course of their working lives, gave up something so they could have a better peace of mind later on. They worked hard day in and day out. They powered our communities and industries and helped our country achieve greatness, even in the toughest times, and they did that with the promise of healthcare and a pension that would allow them to live with dignity in retirement.

We are not talking about lavish pensions. I think this is an important point. The average benefit paid by this fund is \$560 per month. These retirees are not getting rich on their pension plans, and they are not taking lavish expenditures, but without this monthly benefit, many of them would be living on the edge of poverty, if they are not already.

One miner from Logan, WV, who worked in the mines for 36 years wrote:

Please keep fighting for our pension. I receive \$303.34 monthly. We need this badly to help pay for food, medicine, and other bills.

Another retired miner from Richwood, WV, who worked in the mines for 17 years, wrote that his monthly check of \$192 “is not a lot of money, but it means a lot,” and on top of that, he earned it. It helps him make his ends meet.

Another miner from Kistler, WV, who mined for over 35 years, expressed concern that he might not be able to pay his expenses or help his daughter in college without that monthly pension check.

Failing to fix the pension fund would have a terrible impact on communities where many of these miners live. More than 25,000 pension fund beneficiaries live in the State of West Virginia, and they received \$200 million in benefits last year. If they didn't spend that money in their community supporting businesses and other jobs in our coal-field communities—if you subtract those funds out of the community, you would have a significant economic blow.

We have a solution that will prevent the insolvency of the pension fund and protect our retired miners, their families, and their communities. We should pass legislation that expands the use of the same transfer of payments used to support retiree healthcare to make the pension fund solvent. I have supported various forms of that kind of legislation over the years, but as we come closer to the time—2022—when the pension fund will become insolvent, we must redouble our efforts. That is why I appreciate Senator MANCHIN's advocacy. I appreciate his sense of urgency, and I share that.

At the same time, our West Virginia representatives, along with representatives from the States—DAVID MCKINLEY, ALEX MOONEY, and CAROL MILLER—are leading a bipartisan effort in the House to fix this problem as well.

I will keep fighting alongside all of you and all of them and others I see until we enact a solution that keeps the promise of our hard-working coal miners.

Thank you.

I yield back.

Mr. MANCHIN. Madam President, at this time, I would like for the former Governor of the Commonwealth of Virginia and the senior Senator from Virginia to please have the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. First of all, Madam President, I want to thank my colleague from West Virginia, Senator CAPITO, for her comments. I know shortly we are going to hear from the Senator from Pennsylvania. We heard from the Senator from Ohio.

This is sometimes hard for me to say as a former Governor of Virginia to a former Governor of West Virginia, but I want particularly those who are following this issue to know that no one in this body has fought for miners harder, longer, more passionately, more consistently than JOE MANCHIN.

It was only through his repeated efforts—and this man is like a dog with a bone in his mouth who will not let it go. At times he is stiff in the spine with folks on this side of the aisle when they wanted to say: Well, maybe no. We ought to move to something else. He has come back and back and back again.

So I am honored to stand with him one more time. Let me again say that it is with some challenge that someone from the Commonwealth of Virginia has to say these many nice things about somebody from West Virginia, but the folks in the Gallery ought to know there has been no one who has been a better advocate for miners than the Senator from West Virginia.

I don't think there is a Member of the Senate—I know at least on this side of the aisle—who has not heard at least a half dozen times about the promises Harry Truman made to the miners in 1946 and how it is our obligation to keep that word and to keep that promise.

The Senator from West Virginia has indicated why this is timely. Again, it is because we have the challenges around the pension fund. We have other challenges, but we have a crisis right now.

We talked about Westmoreland—the Westmoreland bankruptcy, 1,200 miners, 500 of those live in Virginia. If we can't get a solution on this deal right now on the American Miners Act, then a lot of those miners and their families are going to go bankrupt because their day of reckoning is already upon us.

I want to echo what the Senator from West Virginia said to urge the majority leader and, for that matter, the minority leader that there is a way—if we do the rational, sensible thing and not shut down the government on Friday, we ought to take advantage of making sure the American Miners Act is part of that provision. I can think of nothing better, as we go into the work period, than to try to give miners some certainty.

Let me just mention one other item that the American Miners Act had, and that is the strengthening of the Black Lung Disability Trust Fund. This is also an issue that, if we don't get it resolved, the amount of contributions that go into that trust fund will drop in half.

I don't think many folks realize—and I think this is particularly the case in West Virginia and Southwest Virginia—black lung is still a real, enormous medical challenge. As a matter of fact, we have now seen growth in large populations in my State, and I know in West Virginia, as well, of advanced black lung cases called complicated black lung, which has an even more devastating effect.

If this trust fund is cut in half, based upon legislation that took place at the end of calendar year 2018, the ability of the trust fund to meet the needs of these miners and their families, who are still hard hit by a debilitating disease—we are not going to be able to give them, again, the high-quality care they deserve. It is way past time to fix this problem. Let's take that step.

We have one of these large pieces of legislation, hopefully, that the President will not decide to veto, that we will get through. Wouldn't it be—I ask the Senator from West Virginia this

before I cede to the Senator from Pennsylvania, but sometimes, with these giant bills, strange things pop out at the end of the day, and you kind of wonder how they got in. Wouldn't it be great if, on this mini giant bill, one of the things that popped out might be the promised relief for our miners in terms of healthcare and their pensions? This is something I believe, we, as a country, owe to the miners—back, yes, to President Truman's promise in 1946.

I stand with all of my colleagues on this issue. I particularly thank, again, my friend the Senator from West Virginia for his great leadership and his willingness to stand tall time and again. Let's see if we can get it done this time.

With that, Madam President, I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. MANCHIN. Madam President, I thank, first of all, the Senator from Virginia for fighting for his coal miners in Southwest Virginia.

They have been out there fighting in Westmoreland, and we have 1,200 miners about ready to lose everything that we had to fight for to gain. They are going to lose their pensions. They are going to lose, also, the healthcare. We have to get them in the bill. We have to get our trust fund on the black lung restored.

Mr. WARNER. Right, all we have to try to do with the trust fund is to get it back to the status quo.

Mr. MANCHIN. I am going to make one more plea to the President. I will do that after my good friend and senior Senator from Pennsylvania speaks about his miners, whom he supports.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CASEY. Madam President, I thank the senior Senator from West Virginia for his time today, but, more importantly, as the Senator from Virginia, Mr. WARNER, said, Senator MANCHIN has fought harder than anyone in this Chamber on behalf of men and women, whether they are coal miners or their families or their spouses.

This is a very simple debate. It is not a debate about some far-off, complex issue. This is about a promise—a promise that was made to coal miners and their families in the 1940s.

The only question—a real simple question—is that we are either going to keep the promise or not. It is as simple as that. Both parties, both Houses, and the administration—this is not complicated. We made substantial progress, but it took far too long, and there are some people in this Chamber who have been blocking it for far too long on healthcare. We got that done. That is the good news.

The bad news is, the pension issue is still unresolved. There is still a lot of suffering, a lot of uncertainty, a lot of trauma because two branches of government haven't done enough for these families.

I come from a State where large portions of our State were dependent upon the sweat and the blood of working

men and women, especially coal miners. Stephen Crane, the great novelist, wrote an essay in the early 1900s—actually late 1800s—about all of the dangers in a coal mine and all of the ways a miner could die. He described the mine as a place of “inscrutable darkness” and “a soundless place of tangible loneliness.” That is how he described the work of the coal miner.

I know we made progress in the intervening generation since then, but that work has always been difficult. It has always been dark and dangerous, but the people who did it kept their promise. They kept their promise to their employer to work every day and kept their promise to their family. Many of them kept their promise to their country when they served in World War II or Korea or Vietnam or any conflict after that, even up to the present day—but especially those who were serving in those years.

The only question is whether this government and all of us here—and both parties are on the hook here—whether we are going to keep our promise along with this administration and any future administration. It is as simple as that.

We have some work to do here to make sure that promise is fulfilled. These families, these miners have already kept their promise. They are done. This isn't something extra we are giving them.

All we are doing is our part. We are obligated here, and I am grateful that the senior Senator from West Virginia and others have worked together to make sure that this issue is front and center, even as we are dealing with a range of other issues.

I yield the floor.

Mr. MANCHIN. Madam President, I will wrap up now, and I want to, first of all, thank the Senator from Pennsylvania and the Senators from West Virginia and Ohio for speaking so eloquently for the people who have worked so hard for our country.

This has been a bipartisan movement. This has been bipartisan. I thank all of my Republican colleagues for supporting the hard-working people they all had in their States. We all benefited from the energy they produced for our great country, to defend ourselves in two wars. We had the greatest economy—the only superpower in the world—because of what they have done every day and the sacrifices they have made for us.

Mr. President, if you are watching, if you get a copy of this tape, I am pleading with you. I am pleading with you, Mr. President, on behalf of 87,000 retirees: Please help us. One phone call from you to Majority Leader MCCONNELL to support and adopt the American Miners Act of 2019, which is S. 27—ask him to take this up immediately. We can put it on the bill that we are about ready to open to keep the government open or he can take immediate action. But, Mr. President, you can make a difference. These are peo-

ple who supported you, and I know you support them, and this is the way you can show it.

They are only asking for what they worked for. It does not cost the government one penny of debt—not one penny of debt for the taxpayers. We have pay-fors. It has been bipartisan. It came out of the Finance Committee in a bipartisan movement under the leadership of Senator HATCH. I am very grateful for that.

You will see the miners going around; they make an effort every week, faithfully, to come here. There are real faces, real people, real families who are involved and affected by our inaction. We are asking for your help, Mr. President.

I yield the floor, respectfully.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

MAINTAINING AIR FORCE STRENGTH

Mrs. FISCHER. Madam President, I rise today to support the Air Force's plan to expand the 386 operational squadrons.

Since the earliest days of flight, the United States has been an aviation leader. From the time of the U.S. Army Air Corps through today's modern U.S. Air Force, our Nation has always been at the forefront of air combat.

From air-to-air combat to aerial refueling, to the intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance conducted by the planes of Nebraska's own 55th Wing, the U.S. Air Force is renowned as the dominant force in the sky.

Recent developments have put that advantage at risk. Around the world, nations are rapidly modernizing their capabilities by investing millions in their air forces and air defenses, threatening our ability to claim and maintain air superiority.

Rapid advances in anti-access/area-denial technology and a coordinated, calibrated effort by nations like China and Russia pose a significant threat to our ability to operate in contested airspace.

For decades, we have been accustomed to flying unconstrained, fighting adversaries on the ground that lack modern technology and the ability to seriously threaten our freedom to conduct aerial missions.

The face of 21st century warfare is changing. Competitors are rapidly closing the gap, and while our Air Force remains the most professional and effective air combat force in the world, these nations are pouring hundreds of millions of dollars into matching and exceeding our capability.

We have a choice. If we fail to react, we risk falling behind and losing the air dominance that has been essential to U.S. national security for decades. We cannot sit back and accept that possibility.

We must meet this challenge head-on. The United States must adapt, invest, and show the world that we will never cede control of the skies to our enemies.

Recently, the Air Force conducted a rigorous analysis of future air combat

scenarios that we could face in the coming decades. Utilizing over 2,000 simulations based on the latest intelligence to assess force performance against strategic competitors, the Air Force produced a model of the requirements necessary to fulfill the goals of the national defense strategy.

This analysis found that we will need an array of advanced capabilities to counter ongoing and robust military modernization by our competitors. The assessment determined that we must focus our own modernization around several key areas to ensure our continued ability to defend the homeland and to defeat strategic threats.

Perhaps most critically, this analysis, which the Air Force calls “the Air Force We Need,” has determined that to be effective in achieving these goals, we must grow the Air Force to 386 operational squadrons.

Given the growing threats we face, the Air Force will play a key role in any future conflict. That is why I believe it is imperative that we act on this analysis and align the necessary resources to bridge the gap between the Air Force we have and the Air Force we need and reach that goal of 386 squadrons.

The need to grow the Air Force is not some arbitrary desire for more planes. The reality is that, even today, our Air Force is too small, and it is stretched too thin to properly execute all of its missions.

Right now, the Air Force has 39 percent fewer aircraft and 58 percent fewer combat-coded fighter squadrons than it did during Operation Desert Storm, and it is struggling to maintain a rapidly aging fleet. All the while, Russia and China continue to invest hundreds of millions of dollars into new technology and equipment that is designed to seize control of the sky.

That is why it is imperative that we act to provide the resources necessary to grow to 386 operational squadrons. We simply cannot face these challenges with one of the smallest Air Forces we have ever had. That is a recipe for disaster. It is a recipe for defeat.

Instead, we must rebuild the fleet. We must increase flying hours, improve training, add pilots and maintainers, and retain the best airmen we have. We have to act now, without delay.

While the “Air Force We Need” adds significantly to the physical capability of our Air Force, it is about more than simply adding equipment to the flight line. This plan will also modernize the way we fight. With an increased focus on “jointness” and integration with advanced technology like unmanned systems and artificial intelligence, we can continue adapting to stay ahead of our enemies, all of whom have spent years watching and learning from us in the field.

As a senior member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, I commend the Air Force for putting forward a bold vision for the future. I believe if we truly are to execute the goals of the

national defense strategy, this is the kind of analysis and planning that has to happen, and it must be followed by action from Congress.

That is why I urge my colleagues in the Senate to join me in supporting a robust defense budget and investing in the enhanced capability the Air Force needs to continue its mission of protecting the American people.

At this critical juncture in the Nation’s history and amid a fundamental shift in the type of threats we face, now is not the time to let partisanship get in the way of what must be done to continue supporting our airmen and maintainers. Let’s work together so that we can build the Air Force that we need so that, above all else, the world knows that the U.S. Air Force will never allow any adversary to dictate how, when, and where we fly.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRAMER). Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOMINATION OF WILLIAM BARR

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, I rise this afternoon to speak regarding the nomination of William Barr to serve as the next Attorney General of our country.

First, I want to take a few minutes to reflect on the circumstances surrounding this vacancy. I believe that every Member of this Chamber should use this occasion to decide, ultimately, whether we believe Mr. Barr will be the Attorney General for all Americans or whether Mr. Barr will be the Attorney General, really, for one American.

When President-elect Trump selected then-Senator Jeff Sessions, our colleague from Alabama, to serve as Attorney General for this country, it brought me no joy to vote against our long-time colleague and friend. The truth was, though, that our views too often diverged on too many important issues that included immigration, healthcare, civil rights, voting rights, LGBT rights, environmental protection, and more.

After considerable prayer and reflection, I reached the conclusion that Senator Sessions would not be an Attorney General for all Americans.

Unfortunately, during his tenure at the Department of Justice, he went on to preside over a number of divisive policies and decisions, including the Muslim ban, overturning protections for Dreamers and asylum seekers, enacting a cruel policy of family separation at our southern border, and failing to defend the constitutionality of the Affordable Care Act in court.

I have not been shy about expressing my disagreement with these decisions,

and others, made by the Department of Justice during the current administration. However, one area where I strongly agreed with Attorney General Sessions was his decision to recuse himself from the special counsel’s investigation into Russian interference in our 2016 elections.

One of my core values is to figure out what is the right thing to do and to try to do it—not what is politically expedient, not what is easy but what is the right thing to do. After it became clear that then-Senator Sessions provided testimony to the Senate Judiciary Committee that called into question his impartiality on matters relating to Russia and the 2016 election, Attorney General Sessions recused himself from all matters related to the 2016 Presidential election. That was the right thing to do. It certainly wasn’t what our President wanted him to do. The President has said as much repeatedly. I should say that, maybe, he has tweeted as much repeatedly.

The President repeatedly admonished Attorney General Sessions for doing what I think many of us believe was the right thing to do. Here is what the President tweeted on June 5, 2018:

The Russian Witch Hunt Hoax continues, all because Jeff Sessions didn’t tell me he was going to recuse himself . . . I would have quickly picked someone else. So much time and money wasted, so many lives ruined . . . and Sessions knew better than most that there was No Collusion!

Let me be clear, Special Counsel Robert Mueller’s investigation is not a witch hunt. It is, in fact, the unanimous opinion of the U.S. intelligence Agencies and law enforcement community that Russia attacked our democracy and interfered in our 2016 elections.

As a result of the special counsel’s ongoing investigation, 34 individuals and 3 companies have been indicted or pled guilty to a range of crimes. This includes the Trump campaign manager, the Trump deputy campaign manager, Mr. Trump’s National Security Advisor, and, most recently, President Trump’s longtime political advisor.

Special Counsel Mueller is a lifelong Republican who served with distinction in the Vietnam war. I think I am the last Member of this body who served in the Vietnam war, but he served there with real distinction. He served with distinction as our FBI Director following the September 11 attacks. He is not conducting a partisan witch hunt. He and the team he leads are striving to find out the truth and, in doing so, help us prevent future attacks on our democracy.

I believe we should be doing everything in our power to allow Special Counsel Mueller and his team to conduct and complete this investigation free from political interference and partisan games.

During the years I was privileged to serve as chairman of the Homeland Security Committee, Bob Mueller was the head of the FBI. I had a chance to work

with him and to get to know him. My wife and I know his wife. He is among the finest people I have ever known in the military, outside of the military, in government service, and outside of government service.

Unfortunately, President Trump does not view political independence as a prerequisite for the job of Attorney General. Instead, he tends to view political independence as a disloyal act, an offense for which one should be fired. Just ask former Acting Attorney General Sally Yates. Just ask former FBI Director Comey, whom I also came to know well during the time I served on the Homeland Security Committee, including as its chairman. Just ask former Attorney General Sessions.

Recall with me, if you will, after the November election, President Trump fired Attorney General Sessions and named the Attorney General's Chief of Staff, Matt Whitaker, as Acting Attorney General. This was a curious decision, as well as a legally questionable decision. Why would the President go outside the line of succession at the Department of Justice? I fear it is because of Mr. Whitaker's public comments regarding the Mueller investigation.

Mr. Whitaker previously likened the special counsel's investigation to a "fishing expedition," and a "witch hunt" and implied that following the truth "could be damaging to the President of the United States and his family—and by extension, to our country."

Really? Could he have been serious in saying that getting to the bottom of all this could be damaging to the President of the United States and his family and, by extension, to our country?

Another President, a long time ago, Thomas Jefferson, used to say these words: If the people know the truth, they won't make a mistake.

Those are hardly the views of our current President. It saddens me to say that.

Despite publicly expressing these views that clearly call into question his impartiality, Mr. Whitaker did not recuse himself from the Mueller investigation when he assumed of the role of Acting Attorney General, even though he received a recommendation to recuse himself from ethics officials at the Department of Justice.

Mr. Whitaker's staggering unfitness for the job is a big part of the reason why my initial reaction was positive when President Trump nominated William Barr to be our Attorney General. After all, Mr. Barr previously served as Deputy Attorney General and Attorney General during the administration of George Herbert Walker Bush, someone I revered. I think many of us revered him.

By all accounts, Mr. Barr is a well-qualified nominee, someone who has been a fine public servant throughout many years of public service. I strongly believe that we need Senate-confirmed leadership at the Department of Justice. I want to make it clear that dur-

ing normal times, I might be inclined to support Mr. Barr's nomination. In fact, I probably would.

But these are not normal times. These are extraordinary times. In addition to firing the Attorney General and the FBI Director for their views on the Russia inquiry, President Trump has reportedly asked those around him why he didn't have an Attorney General who is looking out for his personal interests. According to reports, the President has said, "Where's my Roy Cohn?" during moments of crisis. For those who may not know Roy Cohn, he was President Trump's personal lawyer and fixer, who pushed legal tactics to the limits and also served with Senator Joe McCarthy during a very dark period in our Nation's history and a very dark period in this Senate's history.

This is how President Trump views the role of Attorney General—not as a lawyer to defend the rights of all Americans but as a fixer who will look out for him. Moreover, in his State of the Union address last week, President Trump highlighted what he sees as "ridiculous, partisan investigations." He went on to say: "If there is going to be peace and legislation, there cannot be war and investigations."

It is against this extraordinary backdrop that we must ask ourselves: What are Mr. Barr's views on Presidential power, and what are his views on the investigation led by Robert Mueller?

As it turns out, we don't have to guess what the answer is to that question. In an unsolicited 19-page memo that Mr. Barr sent to Deputy Attorney General Rod Rosenstein and President Trump's personal lawyers, Mr. Barr shares his views, and they are clearly hostile to the special counsel's investigation.

In a memo entitled "Mueller's Obstruction Theory," Mr. Barr raises doubt about the special counsel's ability to follow the truth while going on to defend President Trump's actions and even suggesting that the President has the power to limit the scope of this inquiry.

In that same memo, Mr. Barr states that the special counsel's investigation into obstruction of justice may do "lasting damage to the presidency."

I believe that reasonable people can disagree, as I frequently did with my friend, former Senator, and then-Attorney General, Jeff Sessions.

It is clear to me, however, that despite whatever your views may be toward the special counsel's investigation, the views expressed in his memo not only warrant Mr. Barr's recusal from the special counsel's investigation, but they cry out for it.

Attorney General Sessions did the right thing when confronted with a similar decision. However, despite expressing these biased views from President Trump's own personal lawyers, Mr. Barr says he will not recuse himself from the special counsel's investigation if he is confirmed. To make matters worse, Mr. Barr refuses to

commit to making the special counsel's final report public.

Earlier, I asked for us to consider whether Mr. Barr will be the Attorney General for all Americans or whether Mr. Barr will be the Attorney General for one American. That one American happens to go by another name, Individual 1, which is the legal moniker given to President Trump in the Southern District of New York for directing his personal attorney to violate Federal campaign finance law.

Like Mr. Whitaker's public comments prior to his elevation to Acting Attorney General, I fear that Mr. Barr's memo may have been an audition for the job and that his selection may not have been a coincidence. During his Senate hearing in 1989, Mr. Barr plainly stated that the Attorney General "is the President's lawyer."

Colleagues, these are extraordinary times for our Nation. We must make it clear to the American people that the Attorney General is not the President's lawyer. We need independence at the Department of Justice now more than ever. While I hope I am wrong—very wrong—it is my belief that Trump used this appointment as an opportunity to protect himself rather than to protect the constitutional rights of all Americans.

Ultimately, for all of these reasons I have laid out, I have concluded that despite his earlier service to our Nation—distinguished service in many instances—Mr. Barr does not, in this instance, meet the standard that is necessary to be the Attorney General for our country now.

Sadly, on that note, I yield the floor. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, in the next 24 hours, the Senate will do what it should do, which is to actually go through the process of advice and consent with a nominee—this time, for an Attorney General—William Barr.

William Barr is eminently qualified. It has been interesting to hear my colleagues on the other side of the aisle talk all day long today about how qualified William Barr is but then always pause with a "but" and take off on the Mueller investigation.

Let me explain what this means by "eminently qualified." He has had an exceptionally impressive legal career. He serves in one of the top U.S. firms. He began his legal career decades ago as, actually, an analyst and as legislative counsel for the CIA. He worked on domestic policy for Ronald Reagan. He served as the Deputy Attorney General from 1990 to 1991, and then he served as the Attorney General of the United States for George Herbert Walker Bush from 1991 to 1993.

When he was appointed as the Attorney General in 1991, his nomination passed out of the Judiciary Committee with a unanimous vote of 14 to 0. The Judiciary chairman at the time—a gentleman named Joe Biden—called him a fine Attorney General. He was overwhelmingly confirmed by the Senate in

1991—a less partisan time. It was when Democrats and Republicans both looked at his qualifications, not at a political agenda.

We have a unique moment in which to look at someone who was a good Attorney General for the United States, one who served faithfully but then had a season away from that, only to turn around and do it again. How many of us wouldn't want to redo something we did years ago and say: I did it, and it went well, but if I were to have a little more time and could do it over again, I would do things better. We have that chance with William Barr. It is a unique moment for us as a nation to be able to bring somebody like that back again.

What happened under his watch?

During that time period, he believed and still believes that the personal security of the citizens of the United States is the primary, first duty of the government's and of the U.S. Attorney General's. Despite what is being smeared about him on this floor over and over again—with people saying he is being hired to be the President's personal attorney—for those who have actually met with him and talked with him, he speaks openly about law enforcement in the United States. He talks about working with local law enforcement and with U.S. attorneys to actually prosecute crime and go after the issues that distract from American values and that keep the American people from living the American dream.

During his tenure as Attorney General, he spearheaded the initiative called the Weed and Seed Program, which removed violent drug offenders from the streets. Under Attorney General Barr, in the 1990s, violent crime in the United States went down because they were aggressively prosecuting for crime.

He is also the Attorney General who supervised the enforcement and implementation of the Americans with Disabilities Act. It was an incredibly difficult legal process to have gone through and to have implemented nationwide in order to have protected the rights of individuals who had been overlooked in our country for two centuries—those with disabilities. It was a major feature of what he did during that time period.

He brings this unique, important perspective from his dealings with law enforcement, his background, his experience. All of those things look like they would make a slam dunk with which to come to this floor and have wide, bipartisan support except for this—that he is being used as a message in the Mueller investigation. It is not that he said: I am going to stop the Mueller investigation. It is not that he said anything else about that. He did write a 19-page letter as an attorney in the law practice that is helping President Trump get through this process.

He wrote: Hey, as former Attorney General, here are all of the things of

which you should be advised. When you are working with the President, here are the key features.

It seems like a kind thing to do for any President. He wrote the letter with all of that information in it, and he gave those details. Fine.

He has also said over and over again that he is not going to undercut the Mueller investigation. Yet some of my Democratic colleagues have said: No, it has to be more than that. He has to recuse himself like Jeff Sessions did. He has to recuse himself. If he doesn't recuse himself, he can't be there.

May I remind you that the reason Jeff Sessions had to recuse himself was that he was on the campaign team for the President, and when he got into the position of Attorney General, the ethics team from the Department of Justice advised him: Hey, since you were on the campaign team, you can't be the investigator for the campaign team. At that time, Attorney General Jeff Sessions agreed and said that it would violate ethics for a person on the team to help investigate the team, so he recused himself. That was not William Barr. There is all of this talk that he has to recuse himself like Jeff Sessions did, but it is a completely different situation. Why should he recuse himself?

Apparently, people don't want the Mueller investigation to have any supervision, which, again, I find fascinating politically because I distinctly remember, during the Clinton administration, that many of my Democratic colleagues who are still in this Chamber now were furious with Ken Starr. They can't believe Donald Trump would say he is frustrated with the Mueller team, but they had no problem with the Clinton White House's literally saying: We are going to go to war against Ken Starr. The term "witch hunt" is not new. The Clinton administration used that same term against Ken Starr. This is a fascinating side-by-side to me, to be able to look at this.

Here is what I would advise: Let the Mueller investigation finish its job. It has a job. Let it do its job. Quite frankly, the Attorney General shouldn't be in the day-to-day operations of the Mueller investigation. That is why we have a special counsel. Yet, at some point, the special counsel has to turn information over to someone. William Barr is not going to be the one writing all of the information from the special counsel. He should neither have this incredibly high standard nor be held to some standard of doing something that he is not going to do—try to interfere in this process. He has made that very clear.

He has also made it very clear verbally, in committee settings, and in written statements that he is going to release whatever comes out, as under the law, from the Mueller investigation. I think some people believe that the Mueller investigation is going to release a big, giant written report like the Senate Intel Committee will do.

Yet the Mueller investigation's task is not to release some big, giant report; its task is for them, as prosecutors, to go through and recommend indictments. If they choose to write a report, that is up to them. Now, this Congress could try to mandate that, but that is not their requirement. They are a special counsel. This is a group of attorneys that is making recommendations. That is all it is.

Don't judge an Attorney General nominee based on some accusation from some thought of what might happen and what he might do. Judge him on what he actually says and what he has done. Hold him to that standard.

I have also had some folks back in my State say they have heard that William Barr supports the possibility of some States having red flag laws on the Second Amendment. Now, I spoke to William Barr. He came to my office. We spent about 45 minutes together. We went through a whole litany of questions and answers about his background and the issues he has dealt with, his passions, his dealings with local law enforcement, his cooperation with State prisons, consent decrees, religious liberty. We talked of drug trials and processing. We talked about the whole issue of gang violence—on and on and on—including the Second Amendment.

He again reiterated he is supportive of the Second Amendment in every area. If someone loses his Second Amendment rights, it will only be based on due process, which is with a court's being involved. That has always been the standard for us as a country.

I have seen some of the things that have been written about him, one being that he is not supportive of the Second Amendment. That is absolutely false, and I can say those things based on my personal conversation with him after having asked him those questions. See not the things that have been written about him but the things that he has actually written and said about the Second Amendment. He is a protector of our rights under the Constitution. It is one of the things to which he has sworn under oath to protect as the previous Attorney General and would have to swear to again under oath.

This is a simple thing for us. We are looking at a qualified nominee who has an excellent background, the experience, and a passion to protect our country; who has shown a passion for law enforcement, protecting our Nation, and reducing violent crime in our country. I look forward to his stepping in and taking the lead in the Department of Justice.

May I make a side note on this? Again, this nomination reminds me of why it is so important that this Senate fix its nomination process. We have a broken nomination process—period.

If you take the last six Presidents combined, when they were putting their staffs together in their first 2 years of office, it was 25 times that someone in the Senate asked for additional time to debate that person. It

could be any one of 100. For the last six Presidents, it was a total of 25 times that one person asked for additional time to debate. In this body, it was 25 times that somebody said for the last six Presidents combined that we need a little more time to debate this person. They asked for additional what is called postcloture debate time. That is a full intervening day—24 hours—plus an additional 30 hours after that just to debate. That is fine. For highly controversial nominees, it is entirely appropriate.

Yet, in the first 2 years of President Trump's Presidency, that request has been made 128 times—25 times for the last 6 Presidents combined versus 128 times for this President. It is not because they have been all that controversial as nominees, although I am fully aware that President Trump has nominated some folks who have created heated debate on this floor, but it was certainly not 128 times. In fact, many of the times after we had had that postcloture intervening day, plus another 30 hours, those people passed either unanimously or with 90-plus votes. They were not controversial. It was an attempt to shut down this Senate and shut down this President to keep him from hiring his staff. That has never happened before. There has never been a time that the Senate has tried to prevent an elected President from hiring his own team—until now.

In May of 2017, I made a proposal to fix our postcloture vote debate time, seeing what would happen. I continued that conversation over and over again with many of my Democratic colleagues.

The last session, we brought in front of the Rules Committee a proposal that was made by Harry Reid and then was passed under Harry Reid's time and his leadership in the Senate—that is, to limit postcloture debate time to streamline that process.

I brought that exact same proposal back out and said: Republicans voted with Democrats to make sure this process would work in 2013 and 2014. Now will Democrats vote with Republicans on the exact same language? And we will do this together to fix this process.

The Democrats gave me the Heisman at that point and said: No. It was good of you to vote with us, but we are not going to vote with you.

That was all last session.

I brought up another proposal that went through the Rules Committee today. It is a simple proposal. Historically in this body, there hasn't been a lot of postcloture debate time on nominees, especially not on nominees like district court judges or Deputy Assistant Secretaries of some entity.

I met today with the person who will be the IRS counsel, the counsel of the IRS, which I dare guess no one in this room could name right now, and certainly most people in America couldn't, but they have been blocked for a year, so the IRS does not have a

Chief Counsel. Not a controversial nominee—will probably pass unanimously or near unanimously. Just to prevent the IRS from having a counsel, they have been slowed down.

My proposal is simple. We can still have postcloture debate. If anyone in this body wanted to slow down any nominee, they could still do that. They could request a full additional day, 24 hours, and then in the next day, instead of adding an additional 30 hours, it would be just an additional 2 hours. So instead of getting a full day plus 30 hours, they would get a full day plus 2 hours. That is still a lot of time.

Quite frankly, only 25 times in the last six Presidents have there been any requests for any additional time. So that would still allow a long period of time, but it would expedite the process so at least we could go through this.

If we don't fix this now, this will become the habit of the Senate from here on out. When the next Democratic President is elected, I can assure you that we will have the same issue with nominees that President Trump is having because it only takes one Senator to say: No. I want a whole intervening day plus 30 hours for every one of your nominees.

By the way, the President puts 1,200 people through the process of nomination—1,200. So count the times that will happen in the days ahead.

I know this is part of the "resist Trump" movement and to shut down the operation of his Presidency, but it actually is going to shut down the operation of every President from here on out if we don't fix this rule.

I am asking my Democratic colleagues to look long, to not look right in front of us, to look at the future of where this is really headed and what is really happening to this Senate. The precedent that is being set right now on debate will be the standard in the days ahead. Let's fix it now so we can get this resolved long term for the sake of our country and do this right.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I come to the floor this afternoon to express my deep opposition to the nomination of Mr. William Barr to be our Nation's next Attorney General.

His nomination comes at a very trying time for our country. As our own President frequently twists the truth and constantly pushes the limits of the law, the American people deserve to know that the Attorney General—the top law enforcement officer in the country—is committed, above all else, to seeking truth, defending their civil and constitutional rights, administering justice on their behalf, and safeguarding our country against threats to our democracy.

I wish Mr. Barr were the person who could right the ship and stand up for the American people no matter what. I wish he were the person who could help guide our country through this critical

juncture when questions about illegal payments involving both the Trump campaign and the Trump inaugural committee and Russia's interference in our elections and its attempts to influence millions of our friends and families must be fully explained to the public.

We know this is an administration that finds it so difficult to follow the law that it is being investigated in multiple jurisdictions at the Federal level—all of which would be overseen by Mr. Barr.

Sadly, it has become abundantly clear that Mr. Barr is incapable of being the impartial Attorney General people in communities across our country need and deserve and someone who stands up to the President when he is wrong.

Based on what I have seen over the past 2 years and despite the critical time we are in, I don't expect many of my Republican colleagues to join me on the floor today in order to defeat this nomination. Although people across the country have been raising red flags on this nomination, my Republican colleagues have been busy building the glidepath for Mr. Barr's nomination. In fact, just last week, the majority leader, standing here on the Senate floor, left little doubt about whether the majority would try to get this nomination sewn up. The leader referred to Mr. Barr as a "tried and true public servant" and a "proven professional" who was applying for the same job he got in 1991 under President George H. W. Bush. The job description, the majority leader said, "remains exactly the same as it was years ago." But that is the problem. Senate Republicans are still operating as though it is the early 1990s, as if the world around them has not changed, as if what we have experienced for the past 2 years is normal.

Well, on behalf of the American people, I urge us all to wake up. For the past 2 years, we have had a President whose only consistent agenda items are self-preservation and self-dealing, whether that means flouting the law or disregarding ethics, acting with impunity, violating norms and destroying relationships with our allies, firing those who challenge him and bullying those he can't, threatening jail time for political opponents, or changing Federal policy by tweet and based on his current mood.

On top of all that, President Trump faces a number of investigations, including serious questions about whether he has obstructed justice in order to make the special counsel's investigation into Russia's meddling in our elections go away. That is the same special counsel investigation that has already resulted in 34 indictments or guilty pleas to date. Despite what the President would like us to believe, that is far from a witch hunt.

When President Trump's first choice to be the next Attorney General is someone with highly questionable

views on Executive power, we have to be on alert.

When that nominee, Mr. Barr, can't adequately explain why, out of the blue—out of the blue—he sent a memo to the White House in order to criticize the special counsel investigation, absolve the President of questions about obstruction of justice, and make a case for less accountability with this President, we ought to be on alert.

When Mr. Barr writes that President Trump has “complete authority to start or stop a law enforcement proceeding,” we ought to be on alert.

Mr. Barr's memo makes no sense unless it was an audition for this job, and that is absolutely not how any President should select an Attorney General.

When we know that, if confirmed, Mr. Barr would be in charge of the special counsel investigation and would decide what, if anything, the public gets to know about the findings on Russia's 2016 election meddling, we ought to be on alert.

Someone who has written such an obviously flawed analysis of the investigation should not be put in charge of overseeing the investigation. That is just common sense.

People across this country sent us here to Congress not to shield the President from the law but to help restore integrity and independence to the Federal Government and to provide a check on the Executive branch, as outlined in the Constitution. And the idea that any Member of this Senate would support an Attorney General nominee who has openly and unequivocally advocated for less accountability when it comes to President Trump—that is just wrong, and the American people will not stand for it.

So to any of my colleagues who plan to support this nomination, I have a message: Seize this opportunity while you can to make it very clear to Mr. Barr and the Trump administration that you believe the American people deserve to know for sure that the findings on Russia's 2016 election meddling will be made public in order to get them the answers they deserve and that any attempt to cover up or hinder or otherwise muddy the waters around the Mueller investigation would be a serious disservice to the people we represent and will only lead to the further erosion of trust in our institution and our ability to work on their behalf.

The President is not above the law—not in the White House, not in New York, not anywhere. So Mr. Barr may be the Attorney General this President wants—someone to shield him from serious questions about abuse of power, someone who believes the President should be able to do more or less whatever he or she wants—but Mr. Barr is certainly not, in my opinion, the Attorney General this country needs, which is someone who will stand up for the rights of everyone else.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

THE GREEN NEW DEAL

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I came here this afternoon to give my customary weekly climate speech urging that it is time to wake up here, and I was planning to speak about a legal brief that a number of scientists, led by Robert Brulle and Naomi Oreskes, filed in the Ninth Circuit detailing the long history of the oil industry knowing about climate change, doing its own research to confirm what it knows about climate change, telling the public something they knew was false, and yet taking what they knew to be true and using it in their own internal planning. But something even better than that came up, so I come here to react to the—well, for starters, the Wall Street Journal editorial calling for a vote on the Green New Deal.

Let's go back a bit as to what the Wall Street Journal editorial page has been up to for the last, say, 20 years on climate change.

The Wall Street Journal editorial page has been a mouthpiece for the fossil fuel industry's climate denial. The messages of the fossil fuel industry are echoed and amplified through the Wall Street Journal editorial page. All the way up until 2011, if I recall correctly, they were simply denying that this was a problem. They constantly behave like what I would call the one-eyed accountant—looking only at the costs of responding to climate change, never the costs of climate change.

On this subject, for those who may be interested, I would actually like to incorporate by reference two previous climate speeches I gave on this completely bogus effort that has been maintained by the Wall Street Journal editorial page. The first was my speech of April 19, 2016, and then I went back at them again on July 24, 2018. They have been making it up for a very long time, and sure enough, up comes this latest in which just yesterday, February 12, they said: Let's have a vote in Congress on the Green New Deal as soon as possible. Then they went on with a lot of their usual one-eyed accountant stuff, never looking at the costs of climate change, only looking at the costs of preventing those harms, and they concluded: “Let's not hesitate. Take the Green New Deal resolution and put it to a vote forthwith.”

Along the way, they went into some of their usual canards about renewables, saying that “solar costs remain about 20 percent higher than natural gas while offshore wind is two-thirds more expensive” without subsidies—well, unless you look at the subsidy for fossil fuel, which of course they don't, and the subsidy for fossil fuel has been quantified by the International Monetary Fund at \$700 billion per year—\$700 billion per year in the United States—propping up the fossil fuel industry. By contrast, the little tiny tax adjustments that we get for solar and wind, which the fossil fuel industry is always pushing back against, are nothing. There is a monster of a subsidy in the

energy space, and it is the fossil fuel subsidy, but will the dear old Wall Street Journal editorial page ever admit that? Not a chance.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD at the end of my remarks.

That came out in the Wall Street Journal that morning. Then Leader MCCONNELL went out here to the Ohio Clock for his midday press conference, and guess what he said:

I've noted with great interest the Green New Deal, and we're going to be voting on that in the Senate. That'll give everybody an opportunity to go on record and see how they feel about the Green New Deal.

I am in the habit of pointing out here how the string-pulling takes place and how the fossil fuel industry directs certain things and the mouthpieces say certain things and then we behave certain ways, but this may be the land speed record for a response. The Wall Street Journal says it wants a congressional vote, and that very day the vote gets announced. It is almost funny, if the topic weren't so serious.

The whole idea that this is the Republican response to climate change is really classic. It is really classic. Since the Citizens United decision, which powered up the fossil fuel industry to have real bullying dominance in Congress—at least over the Republican Party—no Senator here today has been on any bill to meaningfully reduce carbon dioxide emissions. It is never a topic. Nobody wants to talk about it. It is like the unwelcome, embarrassing guest at the dinner party: Oh, my gosh. Climate change. No, we can't possibly talk about that.

Never mind that NASA—which, by the way, RIP, Opportunity. The Opportunity has been driving around on the surface of Mars for 15 years, sending back information to us about that planet. NASA scientists built that thing, sent it to Mars, landed it safely on Mars, and has been driving it around for 15 years. My God, what a project that was. What a brilliant thing. So when NASA scientists say, “Oh, and by the way, climate change is serious. You ought to listen,” and we don't, that behavior is hard to explain. When we are listening to the flacks of the fossil fuel industry and not the scientists of NASA—and, by the way, 13 or 14 Federal Agencies in the latest report that came out under the Trump administration—we are way past there being any serious factual or scientific dispute here. There are just political demands by the industry with the biggest conflict of interest ever that we can't bring this up.

For pretty much 10 years, since Citizens United, nobody has brought up a serious piece of legislation to limit carbon dioxide emissions on the Republican side. Not one. Zero. Now, the majority leader is going to break this streak and bring up the first carbon-related bill. It is actually not a real bill. It is a resolution, but he is going to bring it up with the intention of voting

against it. I kid you not. The majority leader has announced the intention of bringing up a resolution with the intention of voting against it. Who does that and why? Who had that brain-storm and where?

We will never understand this until we understand better how the anonymous dark money stuff flows around Washington. We need to clean that up. We need to pass the DISCLOSE Act. We need to make sure people know who is behind spending, who is behind advertising. We have to do all of that, but in the meantime, you do get these amazing moments in which the Wall Street Journal says—the editorial page, by the way. I think their correspondents, their reporters, are totally legitimate, and they do terrific work. It is the editorial page that is the problem child here.

So the Wall Street Journal editorial page says we need to have a vote on the Green New Deal. It takes less than a day for the majority leader to say we are going to have a vote on the Green New Deal, and he is calling up the first piece of climate legislation they have ever called up in the majority here, and they are calling it up to vote against it.

Isn't it finally time to have a real conversation about this? Isn't it finally time for there to be a Republican proposal? It has been nearly 10 years since Citizens United. I get it. The fossil fuel industry has enormous sway, but there comes a time when you even have to tell the biggest influencers in Congress that your day is over. It is time for us to treat with the facts and to work in a bipartisan fashion and to do what the people sent us here to do, which is to legislate.

So where is the Republican proposal? Where is the Republican plan? There isn't one. Nothing. Nada. Zip. Nihil. Nitchevo. They are going to call this up. They are going to call this up for a vote. I can hardly wait for this discussion. Bring it on, please.

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

[From the Wall Street Journal, Feb. 11, 2019]

VOTE ON THE GREEN NEW DEAL

(By The Editorial Board)

Every Member of Congress should step up and be counted.

Democrats rolled out their Green New Deal last week, and by all means let's have a national debate and then a vote in Congress—as soon as possible. Here in one package is what the political left really means when it says Americans need to do something urgently about climate change, so let's see who has the courage of those convictions.

Thanks to the resolution introduced last week by New York Rep. Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez and Massachusetts Sen. Ed Markey, there's already official language. While it's nonbinding, the 14 pages give a clear sense of direction and magnitude in calling for a “10-year national mobilization” to exorcise carbon from the U.S. economy.

President Obama's Clean Power Plan looks modest by comparison. The 10-year Green New Deal calls for generating 100% of power from renewables and removing greenhouse

gas emissions from manufacturing and transportation to the extent these goals are “technologically feasible.” Hint: They're not.

The plan also calls for “upgrading all existing buildings in the United States and building new buildings to achieve maximal energy efficiency, water efficiency, safety, affordability, comfort and durability, including through electrification.” That's all existing buildings, comrade.

Millions of jobs would have to be destroyed en route to this brave new green world, but not to worry. The resolution says the government would also guarantee “a job with a family-sustaining wage, adequate family and medical leave, paid vacations, and retirement security to all people of the United States.” Good that they're starting small.

Sorry to mention unhappy reality, but renewable sources currently make up only 17% of U.S. electric-power generation despite enormous federal and state subsidies. Wind and solar energy have become more competitive over the last decade as costs have plunged. But without subsidies, solar costs remain about 20% higher than natural gas while offshore wind is two-thirds more expensive. The bigger problem is solar and wind don't provide reliable power, so backup plants that burn fossil fuels are required to run on stand-by.

Germany has been gracious enough to show what can go wrong. Despite aggressive emissions goals, Germany's carbon emissions have been flat for most of the last decade as the country had to fall back on coal to balance off-shore wind generation. Last year Germany derived 29% of its power from wind and solar, but 38% from coal.

Meantime, taxes and rising power-generation costs have made Germany's electric rates the highest in Europe, slamming small manufacturers and consumers.

“The drag on competitiveness is particularly severe for small and middle-sized firms,” Eric Schweitzer, President of Germany's Chambers of Commerce, told Bloomberg News last year. German manufacturing has become less competitive due to soaring energy costs. Electric and natural gas prices in Germany are two to three times higher than in the U.S.

By contrast, the U.S. is having a modest manufacturing renaissance as shale drilling has created a cheap source of lower-carbon energy. Natural-gas prices have plunged by half over the last decade as production has increased 50%, mostly in the Marcellus and Utica formations in Pennsylvania, Ohio and West Virginia. Carbon emissions from power generation have fallen by 30% since 2005, mostly due to the substitution of coal with natural gas.

Meantime, oil production in Texas's Permian and North Dakota's Bakken shale deposits has soared 80%. Demand for drills, pipelines and other mining equipment has also boosted U.S. growth.

The Green New Deal means that all of this carbon energy and all of these jobs would have to be purged—at least in the U.S. China would suffer no such limits on its fossil-fuel production. Conservatives have long suspected that progressives want to use climate change to justify a government takeover of the free-market economy, but we never thought they'd be this candid about it.

Yet, remarkably, the Green New Deal has been met with hosannas from liberal interest groups and in Congress. It already has 67 cosponsors in the House and the support of 11 Democrats in the Senate including presidential candidates Kamala Harris, Cory Booker, Elizabeth Warren and Amy Klobuchar.

So let's not hesitate. Take the Green New Deal resolution and put it to a vote forthwith on the House and Senate floor.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. With that, 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. MORAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that I be able to address the Senate as if in morning business.

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

PRESIDENT RONALD REAGAN AND ALZHEIMER'S

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, I wish to speak this afternoon in recognition of our late President, Ronald Reagan. I want to speak also about his wife Nancy, and I want to highlight their honest and passionate work to educate Americans about the real effects of Alzheimer's.

Last Wednesday, February 6, would have been President Reagan's 108th birthday, and we paused then to reflect not only on the life and legacy of President Ronald Reagan, but we also remember the way he carried himself, the vision he set for our country, and the direction he steered our Nation.

Years after he left the White House, the President and Nancy Reagan continued their public service to our Nation with grace and class, and that was true even as President Reagan was diagnosed with Alzheimer's disease.

In November of 1994, President Reagan wrote a handwritten letter to Americans announcing this diagnosis that ultimately took his life.

I read lots of biographies, I read lots of history, and this past week I finished a book, “Reagan: An American Journey,” written by Bob Spitz. The story of his circumstance with Alzheimer's captured my attention.

The book quotes President Reagan telling his daughter, Patti: “I have this condition . . . I keep forgetting things.”

The doctors finally put a name to it. On November 4, 1994, a doctor from the Mayo Clinic informed Nancy Reagan that, having had an adequate chance to observe the president, the diagnosis was conclusive: he had Alzheimer's.

According to Fred Ryan, a staff member for the President and Mrs. Reagan, “She was quite upset, emotional.” She spoke at length later that evening: “So we're going to tell him tomorrow,” she said, “and I'd like you to be there.”

The next morning, a Saturday, they gathered in the library, a small, comfortable room at the front of the house where the Reagans typically received guests. The president seemed puzzled when the doctor and Ryan arrived. “Honey, come over here and sit down,” Nancy said, directing him to a couch opposite the two men. “The doctor has something he wants to talk about.”

The doctor didn't beat around the bush. “We think you have Alzheimer's,” he told Reagan.

"Okay," he responded faintly. "What should I expect?"

"We don't know much about it," the doctor admitted. "It's a degenerative disorder." He ran down a few of the effects that Alzheimer's patients experienced while Nancy Reagan struggled to control her emotions. She tried her utmost to be supportive, but was overcome hearing about the devastations of the disease. . . . He acknowledged, quite bluntly, "There is no cure."

"Can I ask a few questions?" Ryan interjected.

While he and Nancy discussed how to handle the president's activities—his schedule, office hours, appointments, and appearances—Reagan wandered over to a small round table in a corner and sat down, staring hypnotically into the yard. After a few minutes, he picked up a pen and began to write. When he finished, he handed two sheets of paper filled with his cramped handwriting to [his staffer]. "Why don't we get this typed up and put it out," Reagan suggested.

It was a letter dated that November 5, 1994.

My Fellow Americans—

It began—

I have recently been told that I am one of the millions of Americans who will be afflicted with Alzheimer's disease. . . . At the moment I feel just fine. I intend to live the remainder of the years God gives me on the earth doing things I have always done. . . . Unfortunately, as Alzheimer's Disease progresses, the family often bears a heavy burden. I only wish I could spare Nancy from this painful experience. When the time comes I am confident that with your help she will face it with faith and courage.

And with faith and courage, indeed, President and Nancy Reagan faced the disease together.

Together, they founded the Ronald and Nancy Reagan Research Institute at the Alzheimer's Association in Chicago, IL, focused on researching, understanding, and treating Alzheimer's disease.

Over the past several decades, this research institute has awarded millions of dollars in Alzheimer's research grants and has continued to see breakthroughs in our understanding of this aggressive and disastrous disease.

Congress has also rightfully come together in a nonpartisan manner to fight this disease head-on. For example, last December, just a few months ago, with legislation that was sponsored by our colleague from Maine, Senator SUSAN COLLINS, Congress passed and the President signed our BOLD Infrastructure for Alzheimer's Act, which aims to combat Alzheimer's through a collaborative public health framework. The BOLD Act will create an Alzheimer's public health infrastructure at the direction of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, which will establish Alzheimer's centers for excellence across the country, award funding to public health departments to increase early detection and diagnosis, and increase data collection, analysis, and reporting through cooperative agreements with public and nonprofit entities.

I am a member of the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Health and Human Services, led by my colleague

from Missouri, Senator BLUNT. I have advocated and successfully worked with my colleague Senator BLUNT and the members of the committee to provide \$2.3 billion for Alzheimer's disease research in FY 2019, finally reaching the \$2 billion funding goal for research laid out by the National Plan to Address Alzheimer's.

I am the cochair of the Senate NIH Caucus, and I am optimistic that these funding increases, combined with NIH initiatives to map the human brain and further develop personalized medicine, will, I hope, lead us closer to an Alzheimer's treatment and a cure.

Eleven years after President Reagan's death, Nancy Reagan continued her Alzheimer's advocacy work, helping to dramatically increase the attention and resources paid to the research of this disease. She recognized that degenerative diseases like Alzheimer's not only pose a financial burden to our Nation and health system but, more importantly and more significantly, these diseases threaten families with significant financial difficulty and tremendous emotional hardship.

As President Reagan's primary caregiver during his battle with Alzheimer's, Nancy reminded us of the importance of caretakers and families and the struggles they themselves go through while watching loved ones suffer.

As we continue our work to treat, cure, and prevent Alzheimer's and other degenerative diseases, we will also continue looking for ways to ease the financial and mental turmoil on caretakers, for they suffer so much as well.

When President Reagan announced his Alzheimer's disease, he did so much more than just admitting to having the disease. He fought it, and he destigmatized it not only for himself but for those who came after him and for those still to come who may be faced with this same circumstance.

In the closing letter that President Reagan wrote—and, incidentally, when he handed it to the staffer and said, "Type it up and send it out," they read it and said, "Let's just send it in your handwriting, Mr. President." So that is what happened, and in that closing letter, President said this:

Let me thank you, the American people, for giving me the great honor of allowing me to serve as your President. When the Lord calls me home, whenever that may be, I will leave with the greatest love for this country of ours and eternal optimism for its future. I now begin the journey that will lead me into the sunset of my life. I know that for America there will always be a bright dawn ahead.

I, too, believe that America's best days are ahead of us, and I implore Washington to reflect upon President Reagan's enduring optimism.

Civil in disagreement and often willing to cross party lines to work toward solutions, I hope we can all remember, like President Reagan, to focus on the real issues facing our Nation, and I hope that all Members of the Congress,

from all walks of life, will be bold in leveraging their life experiences to achieve greatness for our Nation, just as President Reagan and Nancy Reagan did, deepening America's resolve to fight this terrible disease.

I honor President Reagan and his wife Nancy. I thank them for their service to our country, and I thank them for their attention to this disease, Alzheimer's. May we also have the courage and will to continue the battle to rid our country, its citizens, and the world of this affliction.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

RECOGNIZING ALASKA

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, as many of my colleagues here on the Senate floor know, tomorrow is Valentine's Day, and yesterday, my colleague and my good friend, for whom I have so much respect, Senator ERNST from Iowa, was asking Members of this body to come down to the floor and talk about love. Some of you may have seen that.

Now, I have to admit that I am very close to Senator ERNST. I think she is one of the best Senators in the whole body. But I was a little bit leery. To be honest, talking about love on the Senate floor is really not my thing. I am not sure I have done that in 4 years here. As a matter of fact, I know I haven't done that in 4 years.

Then, I thought, well, you know, it is Valentine's Day. I thought, of course, immediately about my family and my beautiful wife Julie, the love of my life. I thought I could talk about that. I thought I could talk about my three daughters, all young Alaskan women, strong. They make me proud each and every day.

That was easy, thinking about Valentine's Day and love that way—Julie, Meghan, Isabella, and Laurel, who, by the way, celebrated her 18th birthday yesterday. They are the loves of my life.

But then my staff told me: Wait a minute. This isn't that kind of speech. What Senator ERNST wanted us to do was to speak about the love of your State and how we all love our State.

Now, that is easy for everybody here because we all do love our State. Then, I realized, well, you know what, Senator ERNST wanted that. It is Valentine's Day, and, of course, it is toward the end of the week, and I typically do my "Alaskan of the Week" speech every Thursday or Wednesday.

This is a little bit of a jazzed up Valentine's Day version of Alaskan of the Week, with the ERNST hashtag "homestatelove," which is what she put out, and I think some other Senators did.

I thought this would be a combination this evening of a little bit of a love story to Alaska, my constituents, combined with the Alaskan of the Week, and, of course, to support what Senator ERNST wanted a bunch of us to do.

I certainly love coming down to the floor every week to talk about the

Alaskans of the Week. It is one of my favorite things to do. So, today, I just want to say a little bit about some of those Alaskans of the Week, not really one or two but just kind of a combo—literally, dozens and dozens of Alaskans, since I started here in the Senate 4 years ago, where I have had the opportunity to come down and talk about them.

They are as old as 100 and as young as 8. Last week we had an 8-year-old. Boy, was he really a fine young man from Juneau. They come from the Far North, the Arctic, and the misty temperate southeast of Alaska. They live surrounded by tundra, by the churning seas, by mountains, by rainforests. These are all those who have earned the title Alaskan of the Week. They come from what we call urban Alaska and from some of the 200 small communities and villages that dot my State, which are not connected by roads. It is a big challenge we have in Alaska.

They are librarians, artists, former Governors, reporters, healthcare workers, whalers, counselors, pastors, lawyers, athletes, students, teachers, and nearly every profession imaginable. Some of them have retired. Some of them are just starting school and aren't even of working age.

They are a diverse group of people, as you can imagine, but they all have one thing in common. They love Alaska. They love their country. They have the fire, the drive, and the heart to use whatever skills they have, whatever experiences they have to help others.

Isn't that what Valentine's Day is all about, what the hashtag "homestatelove" is all about, and, certainly, what the Alaskan of the Week is all about?

Now, when I talk about the Alaskan of the Week, sometimes these people have seen and gotten and deserve a lot of attention in Alaska and even nationally. Other times, they are less well known but no less impactful. Let me give you a couple of examples: someone who has been picking up trash on the side of the road for years, just doing it every day; helping people to find a pet to love; making meals for the sick; starting and contributing to non-profits; writing beautiful prose; helping people overcome addictions; establishing iconic businesses; working their whole lives to do what they think is right for their community, for their State, and the communities they love.

Of course, they are all inspiring to us, and what I try to do once a week is to come down and not just inspire the pages, who, I know, look forward to this speech, but anyone in America who is listening. By the way, you have to come up to Alaska and you, too, will love, and I mean "love" Alaska when you come up to visit.

Now, they are inspiring to all of us in Alaska, but, as I mentioned, all around the country last year. For example, I got to talk about the Alaska Pacific University's ski team—world renowned, gold medalists, Olympic med-

alists—inspiring young people all across the globe to race faster and race better.

Last year, I had the opportunity to talk about a young teenager from Gambell, Chris Apassingok. He made national headlines for his insistence, despite tremendous backlash from some extreme groups outside of Alaska, to continue his cultural heritage of hunting whales to feed his community through subsistence.

Here is another example that will go straight to the heart of my colleague, Senator ERNST from Iowa. In December, Carol Seppilu from Nome, who has overcome tremendous difficulties and disabilities and pain in her life, ran 85 miles of a 100-mile race in Council Bluffs, IA, and she is training for another race.

That kind of training isn't easy in Nome, where she has to walk through blizzards just to get on a treadmill. Carol has the racing community—the long racing community, 100-mile races—in Alaska and Iowa and, literally, around the country in awe of her, if you know her story, and rooting for her.

Sometimes we have a lot of negative news here in DC. I always say there is a lot more going on bipartisan that our friends in the media, who sit above the Presiding Officer's desk there, don't often report, but it can be negative. I think sometimes it can be easy to forget that we live in the greatest country in the world—no doubt about it—the greatest country in the history of the world, in my view, filled with good people who wake up every morning determined to do what is right, to give back to their communities, whether in Alaska or North Dakota, like the Presiding Officer.

I want to thank Senator ERNST for bringing us down to the floor yesterday and even today to talk a little bit about love—good initiative there for Valentine's Day. I thank all of the people of my State. This is a love story, not just of my wife and daughters but of all these great Alaskans of the Week who have been doing such a great job for Alaska and their country. So, to all of them, Happy Valentine's Day.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

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

NOMINATION OF DONALD W. WASHINGTON

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I do not object to the nomination of Donald W. Washington, PN202.

SENATE COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, the Committee on Rules and Administration has adopted rules governing its procedures for the 116th Congress. Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 2, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, on behalf of myself and Senator KLOBUCHAR, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the committee rules be printed in the RECORD.

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

RULES OF PROCEDURE MEETINGS OF THE COMMITTEE

Rule 1. The regular meeting dates of the Committee shall be the second and fourth Wednesdays of each month, at 10:00 a.m., in room SR-301, Russell Senate Office Building. Additional meetings of the Committee may be called by the Chairman as he may deem necessary or pursuant to the provision of paragraph 3 of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate.

Rule 2. Meetings of the committee, including meetings to conduct hearings, shall be open to the public, except that a meeting or series of meetings by the committee on the same subject for a period of no more than 14 calendar days may be closed to the public on a motion made and seconded to go into closed session to discuss only whether the matters enumerated in subparagraphs (a) through (f) would require the meeting to be closed followed immediately by a recorded vote in open session by a majority of the Members of the committee when it is determined that the matters to be discussed or the testimony to be taken at such meeting or meetings:

(a) will disclose matters necessary to be kept secret in the interests of national defense or the confidential conduct of the foreign relations of the United States;

(b) will relate solely to matters of the committee staff personnel or internal staff management or procedure;

(c) will tend to charge an individual with crime or misconduct, to disgrace or injure the professional standing of an individual, or otherwise to expose an individual to public contempt or obloquy, or will represent a clearly unwarranted invasion of the privacy of an individual;

(d) will disclose the identity of any informer or law enforcement agent or will disclose any information relating to the investigation or prosecution of a criminal offense that is required to be kept secret in the interests of effective law enforcement;

(e) will disclose information relating to the trade secrets or financial or commercial information pertaining specifically to a given person if:

(1) an Act of Congress requires the information to be kept confidential by Government officers and employees; or

(2) the information has been obtained by the Government on a confidential basis, other than through an application by such person for a specific Government financial or other benefit, and is required to be kept secret in order to prevent undue injury to the competitive position of such person; or

(f) may divulge matters required to be kept confidential under the provisions of law or

Government regulations. (Paragraph 5(b) of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules.)

Rule 3. Written notices of committee meetings will normally be sent by the committee's staff director to all Members of the committee at least a week in advance. In addition, the committee staff will telephone or e-mail reminders of committee meetings to all Members of the committee or to the appropriate assistants in their offices.

Rule 4. A copy of the committee's intended agenda enumerating separate items of legislative business and committee business will normally be sent to all Members of the committee and released to the public at least 1 day in advance of all meetings. This does not preclude any Member of the committee from discussing appropriate non-agenda topics.

Rule 5. After the Chairman and the Ranking Minority Member, speaking order shall be based on order of arrival, alternating between Majority and Minority Members, unless otherwise directed by the Chairman.

Rule 6. Any witness who is to appear before the committee in any hearing shall file with the clerk of the committee at least 3 business days before the date of his or her appearance, a written statement of his or her proposed testimony and an executive summary thereof, in such form as the chairman may direct, unless the Chairman and the Ranking Minority Member waive such requirement for good cause.

Rule 7. In general, testimony will be restricted to 5 minutes for each witness. The time may be extended by the Chairman, upon the Chair's own direction or at the request of a Member. Each round of questions by Members will also be limited to 5 minutes.

QUORUMS

Rule 8. Pursuant to paragraph 7(a)(1) of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules, a majority of the Members of the committee shall constitute a quorum for the reporting of legislative measures.

Rule 9. Pursuant to paragraph 7(a)(1) of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules, one-third of the Members of the committee shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business, including action on amendments to measures prior to voting to report the measure to the Senate.

Rule 10. Pursuant to paragraph 7(a)(2) of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules, 2 Members of the committee shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of taking testimony under oath and 1 Member of the committee shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of taking testimony not under oath; provided, however, that in either instance, once a quorum is established, any one Member can continue to take such testimony.

Rule 11. Under no circumstances may proxies be considered for the establishment of a quorum.

VOTING

Rule 12. Voting in the committee on any issue will normally be by voice vote.

Rule 13. If a third of the Members present so demand a roll call vote instead of a voice vote, a record vote will be taken on any question by roll call.

Rule 14. The results of roll call votes taken in any meeting upon any measure, or any amendment thereto, shall be stated in the committee report on that measure unless previously announced by the committee, and such report or announcement shall include a tabulation of the votes cast in favor of and the votes cast in opposition to each such measure and amendment by each Member of the committee. (Paragraph 7(b) and (c) of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules.)

Rule 15. Proxy voting shall be allowed on all measures and matters before the committee. However, the vote of the committee

to report a measure or matter shall require the concurrence of a majority of the Members of the committee who are physically present at the time of the vote. Proxies will be allowed in such cases solely for the purpose of recording a Member's position on the question and then only in those instances when the absentee committee Member has been informed of the question and has affirmatively requested that he be recorded. (Paragraph 7(a)(3) of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules.)

AMENDMENTS

Rule 16. Provided at least five business days' notice of the agenda is given, and the text of the proposed bill or resolution has been made available at least five business days in advance, it shall not be in order for the Committee to consider any amendment in the first degree proposed to any measure under consideration by the Committee unless such amendment has been delivered to the office of the Committee and by at least 5:00 p.m. the day prior to the scheduled start of the meeting and circulated to each of the offices by at least 6:00 pm.

Rule 17. In the event the Chairman introduces a substitute amendment or a Chairman's mark, the requirements set forth in Rule 16 shall be considered waived unless such substitute amendment or Chairman's mark has been made available at least five business days in advance of the scheduled meeting.

Rule 18. It shall be in order, without prior notice, for a Member to offer a motion to strike a single section of any bill, resolution, or amendment under consideration.

Rule 19. This section of the rule may be waived by agreement of the Chairman and the Ranking Minority Member.

DELEGATION OF AUTHORITY TO COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN

Rule 20. The Chairman is authorized to sign himself or by delegation all necessary vouchers and routine papers for which the committee's approval is required and to decide on the committee's behalf all routine business.

Rule 21. The Chairman is authorized to engage commercial reporters for the preparation of transcripts of committee meetings and hearings.

Rule 22. The Chairman is authorized to issue, on behalf of the committee, regulations normally promulgated by the committee at the beginning of each session.

DELEGATION OF AUTHORITY TO COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN AND RANKING MINORITY MEMBER

Rule 23. The Chairman and Ranking Minority Member, acting jointly, are authorized to approve on behalf of the committee any rule or regulation for which the committee's approval is required, provided advance notice of their intention to do so is given to Members of the committee.

ARMS SALES NOTIFICATION

Mr. RISCH. Mr. President, section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act requires that Congress receive prior notification of certain proposed arms sales as defined by that statute. Upon such notification, the Congress has 30 calendar days during which the sale may be reviewed. The provision stipulates that, in the Senate, the notification of proposed sales shall be sent to the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

In keeping with the committee's intention to see that relevant information is available to the full Senate, I

ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the notifications which have been received. If the cover letter references a classified annex, then such annex is available to all Senators in the office of the Foreign Relations Committee, room SD-423.

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

DEFENSE SECURITY
COOPERATION AGENCY,
Arlington, VA.

Hon. JAMES E. RISCH,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, we are forwarding herewith Transmittal No. 19-05 concerning the Army's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance to the Government of Israel for defense articles and services estimated to cost \$238 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. 19-05

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: Government of Israel.

(ii) Total Estimated Value:

Major Defense Equipment* \$0 million.

Other \$238 million.

Total \$238 million.

(iii) Description and Quantity or Quantities of Articles or Services under Consideration for Purchase:

Major Defense Equipment (MDE): None.

Non-MDE:

Two hundred forty (240) Namer Armored Personnel Carrier (APC-MT883) Power Packs, Less Transmission (NPPLT) in Full Configuration.

Thirty (30) Namer Armored Personnel Carrier (APC-MT883) Power Pack, Less Transmission (NPPLT) in Light Configuration.

One hundred seventy-nine (179) Control and Diagnostic Systems (CDS).

Also included is an Integrated Logistics Support package that includes: special tools for C-Level maintenance; oil spray nozzle test bench; preservation and packaging; containers; configuration management; technical manuals, spare parts catalogs, other documentation and publications, and other related elements of logistics and program support.

(iv) Military Department: Army (IS-B-ZZD).

(v) Prior Related Cases, if any: None.

(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: None.

(viii) Date Report Delivered to Congress: February 12, 2019.

*As defined in Section 47(6) of the Arms Export Control Act.

POLICY JUSTIFICATION

Israel—Namer Armored Personnel Carrier (APC-MT883) Power Packs Less Transmissions (NPPLT) and Integrated Logistics Support

The Government of Israel has requested to buy two hundred forty (240) Namer Armored Personnel Carrier (APC-MT883) Power Packs, Less Transmission (NPPLT) in Full

Configuration; thirty (30) Namer Armored Personnel Carrier (APC-MT883) Power Packs, Less Transmission (NPPLT) in Light Configuration; and one hundred seventy-nine (179) Control and Diagnostic Systems (CDS). Also included is an Integrated Logistics Support package that includes: special tools for C-Level maintenance; oil spray nozzle test bench; preservation and packaging; containers; configuration management; technical manuals, spare parts catalogs, other documentation and publications, and other related elements of logistics and program support. The total estimated program cost is \$238 million.

The United States is committed to the security of Israel, and it is vital to U.S. national interests to assist Israel to develop and maintain a strong and ready self-defense capability. This proposed sale is consistent with those objectives.

The proposed sale will improve Israel's capability to meet current and future threats in the defense of its borders. These upgraded power packs will be used on their Armored Personnel Carriers (APC-MT883) that were fielded in 2008. Israel will have no difficulty absorbing this equipment into its armed forces.

The proposed equipment and support will not alter the basic military balance in the region.

The prime contractor will be MTU America, Novi, MI. MTU America is the North American subsidiary of Rolls Royce Power Systems. 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 Israel.

There will be no adverse impact on U.S. defense readiness as a result of this proposed sale.

TRIBUTE TO ALFRED K. NEWMAN

Mr. UDALL. Mr. President, today I wish to pay tribute to Alfred K. Newman, one of last remaining Navajo code talkers, who passed away on January 13 of this year.

Mr. Newman was born in Coolidge, NM, on July 21, 1924. He was Naaneesht'ezhi Dine'e—Zuni Clan—and born for Tsi'naajinii—Black Streak Wood People Clan. One of six children, his mother wove rugs that were sold at the Coolidge Trading Post and his stepfather worked as a silversmith there.

When Mr. Newman was about 8 years old, his family sent him to the Rehoboth Mission School, where he boarded during the 9 month school year and rarely saw his parents. During the summers, he herded sheep. At one point, they had a herd of 200, and the young shepherd loved watching the lizards, birds, and bugs that surrounded him as he herded.

Mr. Newman grew up knowing both Navajo and English. However, the boarding students were not allowed to speak Navajo at the school. One time, when he spoke in Navajo, in order to help another Navajo student who knew no English, he was punished by having to write "I must not speak Navajo" 500 times.

While the missionaries at the Rehoboth Mission School forbade Mr. Newman and other Navajo students from

speaking their language, as did Federal Government Indian boarding schools, the U.S. military came to greatly appreciate the strategic advantage the unwritten Dine language held.

Mr. Newman enlisted in the Marines, in 1943, when he was 18, inspired to defend the Nation in light of the attack on Pearl Harbor. He, along with an estimated 44,000 other Native Americans, served in World War II, even though they couldn't vote in U.S. elections and faced discrimination within the military.

Soon after Mr. Newman enlisted, he was assigned to a secret mission, as part of the Navajo code talkers. He attended code school, learning the complex code by memory, and learned how to operate communications equipment. Serving in the 1st Battalion, 21st Marine Regiment, 3rd Marine Division, Alfred was stationed in New Caledonia, Guadalcanal, Bougainville Island, Guam, and Iwo Jima, among other duty stations. He saw battle at the latter three locations and was stationed in Iwo Jima during 28 days of the famous battle and was there the day the Americans raised the flag over Mount Suribachi. Mr. Newman was honorably discharged with the rank of corporal in December 1945.

After his discharge, he came back to New Mexico, and married his sweetheart, Betsy Eleanore Denetson. He worked as an ammunition inspector at Fort Wingate and then at an open-pit mine overseeing blasting at Kirkland Field. Together, he and Betsy have 5 children, 13 grandchildren, and 3 great-grandchildren and were married 69 years before his passing.

The Japanese famously never broke the Navajos' code, and Navajo code talkers are credited with playing a decisive role in key World War II battles, including Iwo Jima. The Navajo code talker mission was kept secret until 1968, when it was declassified. In 2000, Congress awarded the Congressional Silver Medal to the Navajo code talkers. Like so many others, Mr. Newman was humble about his bravery in service and modest about his medals. During a 2010 interview for an oral history project, Mr. Newman was asked, "How did [the war] change you?" He replied that, "Before the war, I was just going just like any other non-Navajo. Peaceful, no worries. Doing what I like. But when the war came, it was a different story. So I had to do what needed to be done."

We are forever grateful to Mr. Newman and all his fellow courageous code talkers for doing "what needed to be done" to defend our country. We will always honor and will never forget their service and sacrifice to the Nation.

150TH ANNIVERSARY OF WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, today, Wyoming Governor Mark Gordon will sign a joint resolution of the

Wyoming Legislature recognizing December 10, 2019, as Wyoming Women's Suffrage Day.

On December 10, 1869, the Wyoming Territory passed the first law in U.S. history granting women the right to vote and hold public office. This right became so important to the people of Wyoming that, when the State sought statehood, it refused to enter the Union if this right was not protected.

In 2015, I came to the floor to speak in honor of the 125th anniversary of Wyoming statehood. I shared with the Senate the challenge Wyoming faced from Congress in its quest to become a member of the Union. I believe it is timely to share that story again.

The debate in Congress was contentious, with the arguments centering on one of our most proud accomplishments: a decision made long before Wyoming became a State. On December 10, 1869, the Wyoming Territory was the first in the United States to grant women the right to vote.

Efforts to attain statehood finally came to fruition 20 years later. It was incumbent on our delegate to the U.S. House of Representatives, Joseph M. Carey, to convince his colleagues to support the statehood bill.

On March 26, 1890, the day of the statehood bill debate, Joseph Carey spoke passionately about Wyoming. His words still hold true today. He said that Wyoming was rich in agricultural possibilities. He explained Wyoming was one of nature's great storehouses of minerals. Joseph Carey also talked about grazing development, educational leadership, widespread railway construction, the model Constitution, and the unique opportunities for women.

Yet opponents to our statehood did not support women having the right to vote. On the same day as Joseph Carey's impassioned speech, Representative William Oates of Alabama argued against our admittance to the Union. He said, "Mr. Speaker, I do not hesitate to say that in my judgment the franchise has been too liberally extended. Should we ever reach universal suffrage this Government will become practically a pure democracy and then the days of its existence are numbered."

The U.S. House of Representatives narrowly passed Wyoming's statehood bill with a vote of 139 to 127. The U.S. Senate passed the bill on June 27, 1890. Wyoming officially became the 44th State on July 10, 1890, and became the first state to allow women the right to vote and hold public office.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD Enrolled Joint Resolution No. 1 of the Sixty-Fifth Legislature of the State of Wyoming recognizing December 10, 2019, as Wyoming Women's Suffrage Day.

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

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 1, SENATE
SIXTY-FIFTH LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF
WYOMING

2019 GENERAL SESSION

A Joint Resolution recognizing December 10, 2019 as Wyoming Women's Suffrage Day.
1Whereas, Wyoming is often referred to as the "Cowboy State," its more apt sobriquet is the "Equality State"; and

Whereas, women, like all persons, have always inherently held the right to vote and participate in their government; and

Whereas, Wyoming was the first government to explicitly acknowledge and affirm women's inherent right to vote and to hold office; and

Whereas, this inherent right, at the founding of the United States, was inhibited; and

Whereas, women, at the founding of the United States, were also prevented from holding office; and

Whereas, women's suffrage—the basic enfranchisement of women—began to burgeon in the United States in the 1840s and continued to gain momentum over the next decades, despite the oppressive atmosphere in which women were not allowed to divorce their husbands or show their booted ankles without risk of public scandal or worse; and

Whereas, during the 1850s, activism to support women's suffrage gathered steam, but lost momentum when the Civil War began; and

Whereas, in the fall of 1868, three (3) years after the American Civil War had ended, Union Army General Ulysses S. Grant was elected President, and chose John Campbell to serve as Governor of the Wyoming Territory; and

Whereas, Joseph A. Carey, who was thereafter appointed to serve as Attorney General of the Wyoming Territory, issued a formal legal opinion that no one in Wyoming could be denied the right to vote based on race; and

Whereas, the first Wyoming Territorial Legislature, comprised entirely of men, required consistent and persistent inveigling to warm to the notion of suffrage; and

Whereas, abolitionist and woman suffrage activist, Esther Hobart Morris, was born in Tioga County, New York, on August 8, 1812, and later became a successful milliner and businesswoman; and

Whereas, Esther Hobart Morris, widowed in 1843, moved to Peru, Illinois, to settle the property in her late husband's estate and experienced the legal hardships faced by women in Illinois and New York; and

Whereas, Esther Hobart Morris married John Morris, a prosperous merchant, and in 1869 moved to the gold rush camp at South Pass City, a small valley situated along the banks of Willow Creek on the southeastern end of the Wind River Mountains in the Wyoming Territory just north of the Oregon Trail; and

Whereas, William Bright, a saloonkeeper, also from the once bustling frontier mining town South Pass City, was elected to serve in the Territorial Legislature and was elected as president of the Territorial Council; and

Whereas, the Territorial Legislature met in 1869 in Cheyenne and passed bills and resolutions formally enabling women to vote and hold property and formally assuring equal pay for teachers; and

Whereas, William Bright introduced a bill to recognize the right of Wyoming women to vote; and

Whereas, no records were kept of the debate between Wyoming territorial lawmakers, although individuals likely asserted a myriad of motivations and intentions in supporting women's suffrage; and

Whereas, the Wyoming Territory population at the time consisted of six adult men

for every adult woman, some lawmakers perchance hoped suffrage would entice more women to the state; and

Whereas, some lawmakers may have believed that women's suffrage was consistent with the goals articulated in post-Civil War Amendment XV to the United States Constitution guaranteeing the "right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any state on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude"; and

Whereas, some lawmakers inherently knew that guaranteeing the right of women to vote was, simply, the right thing to do; and

Whereas, the Territorial Legislature advanced a suffrage bill stating, "That every woman of the age of twenty-one years, residing in this territory, may, at every election to be held under the laws thereof, cast her vote. And her rights to the elective franchise and to hold office shall be the same under the election laws of the territory, as those of electors" and that "This act shall take effect and be in force from and after its passage"; and

Whereas, when invited to join the Union, demanding that women's suffrage be revoked, the Wyoming Legislature said, "We will remain out of the Union one hundred years rather than come in without the women"; and

Whereas, in July 1890, Esther Hobart Morris presented the new Wyoming state flag to Governor Francis E. Warren during the statehood celebration, making Wyoming the 44th state to enter the Union and the first with its women holding the right to vote and serve in elected office; and

Whereas, the United States did not endorse women's suffrage until 1920 with the ratification of the 19th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution; and

Whereas, despite the passage of the 19th Amendment, women of color continued to face barriers with exercising their right to vote, as American Indian men and women were not recognized as United States citizens permitted to vote until the passage of the Indian Citizenship Act of 1924, and ongoing racial discrimination required the passage and implementation of the Voting Rights Act of 1965; and

Whereas, achieving voting rights for all women required firm and continuing resolve to overcome reluctance, and even fervent opposition, toward this rightful enfranchisement; and

Whereas, Wyoming, the first to recognize women's suffrage, blazed a trail of other noteworthy milestones, such as Louisa Swain, of Laramie, casting the first ballot by a woman voter in 1870; and

Whereas, in 1870 the first jury to include women was in Wyoming and was sworn in on March 7 in Laramie; and

Whereas, Esther Hobart Morris was appointed to serve as justice of the peace in February 1870, making her the first woman to serve as a judge in the United States; and

Whereas, Wyoming women become the first women to vote in a presidential election in 1892; and

Whereas, in 1894 Wyoming elected Estelle Reel to serve as the state superintendent of public instruction, making her one of the first women in the United States elected to serve in a statewide office; and

Whereas, the residents of the town of Jackson in 1920 elected a city council composed entirely of women – dubbed the "petticoat government" by the press – making it the first all-women government in the United States; and

Whereas, in 1924 Wyoming elected Nellie Tayloe Ross to serve as governor of the great state of Wyoming, making her the first woman to be sworn in as governor in these United States; and

Whereas, all these milestones illuminate and strengthen Wyoming's heritage as the "Equality State"; and

Whereas, December 10, 2019 marks the 150th anniversary of the date women's suffrage became law.

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the members of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming:

Section 1. That the Wyoming legislature commemorates 2019 as a year to celebrate the one hundred fiftieth (150th) anniversary of the passage of women's suffrage.

Section 2. That the Wyoming legislature is proud of its heritage as the first state to recognize the right of women to vote and hold office, hereby affirming its legacy as the "Equality State."

Section 3. That the Secretary of State of Wyoming transmit a copy of this resolution to the National Women's Hall of Fame in support of Esther Hobart Morris' induction into the Women of the Hall.

Section 4. That the Wyoming legislature encourages its citizens and invites its visitors to learn about the women and men who made women's suffrage in Wyoming a reality, thereby blazing a trail for other states, and eventually the federal government, to recognize the inherent right of men and women alike to elect their leaders and hold office.

RECOGNIZING OLD GLORY HONOR FLIGHT

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. President, today I rise to recognize the Old Glory Honor Flight organization, as it makes its maiden flight to Vietnam to bring 53 veterans back to the place where they risked their lives for our Nation. I am honored to pay tribute to this important first flight and to honor their sacrifices.

The all-volunteer organization, Old Glory Honor Flight, was founded in 2009 by individuals who had a dream of creating an honor flight experience for military veterans in northeast Wisconsin. A dedicated board of volunteers launched the first official flight on October 27, 2009, when they hosted 95 World War II veterans on a trip to our Nation's Capital to experience firsthand the national memorials honoring American military servicemembers.

The honor flight's mission is to create a safe and memorable experience for veterans who call Wisconsin home. Until now, each honor flight has taken place within a single day, sending veterans to Washington, DC, to thank them for all they sacrificed to keep our Nation safe and free. Since its inception, Old Glory Honor Flight has flown more than 3,500 veterans on more than 40 missions.

Through the generous support of individuals and businesses, Old Glory Honor Flight has grown tremendously in the past decade. This month, for the first time in its 10-year existence, the organization is sending 53 veterans who served in Vietnam, Cambodia, Laos, and Thailand back to Vietnam for 2 weeks.

Wisconsinites owe a debt of gratitude to these servicemembers who answered our country's call to serve and defend the United States. These veterans served with honor and endured the horrors of war. When they returned home,

they were shunned and denied their rightful hero's welcome. We must vow to never let this happen again and to always honor those who serve in our Armed Forces. Let this flight be a reminder that we can all do our part to keep the sacred trust we have with our veterans. Let it be a reminder that there is still more work to do to honor their service, and let us be inspired by their selfless and heroic service to a grateful nation.

I am honored to recognize the very first Wisconsin Honor Flight to Vietnam and I commend Old Glory Honor Flight on this extraordinary mission to honor our Wisconsin military veterans. It is my sincere hope that this momentous trip will bring some peace to these brave men traveling back to Vietnam.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

RECOGNIZING PHIL BATT

• Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, along with my colleagues Senator JAMES E. RISCH, Representative MIKE SIMPSON, and Representative RUSS FULCHER, I pay tribute to former Idaho Governor Phil Batt for his immense service to our State.

As his last official act in the Governor's Ceremonial Office in the Idaho State Capitol, outgoing Idaho Governor C.L. Butch Otter co-presented, with current Idaho Governor Brad Little, the 2019 Idaho Medal of Achievement to Governor Phil Batt for his many accomplishments and years of service to the State of Idaho. The award is considered the highest civilian honor bestowed by the State. Phil Batt is the third recipient of this great honor, for which many nominations from across our State have been made by the public.

Governor Batt has an extensive career of service to our State and Nation. He served as our State's 29th Governor from 1995 to 1999. Prior to his service as Governor, he served as Idaho Republican Party Chairman, Lieutenant Governor of Idaho, and president pro tempore of the Idaho Senate. He served in the Idaho Senate for approximately 15 years after serving in the Idaho House of Representatives from 1965 to 1967. He also served in the U.S. Army from 1945 to 1946 after growing up on a farm in Wilder, ID.

Idaho has benefited greatly from Governor Phil Batt's sensible voice, commitment to service, and outstanding leadership. Governor Batt's principal role in advancing human rights in Idaho is among his many achievements on behalf of Idahoans. He led efforts to establish a Commission on Human Rights and pushed for benefits for Idaho farmworkers.

Governor Batt, you have much to be proud of and reflect on for your outstanding service over your exemplary life. You have stood against inequities and, in so doing, helped make others' paths better. Your mentorship, encour-

agement, and guidance have been instrumental in helping current and future leaders in our great State get a start. Thank you for your leadership, friendship, humor, and extraordinary service to our State and Nation.●

REMEMBERING BILL BURGESS

• Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I am here to speak today with a heavy heart from the sudden and untimely passing of my dear friend and confidant, Bill Burgess of Lawton, OK.

Bill spent his entire life in service to Oklahoma and the Nation, and his loss will be felt throughout the State.

Bill was a talented attorney, businessman, and civic leader. Among many different titles Bill held throughout his career, he served the State he loved on the Oklahoma Board of Regents for Higher Education and the University of Oklahoma Board of Regents.

Bill was widely recognized and respected as one of Oklahoma's outstanding leaders, and he was inducted into both the Oklahoma Hall of Fame and the Oklahoma Higher Education Hall of Fame.

As a businessman who developed the largest software engineering company in Oklahoma and the owner and publisher of the Lawton Constitution, Bill was admired for his entrepreneurial ability and success. A tireless advocate for Oklahoma business, he served stints as chairman of both the Oklahoma State Chamber of Commerce and the Oklahoma Business Roundtable.

I worked closely with Bill in his role as civilian aide to the Secretary to the Army and am so thankful to have a man of such integrity, character, and grit in this position.

If you spent any time at all around Bill, you were sure to know that he was the son of a sergeant major, the "backbone of the Army." Friends say that growing up in the house of a non-commissioned officer gave him a love not only for the Army but also for the enlisted men and women who serve their country.

Bill was incredibly proud of his dad's service to our Nation and continued that tradition of service. No one loved, admired, and supported our men and women in uniform more than Bill.

Kay and I are praying for Bill's family, friends, and many loved ones in this extremely hard time. Bill was an exceptional leader, a loving father, and an incomparable friend.

I am blessed to have known him, and he will be sorely missed by myself and the rest of Oklahoma.●

RECOGNIZING JL MARINE SYSTEMS, INC.

• Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, it is my privilege to honor a Florida small business that exemplifies innovation and how thinking outside of the box to solve problems can create techno-

logical breakthroughs. As chairman of the Senate Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship, each week I recognize a small business that embodies the unique American entrepreneurial spirit. This week, it is my distinct privilege to honor JL Marine Systems, Inc., as the Senate Small Business of the Week.

Located in Tampa, FL, JL Marine Systems is known in fishing communities throughout the country as the manufacturer of the Power-Pole shallow water anchor. John Oliverio, the creator of the Power-Pole, has been an angler for all his life and used this experience to create a more practical approach to shallow water fishing. As a flats fisherman, he was frustrated that bringing his boat to a stop with a push pole or an anchor required him to lose sight of fish. In 1998, John devised the concept for an anchor that he could lower from anywhere, allowing him to keep his eyes on fish. Today, the Power-Pole is a premier shallow water anchor, featuring sophisticated technology for more effective shallow water fishing.

JL Marine Systems' Power-Pole technology is available in five different models, at more than 3,500 dealers, manufacturers, and retailers. These quality products have helped JL Marine Systems to build strong partnerships in the boating and fishing industries and has earned accolades at professional fishing tournaments, in magazines, and on television shows. The Power-Pole won Best New Boating Accessory at the International Convention of Allied Sportsfishing Trades in 2011, 2012, and 2013 and won awards for its electronics at the International Boatbuilders Exhibition and Conference in 2017.

JL Marine Systems' commitment to a higher standard is not only seen in their innovative products and customer service, but also in how the company gives back to its community. JL Marine Systems is a proud supporter of the Florida Aquarium, the Coastal Conservation Association, the National Pediatric Cancer Foundation, and numerous other organizations. The company also supports its community by hosting hurricane relief fundraisers and by sponsoring Tampa-area youth sports teams and high school and college fishing teams.

John Oliverio's work to develop and produce the Power-Pole shallow water anchor represents the innovation that Floridian entrepreneurs are known so well for. Through hard work and perseverance, John and his team at JL Marine Systems have revolutionized the shallow water anchor and have set an excellent example of ingenuity. I would like to congratulate John and the entire team at JL Marine Systems for being named the Senate Small Business of the Week. I wish them good luck and look forward to watching their continued growth and success.●

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bill was read the second time, and placed on the calendar:

S. 464. A bill to require the treatment of a lapse in appropriations as a mitigating condition when assessing financial considerations for security clearances, and for other purposes.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bill was read the first time:

S. 483. A bill to enact into law a bill by reference.

The following joint resolution was read the first time:

S.J. Res. 8. Joint resolution recognizing the duty of the Federal Government to create a Green New Deal.

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-315. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to operation of the Exchange Stabilization Fund (ESF) for fiscal year 2018; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-316. 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; Indiana; Negative Declarations for Commercial and Industrial Solid Waste Incineration and Sewage Sludge Incineration Units for Designated Facilities and Pollutants" (FRL No. 9989-36-Region 5) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 12, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-317. 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; Indiana; Reasonable Further Progress Plan and Other Plan Elements for the Chicago Nonattainment Area for the 2008 Ozone Standard" (FRL No. 9989-33-Region 5) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 12, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-318. 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: North Carolina; Ozone NAAQS Update" (FRL No. 9989-38-Region 4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 12, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-319. 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: OR: Lane County Outdoor Burning and Enforcement Procedure Rules" (FRL No. 9989-56-Region 10) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 12, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-320. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule en-

titled "Attainment Plan for the Lake County SO2 Nonattainment Area" (FRL No. 9989-48-Region 5) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 12, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-321. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to section 36(c) and (d) of the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a proposed license for the manufacture of significant military equipment and the export of firearms, parts, and components, including technical data and defense services, abroad controlled under Category I of the U.S. Munitions Lists to Brazil to support the manufacture of components for sporting handguns and rifles in the amount of \$1,000,000 or more (Transmittal No. DDTC 18-017); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-322. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to section 36(c) and (d) of the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a proposed license for the manufacture of significant military equipment and the export of defense articles, including technical data and defense services, abroad to Italy, Turkey, and the Netherlands to support the manufacture of the F-35 Lightning II's Center Fuselage and related assemblies, subassemblies, and components associated with all variants of the F-35 Aircraft in the amount of \$100,000,000 or more (Transmittal No. DDTC 17-076); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-323. A communication from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Federal Election Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Commission's competitive sourcing efforts during fiscal year 2018; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

EC-324. A communication from the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department of Veterans Affairs Vehicle Fleet Report on Alternative Fuel Vehicles for fiscal year 2018; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC-325. A communication from the Deputy Chief, Enforcement Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Section 1.80(b) of the Commission's Rules; Forfeiture Proceedings" (DA 18-1272) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 12, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-326. A communication from the Program Analyst, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Federal Motor Vehicle Theft Prevention Standard, Final Listing of the 2017 Light Duty Truck Lines Subject to the Requirements of This Standard and Exempted Vehicle Lines for Model Year 2017" (RIN2127-AL72) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 8, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-327. A communication from the Regulatory Ombudsman, Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Commercial Learner's Permit Validity" (RIN2126-AB98) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 8, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-328. A communication from the Regulatory Ombudsman, Federal Motor Carrier

Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fees for the Unified Carrier Registration Plan Agreement" ((RIN2126-AC12) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 8, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-329. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Establishment of Class E Airspace; Maurice, IA" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2018-0671)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 8, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-330. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Establishment of Class E Airspace; Hardinsburg, KY" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2018-0486)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 8, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-331. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Removal of Class E Airspace; Mercury, NV" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2017-1148)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 8, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-332. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Class E Airspace; Leitchfield, KY" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2018-0485)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 8, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-333. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Class E Airspace; Pago Pago, America Soma" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2018-0082)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 8, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-334. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Class E Airspace; Mesquite, NV" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2018-0007)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 8, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-335. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Class E Airspace; Bethel, ME" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2018-0883)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 8, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-336. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal

Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Class D Airspace; Appleton, WI" (RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2018-0006)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 8, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-337. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Class D and E Airspace; Casper, WY" (RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2017-0223)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 8, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-338. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Class D and E Airspace; Moses Lake, WA" (RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2017-1033)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 8, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-339. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Class D and E Airspace; Aspen, CO" (RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2018-0016)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 8, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-340. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Class D and E Airspace; and Revocation of Class E Airspace; Jackson, MI" (RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2017-1187)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 8, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-341. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Class D and E Airspace, and Removal of Class E Airspace; Lompoc, CA" (RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2017-1146)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 8, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-342. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Part 95 Instrument Flight Rules; Miscellaneous Amendments; Amendment No. 543" (RIN2120-AA63) (Docket No. 31228)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 8, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-343. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes" (RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2018-1066)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of

the Senate on February 8, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petition or memorial was laid before the Senate and was referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM-5. A petition from a citizen of the State of Texas relative to an amendment to the United States Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. BLUNT, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, without amendment:

S. Res. 50. A resolution improving procedures for the consideration of nominations in the Senate.

S. Res. 70. An original resolution authorizing expenditures by committees of the Senate for the periods March 1, 2019 through September 30, 2019, October 1, 2019 through September 30, 2020, and October 1, 2020 through February 28, 2021.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. WICKER for the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

*Janice Miriam Hellreich, of Hawaii, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting for a term expiring January 31, 2024.

*Robert A. Mandell, of Florida, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting for a term expiring January 31, 2022.

*Don Muncie, of Florida, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting for a term expiring January 31, 2024.

*Bruce M. Ramer, of California, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting for a term expiring January 31, 2024.

*Coast Guard nomination of Alexander C. Foos, to be Captain.

By Mr. JOHNSON for the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

*Julia Akins Clark, of Maryland, to be a Member of the Merit Systems Protection Board for the term of seven years expiring March 1, 2021.

*Dennis Dean Kirk, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Merit Systems Protection Board for the term of seven years expiring March 1, 2023.

*Dennis Dean Kirk, of Virginia, to be Chairman of the Merit Systems Protection Board.

*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. WARNER (for himself, Mr. CARDIN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, and Ms. BALDWIN):

S. 466. A bill to provide that certain guidance related to waivers for State innovation under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act shall have no force or effect; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. WARREN (for herself, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. UDALL, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. SMITH, Mr. KING, Mr. TESTER, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, and Ms. ROSEN):

S. 467. A bill to amend section 520E of the Public Health Service Act to require States and their designees receiving grants for development and implementation of statewide suicide early intervention and prevention strategies to collaborate with each Federally recognized Indian tribe, tribal organization, urban Indian organization, and Native Hawaiian health care system in the State; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Mr. WARNER, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, and Mr. BENNET):

S. 468. A bill to amend title II of the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide for teacher, principal, and other school leader quality enhancement; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. CORTEZ MASTO (for herself, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. SMITH, Mr. BROWN, Mr. CASEY, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. KAINE, and Ms. ROSEN):

S. 469. A bill to allow penalty-free distributions from retirement accounts in the case of certain Federal contractors impacted by Federal Government shutdowns; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. STABENOW (for herself, Mr. BROWN, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. CARDIN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. PETERS, Mr. REED, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. SMITH, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, and Mr. HEINRICH):

S. 470. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for an option for any citizen or permanent resident of the United States age 50 to 64 to buy into Medicare; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. CORNYN, and Mr. SASSE):

S. 471. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to increase transparency and oversight of third-party litigation funding in certain actions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. 472. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to ensure that revenues collected from passengers as aviation security fees are used to help finance the costs of aviation security screening by repealing a requirement that a portion of such fees be credited as offsetting receipts and deposited in the general fund of the Treasury; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. BOOKER (for himself and Mr. PORTMAN):

S. 473. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to include certain Federal positions within the definition of law enforcement officer for retirement purposes, and for

other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. COONS, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. STABENOW, and Mr. TESTER):

S. 474. A bill to amend title XI of the Social Security Act to require drug manufacturers to publicly justify unnecessary price increases; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. BENNET, Mr. CARDIN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. MERKLEY, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE):

S. 475. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to prevent catastrophic out-of-pocket spending on prescription drugs for seniors and individuals with disabilities; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. BROWN, Mr. CARPER, and Mr. TESTER):

S. 476. A bill to amend title XI and XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide greater transparency of discounts provided by drug manufacturers; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. WARREN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. MERKLEY, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. WYDEN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. CARDIN, Ms. HIRONO, and Mr. LEAHY):

S. 477. A bill to authorize the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to establish a Climate Change Education Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. SANDERS (for himself, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. BOOKER, and Ms. HARRIS):

S. 478. A bill to enhance Social Security benefits and ensure the long-term solvency of the Social Security program; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. TOOMEY (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Mr. DURBIN):

S. 479. A bill to revise section 48 of title 18, United States Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. CORNYN, and Mr. COTTON):

S. 480. A bill to require an unclassified interagency report on the political influence operations of the Government of China and the Communist Party of China with respect to the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself and Mr. HOEVEN):

S. 481. A bill to encourage States to require the installation of residential carbon monoxide detectors in homes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. GRAHAM (for himself, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. CARDIN, and Mrs. SHAHEEN):

S. 482. A bill to strengthen the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, to combat international cybercrime, and to impose additional sanctions with respect to the Russian Federation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. ROBERTS (for himself, Ms. STABENOW, and Mr. UDALL):

S. 483. A bill to enact into law a bill by reference; read the first time.

By Ms. CORTEZ MASTO (for herself, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. WARREN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Mr. UDALL):

S. 484. A bill to require additional disclosures relating to donations to the Presidential Inaugural Committee, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCCONNELL:

S.J. Res. 8. A joint resolution recognizing the duty of the Federal Government to create a Green New Deal; read the first time.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BURR (for himself and Mr. MANCHIN):

S. Res. 68. A resolution designating April 5, 2019, as "Gold Star Wives Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURR (for himself and Mr. MANCHIN):

S. Res. 69. A resolution designating March 29, 2019, as "Vietnam Veterans Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLUNT:

S. Res. 70. An original resolution authorizing expenditures by committees of the Senate for the periods March 1, 2019 through September 30, 2019, October 1, 2019 through September 30, 2020, and October 1, 2020 through February 28, 2021; from the Committee on Rules and Administration; placed on the calendar.

By Mr. BOOZMAN (for himself and Mr. COTTON):

S. Con. Res. 3. A concurrent resolution recognizing the rich history, heritage, and strategic importance of the Republic of the Marshall Islands and the Marshallese population residing in the United States; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 22

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 22, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage of dental services under the Medicare program.

S. 63

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 63, a bill to implement the recommendations of the Joint Select Committee on Budget and Appropriations Process Reform.

S. 74

At the request of Mr. DAINES, the names of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) and the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BRAUN) were added as cosponsors of S. 74, a bill to prohibit paying Members of Congress during periods during which a Government shutdown is in effect, and for other purposes.

S. 91

At the request of Mr. GARDNER, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 91, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize per diem payments under comprehensive service programs for homeless veterans to furnish care to dependents of homeless veterans, and for other purposes.

S. 135

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 135, a bill to prioritize the allocation of H-2B visas for States with low unemployment rates.

S. 152

At the request of Mr. COTTON, the names of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) were added as cosponsors of S. 152, a bill to direct the President to impose penalties pursuant to denial orders with respect to certain Chinese telecommunications companies that are in violation of the export control or sanctions laws of the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 172

At the request of Mr. GARDNER, the names of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) and the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER) were added as cosponsors of S. 172, a bill to delay the reimposition of the annual fee on health insurance providers until after 2021.

S. 175

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 175, a bill to improve agricultural job opportunities, benefits, and security for aliens in the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 178

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 178, a bill to condemn gross human rights violations of ethnic Turkic Muslims in Xinjiang, and calling for an end to arbitrary detention, torture, and harassment of these communities inside and outside China.

S. 186

At the request of Ms. ERNST, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BRAUN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 186, a bill to ensure timely completion of the concurrent resolution on the budget and regular appropriations bills, and for other purposes.

S. 201

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 201, a bill to amend title 13, United States Code, to make clear that each decennial census, as required for the apportionment of Representatives in Congress among the several States, shall tabulate the total number of persons in each State, and to provide that no information regarding United States citizenship or immigration status may be elicited in any such census.

S. 225

At the request of Mr. ISAKSON, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 225, a bill to provide for partnerships among State and local governments, regional entities, and the private sector to preserve, conserve, and

enhance the visitor experience at nationally significant battlefields of the American Revolution, War of 1812, and Civil War, and for other purposes.

S. 266

At the request of Mr. REED, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 266, a bill to provide for the long-term improvement of public school facilities, and for other purposes.

S. 285

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

S. 287

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 287, a bill to amend the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 to impose limitations on the authority of the President to adjust imports that are determined to threaten to impair national security, and for other purposes.

S. 293

At the request of Mr. CASSIDY, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 293, a bill to enhance border security to reduce drug trafficking and related money laundering.

S. 296

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 296, a bill to amend XVIII of the Social Security Act to ensure more timely access to home health services for Medicare beneficiaries under the Medicare program.

S. 362

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 362, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reform taxation of alcoholic beverages.

S. 380

At the request of Mr. JOHNSON, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA) was added as a cosponsor of S. 380, a bill to increase access to agency guidance documents.

S. 415

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 415, a bill to provide immigration status for certain battered spouses and children.

S. 459

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 459, a bill to protect the American people from undetectable ghost guns, and for other purposes.

S. CON. RES. 1

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 1, a concurrent resolution calling for credible, transparent, and safe elections in Nigeria, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 65

At the request of Mr. JOHNSON, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 65, a resolution congratulating the Hellenic Republic and the Republic of North Macedonia on ratification of the Prespa Agreement, which resolves a long-standing bilateral dispute and establishes a strategic partnership between the 2 countries.

S. RES. 66

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 66, a resolution rejecting the use of Government shutdowns.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. MCCONNELL:

S.J. Res. 8. A joint resolution recognizing the duty of the Federal Government to create a Green New Deal; read the first time.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the joint resolution be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the joint resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S.J. RES. 8

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) the October 2018 report entitled “Special Report on Global Warming of 1.5 C” by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change and the November 2018 Fourth National Climate Assessment report found that—

(A) human activity is the dominant cause of observed climate change over the past century;

(B) a changing climate is causing sea levels to rise and an increase in wildfires, severe storms, droughts, and other extreme weather events that threaten human life, healthy communities, and critical infrastructure;

(C) global warming at or above 2 degrees Celsius beyond pre-industrialized levels will cause—

(i) mass migration from the regions most affected by climate change;

(ii) more than \$500,000,000,000 in lost annual economic output in the United States by the year 2100;

(iii) wildfires that, by 2050, will annually burn at least twice as much forest area in the western United States than was typically burned by wildfires in the years preceding 2019;

(iv) a loss of more than 99 percent of all coral reefs on Earth;

(v) more than 350,000,000 more people to be exposed globally to deadly heat stress by 2050; and

(vi) a risk of damage to \$1,000,000,000,000 of public infrastructure and coastal real estate in the United States; and

(D) global temperatures must be kept below 1.5 degrees Celsius above pre-industrialized levels to avoid the most severe impacts of a changing climate, which will require—

(i) global reductions in greenhouse gas emissions from human sources of 40 to 60 percent from 2010 levels by 2030; and

(ii) net-zero global emissions by 2050;

(2) because the United States has historically been responsible for a disproportionate amount of greenhouse gas emissions, having emitted 20 percent of global greenhouse gas emissions through 2014, and has a high technological capacity, the United States must take a leading role in reducing emissions through economic transformation;

(3) the United States is currently experiencing several related crises, with—

(A) life expectancy declining while basic needs, such as clean air, clean water, healthy food, and adequate health care, housing, transportation, and education, are inaccessible to a significant portion of the United States population;

(B) a 4-decade trend of wage stagnation, deindustrialization, and anti-labor policies that has led to—

(i) hourly wages overall stagnating since the 1970s despite increased worker productivity;

(ii) the third-worst level of socioeconomic mobility in the developed world before the Great Recession;

(iii) the erosion of the earning and bargaining power of workers in the United States; and

(iv) inadequate resources for public sector workers to confront the challenges of climate change at local, State, and Federal levels; and

(C) the greatest income inequality since the 1920s, with—

(i) the top 1 percent of earners accruing 91 percent of gains in the first few years of economic recovery after the Great Recession;

(ii) a large racial wealth divide amounting to a difference of 20 times more wealth between the average White family and the average Black family; and

(iii) a gender earnings gap that results in women earning approximately 80 percent as much as men, at the median;

(4) climate change, pollution, and environmental destruction have exacerbated systemic racial, regional, social, environmental, and economic injustices (referred to in this section as “systemic injustices”) by disproportionately affecting indigenous peoples, communities of color, migrant communities, deindustrialized communities, depopulated rural communities, the poor, low-income workers, women, the elderly, the unhoused, people with disabilities, and youth (referred to in this section as “frontline and vulnerable communities”);

(5) climate change constitutes a direct threat to the national security of the United States—

(A) by impacting the economic, environmental, and social stability of countries and communities around the world; and

(B) by acting as a threat multiplier;

(6) the Federal Government-led mobilizations during World War II and the New Deal created the greatest middle class that the United States has ever seen, but many members of frontline and vulnerable communities were excluded from many of the economic and societal benefits of those mobilizations; and

(7) a new national, social, industrial, and economic mobilization on a scale not seen since World War II and the New Deal era is a historic opportunity—

(A) to create millions of good, high-wage jobs in the United States;

(B) to provide unprecedented levels of prosperity and economic security for all people of the United States; and

(C) to counteract systemic injustices.

SEC. 2. GREEN NEW DEAL POLICY.

It is the policy of the United States that—

(1) it is the duty of the Federal Government to create a Green New Deal—

(A) to achieve net-zero greenhouse gas emissions through a fair and just transition for all communities and workers;

(B) to create millions of good, high-wage jobs and ensure prosperity and economic security for all people of the United States;

(C) to invest in the infrastructure and industry of the United States to sustainably meet the challenges of the 21st century;

(D) to secure for all people of the United States for generations to come—

(i) clean air and water;

(ii) climate and community resiliency;

(iii) healthy food;

(iv) access to nature; and

(v) a sustainable environment; and

(E) to promote justice and equity by stopping current, preventing future, and repairing historic oppression of indigenous peoples, communities of color, migrant communities, deindustrialized communities, depopulated rural communities, the poor, low-income workers, women, the elderly, the unhoused, people with disabilities, and youth (referred to in this section as “frontline and vulnerable communities”);

(2) the goals described in subparagraphs (A) through (E) of paragraph (1) (referred to in this section as the “Green New Deal goals”) should be accomplished through a 10-year national mobilization (referred to in this section as the “Green New Deal mobilization”) that will require the following goals and projects—

(A) building resiliency against climate change-related disasters, such as extreme weather, including by leveraging funding and providing investments for community-defined projects and strategies;

(B) repairing and upgrading the infrastructure in the United States, including—

(i) by eliminating pollution and greenhouse gas emissions as much as technologically feasible;

(ii) by guaranteeing universal access to clean water;

(iii) by reducing the risks posed by climate impacts; and

(iv) by ensuring that any infrastructure bill considered by Congress addresses climate change;

(C) meeting 100 percent of the power demand in the United States through clean, renewable, and zero-emission energy sources, including—

(i) by dramatically expanding and upgrading renewable power sources; and

(ii) by deploying new capacity;

(D) building or upgrading to energy-efficient, distributed, and “smart” power grids, and ensuring affordable access to electricity;

(E) upgrading all existing buildings in the United States and building new buildings to achieve maximum energy efficiency, water efficiency, safety, affordability, comfort, and durability, including through electrification;

(F) spurring massive growth in clean manufacturing in the United States and removing pollution and greenhouse gas emissions from manufacturing and industry as much as is technologically feasible, including by expanding renewable energy manufacturing and investing in existing manufacturing and industry;

(G) working collaboratively with farmers and ranchers in the United States to remove pollution and greenhouse gas emissions from the agricultural sector as much as is technologically feasible, including—

(i) by supporting family farming;

(ii) by investing in sustainable farming and land use practices that increase soil health; and

(iii) by building a more sustainable food system that ensures universal access to healthy food;

(H) overhauling transportation systems in the United States to remove pollution and greenhouse gas emissions from the transportation sector as much as is technologically feasible, including through investment in—

(i) zero-emission vehicle infrastructure and manufacturing;

(ii) clean, affordable, and accessible public transit; and

(iii) high-speed rail;

(I) mitigating and managing the long-term adverse health, economic, and other effects of pollution and climate change, including by providing funding for community-defined projects and strategies;

(J) removing greenhouse gases from the atmosphere and reducing pollution by restoring natural ecosystems through proven low-tech solutions that increase soil carbon storage, such as land preservation and afforestation;

(K) restoring and protecting threatened, endangered, and fragile ecosystems through locally appropriate and science-based projects that enhance biodiversity and support climate resiliency;

(L) cleaning up existing hazardous waste and abandoned sites, ensuring economic development and sustainability on those sites;

(M) identifying other emission and pollution sources and creating solutions to remove them; and

(N) promoting the international exchange of technology, expertise, products, funding, and services, with the aim of making the United States the international leader on climate action, and to help other countries achieve a Green New Deal;

(3) a Green New Deal must be developed through transparent and inclusive consultation, collaboration, and partnership with frontline and vulnerable communities, labor unions, worker cooperatives, civil society groups, academia, and businesses; and

(4) to achieve the Green New Deal goals and mobilization, a Green New Deal will require the following goals and projects—

(A) providing and leveraging, in a way that ensures that the public receives appropriate ownership stakes and returns on investment, adequate capital (including through community grants, public banks, and other public financing), technical expertise, supporting policies, and other forms of assistance to communities, organizations, Federal, State, and local government agencies, and businesses working on the Green New Deal mobilization;

(B) ensuring that the Federal Government takes into account the complete environmental and social costs and impacts of emissions through—

(i) existing laws;

(ii) new policies and programs; and

(iii) ensuring that frontline and vulnerable communities shall not be adversely affected;

(C) providing resources, training, and high-quality education, including higher education, to all people of the United States, with a focus on frontline and vulnerable communities, so that all people of the United States may be full and equal participants in the Green New Deal mobilization;

(D) making public investments in the research and development of new clean and renewable energy technologies and industries;

(E) directing investments to spur economic development, deepen and diversify industry and business in local and regional economies, and build wealth and community ownership, while prioritizing high-quality job creation

and economic, social, and environmental benefits in frontline and vulnerable communities, and deindustrialized communities, that may otherwise struggle with the transition away from greenhouse gas intensive industries;

(F) ensuring the use of democratic and participatory processes that are inclusive of and led by frontline and vulnerable communities and workers to plan, implement, and administer the Green New Deal mobilization at the local level;

(G) ensuring that the Green New Deal mobilization creates high-quality union jobs that pay prevailing wages, hires local workers, offers training and advancement opportunities, and guarantees wage and benefit parity for workers affected by the transition;

(H) guaranteeing a job with a family-sustaining wage, adequate family and medical leave, paid vacations, and retirement security to all people of the United States;

(I) strengthening and protecting the right of all workers to organize, unionize, and collectively bargain free of coercion, intimidation, and harassment;

(J) strengthening and enforcing labor, workplace health and safety, antidiscrimination, and wage and hour standards across all employers, industries, and sectors;

(K) enacting and enforcing trade rules, procurement standards, and border adjustments with strong labor and environmental protections—

(i) to stop the transfer of jobs and pollution overseas; and

(ii) to grow domestic manufacturing in the United States;

(L) ensuring that public lands, waters, and oceans are protected and that eminent domain is not abused;

(M) obtaining the free, prior, and informed consent of indigenous peoples for all decisions that affect indigenous peoples and their traditional territories, honoring all treaties and agreements with indigenous peoples, and protecting and enforcing the sovereignty and land rights of indigenous peoples;

(N) ensuring a commercial environment where every businessperson is free from unfair competition and domination by domestic or international monopolies; and

(O) providing all people of the United States with—

(i) high-quality health care;

(ii) affordable, safe, and adequate housing;

(iii) economic security; and

(iv) clean water, clean air, healthy and affordable food, and access to nature.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 68—DESIGNATING APRIL 5, 2019, AS “GOLD STAR WIVES DAY”

Mr. BURR (for himself and Mr. MANCHIN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 68

Whereas the Senate honors the sacrifices made by the spouses and families of the fallen members of the Armed Forces of the United States;

Whereas Gold Star Wives of America, Inc. represents the spouses and families of the members and veterans of the Armed Forces of the United States who have died on active duty or as a result of a service-connected disability;

Whereas the primary mission of Gold Star Wives of America, Inc. is to provide services, support, and friendship to the spouses of the fallen members and veterans of the Armed Forces of the United States;

Whereas, in 1945, Gold Star Wives of America, Inc. was organized with the help of Eleanor Roosevelt to assist the families left behind by the fallen members and veterans of the Armed Forces of the United States;

Whereas the first meeting of Gold Star Wives of America, Inc. was held on April 5, 1945;

Whereas April 5, 2019, marks the 74th anniversary of the first meeting of Gold Star Wives of America, Inc.;

Whereas the members and veterans of the Armed Forces of the United States bear the burden of protecting the freedom of the people of the United States; and

Whereas the sacrifices of the families of the fallen members and veterans of the Armed Forces of the United States should never be forgotten: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates April 5, 2019, as “Gold Star Wives Day”;

(2) honors and recognizes—

(A) the contributions of the members of Gold Star Wives of America, Inc.; and

(B) the dedication of the members of Gold Star Wives of America, Inc. to the members and veterans of the Armed Forces of the United States; and

(3) encourages the people of the United States to observe Gold Star Wives Day to promote awareness of—

(A) the contributions and dedication of the members of Gold Star Wives of America, Inc. to the members and veterans of the Armed Forces of the United States; and

(B) the important role that Gold Star Wives of America, Inc. plays in the lives of the spouses and families of the fallen members and veterans of the Armed Forces of the United States.

SENATE RESOLUTION 69—DESIGNATING MARCH 29, 2019, AS “VIETNAM VETERANS DAY”

Mr. BURR (for himself and Mr. MANCHIN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 69

Whereas the Vietnam War was fought in the Republic of Vietnam from 1955 to 1975 and involved regular forces from the Democratic Republic of Vietnam and Viet Cong guerrilla forces in armed conflict with the Armed Forces of the United States, the armed forces of allies of the United States, and the armed forces of the Republic of Vietnam;

Whereas the Armed Forces of the United States became involved in Vietnam because the United States Government wanted to provide direct support by the Armed Forces to the Government of the Republic of Vietnam to defend against the growing threat of Communism from the Democratic Republic of Vietnam;

Whereas members of the Armed Forces of the United States began serving in an advisory role to the Government of South Vietnam in 1955;

Whereas, as a result of the incidents in the Gulf of Tonkin on August 2 and 4, 1964, Congress approved the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution (Public Law 88-408) by an overwhelming majority on August 7, 1964, which provided to the President of the United States the authority to use armed force to assist the Republic of Vietnam in the defense of its freedom against the Democratic Republic of Vietnam;

Whereas, in 1965, ground combat units of the Armed Forces of the United States arrived in the Republic of Vietnam to join approximately 23,000 personnel of the Armed Forces who were already present there;

Whereas, by September 1965, between 150,000 and 190,000 troops of the Armed Forces of the United States were in Vietnam, and by 1969, the number of such troops reached a peak of approximately 549,500, including members of the Armed Forces who were supporting the combat operations from Thailand, Cambodia, Laos, and aboard Navy vessels;

Whereas, on January 27, 1973, the Agreement on Ending the War and Restoring Peace in Viet-Nam (commonly known as the “Paris Peace Accords”) was signed, which required the release of all prisoners-of-war of the United States held in North Vietnam and the withdrawal of all Armed Forces of the United States from South Vietnam;

Whereas, on March 29, 1973, the Armed Forces of the United States completed the withdrawal of combat units and combat support units from South Vietnam;

Whereas, on April 30, 1975, North Vietnamese regular forces captured Saigon, the capital of South Vietnam, effectively placing South Vietnam under Communist control;

Whereas more than 58,000 members of the Armed Forces of the United States lost their lives in the Vietnam War, and more than 300,000 members of the Armed Forces of the United States were wounded in Vietnam;

Whereas, in 1982, the Vietnam Veterans Memorial was dedicated in the District of Columbia to commemorate the members of the Armed Forces of the United States who died or were declared missing-in-action in Vietnam;

Whereas the Vietnam War was an extremely divisive issue among the people of the United States and a conflict that caused a generation of veterans to wait too long for the public of the United States to acknowledge and honor the efforts and services of those veterans;

Whereas members of the Armed Forces who served bravely and faithfully for the United States during the Vietnam War were often wrongly criticized for the decisions of policymakers that were beyond the control of those members; and

Whereas designating March 29, 2019, as “Vietnam Veterans Day” would be an appropriate way to honor the members of the Armed Forces of the United States who served in South Vietnam and throughout Southeast Asia during the Vietnam War: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates March 29, 2019, as “Vietnam Veterans Day”;

(2) honors and recognizes the contributions of the veterans of the Armed Forces of the United States who served in Vietnam during war and during peace;

(3) encourages States and local governments to designate March 29, 2019, as “Vietnam Veterans Day”; and

(4) encourages the people of the United States to observe Vietnam Veterans Day with appropriate ceremonies and activities that—

(A) provide the appreciation that veterans of the Vietnam War deserve;

(B) demonstrate the resolve that the people of the United States shall never forget the sacrifices and service of a generation of veterans who served in the Vietnam War;

(C) promote awareness of the faithful service and contributions of the veterans of the Vietnam War—

(i) during service in the Armed Forces of the United States; and

(ii) to the communities of the veterans since returning home;

(D) promote awareness of the importance of entire communities empowering veterans and the families of veterans in helping the veterans readjust to civilian life after service in the Armed Forces; and

(E) promote opportunities for veterans of the Vietnam War—

(i) to assist younger veterans returning from the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan in rehabilitation from wounds, both seen and unseen; and

(ii) to support the reintegration of younger veterans into civilian life.

SENATE RESOLUTION 70—AUTHORIZING EXPENDITURES BY COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE FOR THE PERIODS MARCH 1, 2019 THROUGH SEPTEMBER 30, 2019, OCTOBER 1, 2019 THROUGH SEPTEMBER 30, 2020, AND OCTOBER 1, 2020 THROUGH FEBRUARY 28, 2021

Mr. BLUNT submitted the following resolution; which was from the Committee on Rules and Administration; placed on the calendar:

S. RES. 70

Resolved,

SECTION 1. AGGREGATE AUTHORIZATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of carrying out the powers, duties, and functions under the Standing Rules of the Senate, and under the appropriate authorizing resolutions of the Senate, there is authorized for the period March 1, 2019 through September 30, 2019, in the aggregate of \$62,440,527, for the period October 1, 2019 through September 30, 2020, in the aggregate of \$107,021,881, and for the period October 1, 2020 through February 28, 2021, in the aggregate of \$44,592,452, in accordance with the provisions of this resolution, for standing committees of the Senate, the Special Committee on Aging, the Select Committee on Intelligence, and the Committee on Indian Affairs.

(b) AGENCY CONTRIBUTIONS.—There are authorized to be paid from the appropriations account for “Expenses of Inquiries and Investigations” of the Senate such sums as may be necessary for agency contributions related to the compensation of employees of the committees for the period March 1, 2019 through September 30, 2019, for the period October 1, 2019 through September 30, 2020, and for the period October 1, 2020 through February 28, 2021.

(c) EXPENSES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), expenses of each standing committee of the Senate, the Special Committee on Aging, the Select Committee on Intelligence, and the Committee on Indian Affairs under this resolution shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the applicable committee.

(2) VOUCHERS NOT REQUIRED.—Vouchers shall not be required for—

(A) the disbursement of salaries of employees paid at an annual rate;

(B) the payment of telecommunications provided by the Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper;

(C) the payment of stationery supplies purchased through the Keeper of the Stationery;

(D) payments to the Postmaster of the Senate;

(E) the payment of metered charges on copying equipment provided by the Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper;

(F) the payment of Senate Recording and Photographic Services; or

(G) the payment of franked and mass mail costs by the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper.

SEC. 2. COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY.

(a) GENERAL AUTHORITY.—In carrying out its powers, duties, and functions under the

Standing Rules of the Senate, in accordance with its jurisdiction under rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, including holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by paragraphs 1 and 8 of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry is authorized from March 1, 2019 through February 28, 2021, in its discretion—

(1) to make expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate;

(2) to employ personnel; and

(3) with the prior consent of the Government department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to use on a reimbursable, or nonreimbursable, basis the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

(b) **EXPENSES FOR PERIOD ENDING SEPTEMBER 30, 2019.**—The expenses of the committee for the period March 1, 2019 through September 30, 2019 under this section shall not exceed \$2,758,627, of which amount—

(1) not to exceed \$200,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 4301(i))); and

(2) not to exceed \$40,000 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of that Act).

(c) **EXPENSES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2020 PERIOD.**—The expenses of the committee for the period October 1, 2019 through September 30, 2020 under this section shall not exceed \$4,729,075, of which amount—

(1) not to exceed \$200,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 4301(i))); and

(2) not to exceed \$40,000 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of that Act).

(d) **EXPENSES FOR PERIOD ENDING FEBRUARY 28, 2021.**—The expenses of the committee for the period October 1, 2020 through February 28, 2021 under this section shall not exceed \$1,970,448, of which amount—

(1) not to exceed \$200,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 4301(i))); and

(2) not to exceed \$40,000 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of that Act).

SEC. 3. COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES.

(a) **GENERAL AUTHORITY.**—In carrying out its powers, duties, and functions under the Standing Rules of the Senate, in accordance with its jurisdiction under rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, including holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by paragraphs 1 and 8 of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Armed Services is authorized from March 1, 2019 through February 28, 2021, in its discretion—

(1) to make expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate;

(2) to employ personnel; and

(3) with the prior consent of the Government department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to use on a reimbursable, or nonreimbursable, basis the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

(b) **EXPENSES FOR PERIOD ENDING SEPTEMBER 30, 2019.**—The expenses of the com-

mittee for the period March 1, 2019 through September 30, 2019 under this section shall not exceed \$4,162,229, of which amount—

(1) not to exceed \$51,333 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 4301(i))); and

(2) not to exceed \$19,250 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of that Act).

(c) **EXPENSES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2020 PERIOD.**—The expenses of the committee for the period October 1, 2019 through September 30, 2020 under this section shall not exceed \$7,135,250, of which amount—

(1) not to exceed \$88,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 4301(i))); and

(2) not to exceed \$33,000 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of that Act).

(d) **EXPENSES FOR PERIOD ENDING FEBRUARY 28, 2021.**—The expenses of the committee for the period October 1, 2020 through February 28, 2021 under this section shall not exceed \$2,973,021, of which amount—

(1) not to exceed \$36,667 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 4301(i))); and

(2) not to exceed \$13,750 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of that Act).

SEC. 4. COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS.

(a) **GENERAL AUTHORITY.**—In carrying out its powers, duties, and functions under the Standing Rules of the Senate, in accordance with its jurisdiction under rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, including holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by paragraphs 1 and 8 of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs is authorized from March 1, 2019 through February 28, 2021, in its discretion—

(1) to make expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate;

(2) to employ personnel; and

(3) with the prior consent of the Government department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to use on a reimbursable, or nonreimbursable, basis the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

(b) **EXPENSES FOR PERIOD ENDING SEPTEMBER 30, 2019.**—The expenses of the committee for the period March 1, 2019 through September 30, 2019 under this section shall not exceed \$3,243,919, of which amount—

(1) not to exceed \$11,666 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 4301(i))); and

(2) not to exceed \$875 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of that Act).

(c) **EXPENSES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2020 PERIOD.**—The expenses of the committee for the period October 1, 2019 through September 30, 2020 under this section shall not exceed \$5,561,004, of which amount—

(1) not to exceed \$20,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of indi-

vidual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 4301(i))); and

(2) not to exceed \$1,500 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of that Act).

(d) **EXPENSES FOR PERIOD ENDING FEBRUARY 28, 2021.**—The expenses of the committee for the period October 1, 2020 through February 28, 2021 under this section shall not exceed \$2,317,085, of which amount—

(1) not to exceed \$8,334 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 4301(i))); and

(2) not to exceed \$625 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of that Act).

SEC. 5. COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET.

(a) **GENERAL AUTHORITY.**—In carrying out its powers, duties, and functions under the Standing Rules of the Senate, in accordance with its jurisdiction under rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, including holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by paragraphs 1 and 8 of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on the Budget is authorized from March 1, 2019 through February 28, 2021, in its discretion—

(1) to make expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate;

(2) to employ personnel; and

(3) with the prior consent of the Government department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to use on a reimbursable, or nonreimbursable, basis the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

(b) **EXPENSES FOR PERIOD ENDING SEPTEMBER 30, 2019.**—The expenses of the committee for the period March 1, 2019 through September 30, 2019 under this section shall not exceed \$3,534,372, of which amount—

(1) not to exceed \$15,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 4301(i))); and

(2) not to exceed \$18,000 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of that Act).

(c) **EXPENSES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2020 PERIOD.**—The expenses of the committee for the period October 1, 2019 through September 30, 2020 under this section shall not exceed \$6,058,924, of which amount—

(1) not to exceed \$40,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 4301(i))); and

(2) not to exceed \$30,000 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of that Act).

(d) **EXPENSES FOR PERIOD ENDING FEBRUARY 28, 2021.**—The expenses of the committee for the period October 1, 2020 through February 28, 2021 under this section shall not exceed \$2,524,552, of which amount—

(1) not to exceed \$10,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 4301(i))); and

(2) not to exceed \$10,000 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of

such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of that Act).

SEC. 6. COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION.

(a) **GENERAL AUTHORITY.**—In carrying out its powers, duties, and functions under the Standing Rules of the Senate, in accordance with its jurisdiction under rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, including holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by paragraphs 1 and 8 of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation is authorized from March 1, 2019 through February 28, 2021, in its discretion—

(1) to make expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate;

(2) to employ personnel; and

(3) with the prior consent of the Government department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to use on a reimbursable, or nonreimbursable, basis the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

(b) **EXPENSES FOR PERIOD ENDING SEPTEMBER 30, 2019.**—The expenses of the committee for the period March 1, 2019 through September 30, 2019 under this section shall not exceed \$4,155,132, of which amount—

(1) not to exceed \$50,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 4301(i))); and

(2) not to exceed \$50,000 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of that Act).

(c) **EXPENSES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2020 PERIOD.**—The expenses of the committee for the period October 1, 2019 through September 30, 2020 under this section shall not exceed \$7,104,057, of which amount—

(1) not to exceed \$50,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 4301(i))); and

(2) not to exceed \$50,000 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of that Act).

(d) **EXPENSES FOR PERIOD ENDING FEBRUARY 28, 2021.**—The expenses of the committee for the period October 1, 2020 through February 28, 2021 under this section shall not exceed \$2,960,024, of which amount—

(1) not to exceed \$50,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 4301(i))); and

(2) not to exceed \$50,000 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of that Act).

SEC. 7. COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES.

(a) **GENERAL AUTHORITY.**—In carrying out its powers, duties, and functions under the Standing Rules of the Senate, in accordance with its jurisdiction under rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, including holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by paragraphs 1 and 8 of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources is authorized from March 1, 2019 through February 28, 2021, in its discretion—

(1) to make expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate;

(2) to employ personnel; and

(3) with the prior consent of the Government department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to use on a reimbursable, or nonreimbursable, basis the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

(b) **EXPENSES FOR PERIOD ENDING SEPTEMBER 30, 2019.**—The expenses of the committee for the period March 1, 2019 through September 30, 2019 under this section shall not exceed \$3,348,303, of which amount—

(1) not to exceed \$17,500 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 4301(i))); and

(2) not to exceed \$8,750 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of that Act).

(c) **EXPENSES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2020 PERIOD.**—The expenses of the committee for the period October 1, 2019 through September 30, 2020 under this section shall not exceed \$5,739,948, of which amount—

(1) not to exceed \$30,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 4301(i))); and

(2) not to exceed \$15,000 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of that Act).

(d) **EXPENSES FOR PERIOD ENDING FEBRUARY 28, 2021.**—The expenses of the committee for the period October 1, 2020 through February 28, 2021 under this section shall not exceed \$2,391,645, of which amount—

(1) not to exceed \$12,500 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 4301(i))); and

(2) not to exceed \$6,250 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of that Act).

SEC. 8. COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS.

(a) **GENERAL AUTHORITY.**—In carrying out its powers, duties, and functions under the Standing Rules of the Senate, in accordance with its jurisdiction under rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, including holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by paragraphs 1 and 8 of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Environment and Public Works is authorized from March 1, 2019 through February 28, 2021, in its discretion—

(1) to make expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate;

(2) to employ personnel; and

(3) with the prior consent of the Government department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to use on a reimbursable, or nonreimbursable, basis the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

(b) **EXPENSES FOR PERIOD ENDING SEPTEMBER 30, 2019.**—The expenses of the committee for the period March 1, 2019 through September 30, 2019 under this section shall not exceed \$3,183,482, of which amount—

(1) not to exceed \$4,666 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 4301(i))); and

(2) not to exceed \$1,166 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of that Act).

(c) **EXPENSES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2020 PERIOD.**—The expenses of the committee for the period October 1, 2019 through September 30, 2020 under this section shall not exceed \$5,457,399, of which amount—

(1) not to exceed \$8,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 4301(i))); and

(2) not to exceed \$2,000 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of that Act).

(d) **EXPENSES FOR PERIOD ENDING FEBRUARY 28, 2021.**—The expenses of the committee for the period October 1, 2020 through February 28, 2021 under this section shall not exceed \$2,273,917, of which amount—

(1) not to exceed \$3,334 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 4301(i))); and

(2) not to exceed \$834 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of that Act).

SEC. 9. COMMITTEE ON FINANCE.

(a) **GENERAL AUTHORITY.**—In carrying out its powers, duties, and functions under the Standing Rules of the Senate, in accordance with its jurisdiction under rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, including holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by paragraphs 1 and 8 of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Finance is authorized from March 1, 2019 through February 28, 2021, in its discretion—

(1) to make expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate;

(2) to employ personnel; and

(3) with the prior consent of the Government department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to use on a reimbursable, or nonreimbursable, basis the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

(b) **EXPENSES FOR PERIOD ENDING SEPTEMBER 30, 2019.**—The expenses of the committee for the period March 1, 2019 through September 30, 2019 under this section shall not exceed \$5,119,003, of which amount—

(1) not to exceed \$17,500 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 4301(i))); and

(2) not to exceed \$5,833 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of that Act).

(c) **EXPENSES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2020 PERIOD.**—The expenses of the committee for the period October 1, 2019 through September 30, 2020 under this section shall not exceed \$8,775,434, of which amount—

(1) not to exceed \$30,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 4301(i))); and

(2) not to exceed \$10,000 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of that Act).

(d) **EXPENSES FOR PERIOD ENDING FEBRUARY 28, 2021.**—The expenses of the committee for the period October 1, 2020 through February 28, 2021 under this section shall not exceed \$3,656,431, of which amount—

(1) not to exceed \$12,500 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 4301(i))); and

(2) not to exceed \$4,166 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of that Act).

SEC. 10. COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS.

(a) GENERAL AUTHORITY.—In carrying out its powers, duties, and functions under the Standing Rules of the Senate, in accordance with its jurisdiction under rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, including holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by paragraphs 1 and 8 of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized from March 1, 2019 through February 28, 2021, in its discretion—

(1) to make expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate;

(2) to employ personnel; and

(3) with the prior consent of the Government department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to use on a reimbursable, or nonreimbursable, basis the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

(b) EXPENSES FOR PERIOD ENDING SEPTEMBER 30, 2019.—The expenses of the committee for the period March 1, 2019 through September 30, 2019 under this section shall not exceed \$4,224,651, of which amount—

(1) not to exceed \$150,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 4301(i))); and

(2) not to exceed \$20,000 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of that Act).

(c) EXPENSES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2020 PERIOD.—The expenses of the committee for the period October 1, 2019 through September 30, 2020 under this section shall not exceed \$7,242,259, of which amount—

(1) not to exceed \$150,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 4301(i))); and

(2) not to exceed \$20,000 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of that Act).

(d) EXPENSES FOR PERIOD ENDING FEBRUARY 28, 2021.—The expenses of the committee for the period October 1, 2020 through February 28, 2021 under this section shall not exceed \$3,017,608, of which amount—

(1) not to exceed \$150,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 4301(i))); and

(2) not to exceed \$20,000 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of that Act).

SEC. 11. COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS.

(a) GENERAL AUTHORITY.—In carrying out its powers, duties, and functions under the Standing Rules of the Senate, in accordance with its jurisdiction under rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, including holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by paragraphs 1 and 8 of rule XXVI of the

Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions is authorized from March 1, 2019 through February 28, 2021, in its discretion—

(1) to make expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate;

(2) to employ personnel; and

(3) with the prior consent of the Government department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to use on a reimbursable, or nonreimbursable, basis the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

(b) EXPENSES FOR PERIOD ENDING SEPTEMBER 30, 2019.—The expenses of the committee for the period March 1, 2019 through September 30, 2019 under this section shall not exceed \$5,451,418, of which amount—

(1) not to exceed \$75,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 4301(i))); and

(2) not to exceed \$25,000 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of that Act).

(c) EXPENSES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2020 PERIOD.—The expenses of the committee for the period October 1, 2019 through September 30, 2020 under this section shall not exceed \$9,345,288, of which amount—

(1) not to exceed \$75,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 4301(i))); and

(2) not to exceed \$25,000 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of that Act).

(d) EXPENSES FOR PERIOD ENDING FEBRUARY 28, 2021.—The expenses of the committee for the period October 1, 2020 through February 28, 2021 under this section shall not exceed \$3,893,870, of which amount—

(1) not to exceed \$75,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 4301(i))); and

(2) not to exceed \$25,000 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of that Act).

SEC. 12. COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS.

(a) GENERAL AUTHORITY.—In carrying out its powers, duties, and functions under the Standing Rules of the Senate, in accordance with its jurisdiction under rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate and S. Res. 445, agreed to October 9, 2004 (108th Congress), including holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by paragraphs 1 and 8 of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs is authorized from March 1, 2019 through February 28, 2021, in its discretion—

(1) to make expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate;

(2) to employ personnel; and

(3) with the prior consent of the Government department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to use on a reimbursable, or nonreimbursable, basis the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

(b) EXPENSES FOR PERIOD ENDING SEPTEMBER 30, 2019.—The expenses of the committee for the period March 1, 2019 through September 30, 2019 under this section shall not exceed \$5,591,653, of which amount—

(1) not to exceed \$75,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 4301(i))); and

(2) not to exceed \$20,000 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of that Act).

(c) EXPENSES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2020 PERIOD.—The expenses of the committee for the period October 1, 2019 through September 30, 2020 under this section shall not exceed \$9,585,691, of which amount—

(1) not to exceed \$75,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 4301(i))); and

(2) not to exceed \$20,000 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of that Act).

(d) EXPENSES FOR PERIOD ENDING FEBRUARY 28, 2021.—The expenses of the committee for the period October 1, 2020 through February 28, 2021 under this section shall not exceed \$3,994,038, of which amount—

(1) not to exceed \$75,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 4301(i))); and

(2) not to exceed \$20,000 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of that Act).

(e) INVESTIGATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee of the committee, is authorized to study or investigate—

(A) the efficiency and economy of operations of all branches of the Government including the possible existence of fraud, misfeasance, malfeasance, collusion, mismanagement, incompetence, corruption or unethical practices, waste, extravagance, conflicts of interest, and the improper expenditure of Government funds in transactions, contracts, and activities of the Government or of Government officials and employees and any and all such improper practices between Government personnel and corporations, individuals, companies, or persons affiliated therewith, doing business with the Government, and the compliance or noncompliance of such corporations, companies, or individuals or other entities with the rules, regulations, and laws governing the various governmental agencies and the Government's relationships with the public;

(B) the extent to which criminal or other improper practices or activities are, or have been, engaged in the field of labor-management relations or in groups or organizations of employees or employers, to the detriment of interests of the public, employers, or employees, and to determine whether any changes are required in the laws of the United States in order to protect such interests against the occurrence of such practices or activities;

(C) organized criminal activity which may operate in or otherwise utilize the facilities of interstate or international commerce in furtherance of any transactions and the manner and extent to which, and the identity of the persons, firms, or corporations, or other entities by whom such utilization is being made, and further, to study and investigate the manner in which and the extent to which persons engaged in organized criminal

activity have infiltrated lawful business enterprise, and to study the adequacy of Federal laws to prevent the operations of organized crime in interstate or international commerce, and to determine whether any changes are required in the laws of the United States in order to protect the public against such practices or activities;

(D) all other aspects of crime and lawlessness within the United States which have an impact upon or affect the national health, welfare, and safety, including investment fraud schemes, commodity and security fraud, computer fraud, and the use of offshore banking and corporate facilities to carry out criminal objectives;

(E) the efficiency and economy of operations of all branches and functions of the Government with particular reference to—

(i) the effectiveness of present national security methods, staffing, and processes as tested against the requirements imposed by the rapidly mounting complexity of national security problems;

(ii) the capacity of present national security staffing, methods, and processes to make full use of the Nation's resources of knowledge and talents;

(iii) the adequacy of present intergovernmental relations between the United States and international organizations principally concerned with national security of which the United States is a member; and

(iv) legislative and other proposals to improve these methods, processes, and relationships;

(F) the efficiency, economy, and effectiveness of all agencies and departments of the Government involved in the control and management of energy shortages including their performance with respect to—

(i) the collection and dissemination of accurate statistics on fuel demand and supply;

(ii) the implementation of effective energy conservation measures;

(iii) the pricing of energy in all forms;

(iv) coordination of energy programs with State and local government;

(v) control of exports of scarce fuels;

(vi) the management of tax, import, pricing, and other policies affecting energy supplies;

(vii) maintenance of the independent sector of the petroleum industry as a strong competitive force;

(viii) the allocation of fuels in short supply by public and private entities;

(ix) the management of energy supplies owned or controlled by the Government;

(x) relations with other oil producing and consuming countries;

(xi) the monitoring of compliance by governments, corporations, or individuals with the laws and regulations governing the allocation, conservation, or pricing of energy supplies; and

(xii) research into the discovery and development of alternative energy supplies; and

(G) the efficiency and economy of all branches and functions of Government with particular references to the operations and management of Federal regulatory policies and programs.

(2) **EXTENT OF INQUIRIES.**—In carrying out the duties provided in paragraph (1), the inquiries of this committee or any subcommittee of the committee shall not be construed to be limited to the records, functions, and operations of any particular branch of the Government and may extend to the records and activities of any persons, corporation, or other entity.

(3) **SPECIAL COMMITTEE AUTHORITY.**—For the purposes of this subsection, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee of the committee, or its chairman, or any other member of the committee or subcommittee designated by the chairman

is authorized, in its, his, her, or their discretion—

(A) to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of witnesses and production of correspondence, books, papers, and documents;

(B) to hold hearings;

(C) to sit and act at any time or place during the sessions, recess, and adjournment periods of the Senate;

(D) to administer oaths; and

(E) to take testimony, either orally or by sworn statement, or, in the case of staff members of the Committee and the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, by deposition in accordance with the Committee Rules of Procedure.

(4) **AUTHORITY OF OTHER COMMITTEES.**—Nothing contained in this subsection shall affect or impair the exercise of any other standing committee of the Senate of any power, or the discharge by such committee of any duty, conferred or imposed upon it by the Standing Rules of the Senate or by the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

(5) **SUBPOENA AUTHORITY.**—All subpoenas and related legal processes of the committee and any duly authorized subcommittee of the committee authorized under S. Res. 62, agreed to February 28, 2017 (115th Congress) are authorized to continue.

SEC. 13. COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY.

(a) **GENERAL AUTHORITY.**—In carrying out its powers, duties, and functions under the Standing Rules of the Senate, in accordance with its jurisdiction under rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, including holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by paragraphs 1 and 8 of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on the Judiciary is authorized from March 1, 2019 through February 28, 2021, in its discretion—

(1) to make expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate;

(2) to employ personnel; and

(3) with the prior consent of the Government department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to use on a reimbursable, or nonreimbursable, basis the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

(b) **EXPENSES FOR PERIOD ENDING SEPTEMBER 30, 2019.**—The expenses of the committee for the period March 1, 2019 through September 30, 2019 under this section shall not exceed \$6,280,596, of which amount—

(1) not to exceed \$116,667 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 4301(i))); and

(2) not to exceed \$11,667 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of that Act).

(c) **EXPENSES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2020 PERIOD.**—The expenses of the committee for the period October 1, 2019 through September 30, 2020 under this section shall not exceed \$10,766,736, of which amount—

(1) not to exceed \$200,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 4301(i))); and

(2) not to exceed \$20,000 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of that Act).

(d) **EXPENSES FOR PERIOD ENDING FEBRUARY 28, 2021.**—The expenses of the committee for the period October 1, 2020 through February 28, 2021 under this section shall not exceed \$4,486,140, of which amount—

(1) not to exceed \$83,333 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 4301(i))); and

(2) not to exceed \$8,333 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of that Act).

(e) **ADDITIONAL COMMITTEE AUTHORITY.**—For the purposes of carrying out its investigative powers, duties, and functions under the Standing Rules of the Senate and in accordance with Committee Rules of Procedure, the committee is authorized to require by subpoena the attendance of witnesses at depositions of the committee, which may be conducted by designated staff.

SEC. 14. COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION.

(a) **GENERAL AUTHORITY.**—In carrying out its powers, duties, and functions under the Standing Rules of the Senate, in accordance with its jurisdiction under rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, including holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by paragraphs 1 and 8 of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Rules and Administration is authorized from March 1, 2019 through February 28, 2021, in its discretion, to—

(1) make expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate;

(2) employ personnel; and

(3) with the prior consent of the Government department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, use on a reimbursable or nonreimbursable basis the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

(b) **EXPENSES FOR PERIOD ENDING SEPTEMBER 30, 2019.**—The expenses of such committee for the period March 1, 2019 through September 30, 2019 under this section shall not exceed \$1,589,010, of which amount—

(1) not to exceed \$43,750 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 4301(i))); and

(2) not to exceed \$7,000 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of that Act).

(c) **EXPENSES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2020 PERIOD.**—The expenses of such committee for the period October 1, 2019 through September 30, 2020 under this section shall not exceed \$2,724,017, of which amount—

(1) not to exceed \$75,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 4301(i))); and

(2) not to exceed \$12,000 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of that Act).

(d) **EXPENSES FOR PERIOD ENDING FEBRUARY 28, 2021.**—The expenses of such committee for the period October 1, 2020 through February 28, 2021 under this section shall not exceed \$1,135,007, of which amount—

(1) not to exceed \$31,250 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 4301(i))); and

(2) not to exceed \$5,000 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of that Act).

SEC. 15. COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP.

(a) **GENERAL AUTHORITY.**—In carrying out its powers, duties, and functions under the Standing Rules of the Senate, in accordance with its jurisdiction under rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, including holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by paragraphs 1 and 8 of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship is authorized from March 1, 2019 through February 28, 2021, in its discretion—

(1) to make expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate;

(2) to employ personnel; and

(3) with the prior consent of the Government department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to use on a reimbursable, or nonreimbursable, basis the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

(b) **EXPENSES FOR PERIOD ENDING SEPTEMBER 30, 2019.**—The expenses of the committee for the period March 1, 2019 through September 30, 2019 under this section shall not exceed \$1,708,807, of which amount—

(1) not to exceed \$25,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 4301(i))); and

(2) not to exceed \$10,000 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of that Act).

(c) **EXPENSES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2020 PERIOD.**—The expenses of the committee for the period October 1, 2019 through September 30, 2020 under this section shall not exceed \$2,929,383, of which amount—

(1) not to exceed \$25,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 4301(i))); and

(2) not to exceed \$10,000 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of that Act).

(d) **EXPENSES FOR PERIOD ENDING FEBRUARY 28, 2021.**—The expenses of the committee for the period October 1, 2020 through February 28, 2021 under this section shall not exceed \$1,220,576, of which amount—

(1) not to exceed \$25,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 4301(i))); and

(2) not to exceed \$10,000 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of that Act).

SEC. 16. COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS.

(a) **GENERAL AUTHORITY.**—In carrying out its powers, duties, and functions under the Standing Rules of the Senate, in accordance with its jurisdiction under rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, including holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by paragraphs 1 and 8 of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs is authorized from March 1, 2019 through February 28, 2021, in its discretion—

(1) to make expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate;

(2) to employ personnel; and

(3) with the prior consent of the Government department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to use on a reimbursable, or nonreimburs-

able, basis the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

(b) **EXPENSES FOR PERIOD ENDING SEPTEMBER 30, 2019.**—The expenses of the committee for the period March 1, 2019 through September 30, 2019 under this section shall not exceed \$1,633,522, of which amount—

(1) not to exceed \$4,100 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 4301(i))); and

(2) not to exceed \$16,500 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of that Act).

(c) **EXPENSES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2020 PERIOD.**—The expenses of the committee for the period October 1, 2019 through September 30, 2020 under this section shall not exceed \$2,800,323, of which amount—

(1) not to exceed \$7,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 4301(i))); and

(2) not to exceed \$28,000 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of that Act).

(d) **EXPENSES FOR PERIOD ENDING FEBRUARY 28, 2021.**—The expenses of the committee for the period October 1, 2020 through February 28, 2021 under this section shall not exceed \$1,166,801, of which amount—

(1) not to exceed \$3,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 4301(i))); and

(2) not to exceed \$11,700 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of that Act).

SEC. 17. SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING.

(a) **GENERAL AUTHORITY.**—In carrying out its powers, duties, and functions imposed by section 104 of S. Res. 4, agreed to February 4, 1977 (95th Congress), and in exercising the authority conferred on it by such section, the Special Committee on Aging is authorized from March 1, 2019 through February 28, 2021, in its discretion—

(1) to make expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate;

(2) to employ personnel; and

(3) with the prior consent of the Government department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to use on a reimbursable, or nonreimbursable, basis the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

(b) **EXPENSES FOR PERIOD ENDING SEPTEMBER 30, 2019.**—The expenses of the committee for the period March 1, 2019 through September 30, 2019 under this section shall not exceed \$1,516,667, of which amount—

(1) not to exceed \$1,500 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 4301(i))); and

(2) not to exceed \$3,000 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of that Act).

(c) **EXPENSES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2020 PERIOD.**—The expenses of the committee for the period October 1, 2019 through September 30, 2020 under this section shall not exceed \$2,600,000, of which amount—

(1) not to exceed \$3,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual

consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 4301(i))); and

(2) not to exceed \$3,000 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of that Act).

(d) **EXPENSES FOR PERIOD ENDING FEBRUARY 28, 2021.**—The expenses of the committee for the period October 1, 2020 through February 28, 2021 under this section shall not exceed \$1,083,333, of which amount—

(1) not to exceed \$1,250 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 4301(i))); and

(2) not to exceed \$1,500 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of that Act).

SEC. 18. SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE.

(a) **GENERAL AUTHORITY.**—In carrying out its powers, duties, and functions under S. Res. 400, agreed to May 19, 1976 (94th Congress), as amended by S. Res. 445, agreed to October 9, 2004 (108th Congress), in accordance with its jurisdiction under sections 3(a) and 17 of such S. Res. 400, including holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by section 5 of such S. Res. 400, the Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized from March 1, 2019 through February 28, 2021, in its discretion—

(1) to make expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate;

(2) to employ personnel; and

(3) with the prior consent of the Government department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to use on a reimbursable, or nonreimbursable, basis the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

(b) **EXPENSES FOR PERIOD ENDING SEPTEMBER 30, 2019.**—The expenses of the committee for the period March 1, 2019 through September 30, 2019 under this section shall not exceed \$3,707,448, of which not to exceed \$10,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 4301(i))).

(c) **EXPENSES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2020 PERIOD.**—The expenses of the committee for the period October 1, 2019 through September 30, 2020 under this section shall not exceed \$6,355,625, of which not to exceed \$17,144 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 4301(i))).

(d) **EXPENSES FOR PERIOD ENDING FEBRUARY 28, 2021.**—The expenses of the committee for the period October 1, 2020 through February 28, 2021 under this section shall not exceed \$2,648,177, of which not to exceed \$7,143 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 4301(i))).

SEC. 19. COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS.

(a) **GENERAL AUTHORITY.**—In carrying out its powers, duties, and functions imposed by section 105 of S. Res. 4, agreed to February 4, 1977 (95th Congress), and in exercising the authority conferred on it by that section, the Committee on Indian Affairs is authorized from March 1, 2019 through February 28, 2021, in its discretion—

(1) to make expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate;

(2) to employ personnel; and

(3) with the prior consent of the Government department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to use on a reimbursable, or nonreimbursable, basis the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

(b) EXPENSES FOR PERIOD ENDING SEPTEMBER 30, 2019.—The expenses of the committee for the period March 1, 2019 through September 30, 2019 under this section shall not exceed \$1,231,690, of which amount—

(1) not to exceed \$20,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 4301(i))); and

(2) not to exceed \$20,000 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of that Act).

(c) EXPENSES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2020 PERIOD.—The expenses of the committee for the period October 1, 2019 through September 30, 2020 under this section shall not exceed \$2,111,468, of which amount—

(1) not to exceed \$20,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 4301(i))); and

(2) not to exceed \$20,000 may be expended for training consultants of the professional staff of such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of that Act).

(d) EXPENSES FOR PERIOD ENDING FEBRUARY 28, 2021.—The expenses of the committee for the period October 1, 2020 through February 28, 2021 under this section shall not exceed \$879,778, of which amount—

(1) not to exceed \$20,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 4301(i))); and

(2) not to exceed \$20,000 may be expended for training consultants of the professional staff of such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of that Act).

SEC. 20. SPECIAL RESERVE.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—Within the funds in the account “Expenses of Inquiries and Investigations”, there is authorized to be established a special reserve to be available to any committee funded by this resolution as provided in subsection (b) of which amount—

(1) for the period March 1, 2019 through September 30, 2019, an amount shall be available, not to exceed 7 percent of the amount equal to $\frac{1}{12}$ th of the appropriations for the account that are available for the period October 1, 2018 through September 30, 2019;

(2) for the period October 1, 2019 through September 30, 2020, an amount shall be available, not to exceed 7 percent of the appropriations for the account that are available for that period; and

(3) for the period October 1, 2020 through February 28, 2021, an amount shall be available, not to exceed 7 percent of the amount equal to $\frac{1}{12}$ th of the appropriations for the account that are available for the period October 1, 2020 through September 30, 2021.

(b) AVAILABILITY.—The special reserve authorized in subsection (a) shall be available to any committee—

(1) on the basis of special need to meet unpaid obligations incurred by that committee during the periods referred to in paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of subsection (a); and

(2) at the request of a Chairman and Ranking Member of that committee subject to the approval of the Chairman and Ranking Member of the Committee on Rules and Administration.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 3—RECOGNIZING THE RICH HISTORY, HERITAGE, AND STRATEGIC IMPORTANCE OF THE REPUBLIC OF THE MARSHALL ISLANDS AND THE MARSHALLESE POPULATION RESIDING IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. BOOZMAN (for himself and Mr. COTTON) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources:

S. CON. RES. 3

Whereas the Republic of the Marshall Islands—

(1) is a sovereign country in free association with the United States under the Compact of Free Association between the Government of the United States and the Government of the Republic of the Marshall Islands (referred to in this preamble as the “Compact”), approved in the Compact of Free Association Act of 1985 (Public Law 99-239; 99 Stat. 1770) and amended by the Compact of Free Association Amendments Act of 2003 (Public Law 108-188; 117 Stat. 2720), which authorizes economic assistance, through Federal grants and programs, to persons in the Republic of the Marshall Islands; and

(2) has full authority and responsibility over security and defense matters relating to the Republic of the Marshall Islands;

Whereas, under the Compact, eligible citizens of the Republic of the Marshall Islands may reside, work, and study in the United States without a visa and may serve in the Armed Forces of the United States;

Whereas an estimated $\frac{1}{3}$ of the population of the Republic of the Marshall Islands has relocated to the United States; and

Whereas Marshallese individuals who live in the United States—

(1) offer positive economic and cultural benefits to the communities in which those individuals live;

(2) pay Federal and State taxes but are not eligible for benefits under—

(A) the Medicare program established under title XVIII of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395 et seq.); or

(B) the Medicaid program established under title XIX of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396 et seq.); and

(3) were undercounted in the 2010 census and, as a result, areas where those individuals live are underserved by the Federal Government: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That Congress—

(1) commends—

(A) the rich history and heritage of the Republic of the Marshall Islands; and

(B) citizens of the Republic of the Marshall Islands who live in the United States for the contributions of those individuals to—

(i) the communities in which those individuals live; and

(ii) the national defense of the United States through their service in the Armed Forces of the United States;

(2) recognizes the strategic importance of the Republic of the Marshall Islands; and

(3) encourages a continued commitment to improve census data to better serve citizens of the Republic of the Marshall Islands who live in the United States.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mrs. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I have 9 requests for committees to meet

during today's session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today's session of the Senate:

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

The Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, February 13, 2019, at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled “Briefing on cyber operations to defend the midterm elections.”

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

The Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, February 13, 2019, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing on the following nominations: Janice Miriam Hellreich, of Hawaii, Robert A. Mandell, of Florida, Don Munce, of Florida, and Bruce M. Ramer, of California, each to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, and a routine list in the Coast Guard.

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

The Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, February 13, 2019, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled, “America's infrastructure needs: keeping pace with a growing economy.”

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

The Committee on Environment and Public Works is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, February 13, 2019, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled “The invasive species threat: protecting wildlife, public health, and infrastructure.”

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

The Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, February 13, 2019, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing on pending legislation and the following nominations: Dennis Dean Kirk, of Virginia, to be Chairman, and Julia Akins Clark, of Maryland, and Andrew F. Maunz, of Ohio, both to be a Member, all of the of the Merit Systems Protection Board, and Ronald D. Vitiello, of Illinois, to be an Assistant Secretary of Homeland Security.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, February 13, 2019, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing on pending legislation and the following nominations: Michael H. Park, of New York, and Joseph F. Bianco, of New York, both to be a United States Circuit Judge for the Second Circuit,

Greg Girard Guidry, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Louisiana, Michael T. Liburdi, to be United States District Judge for the District of Arizona, and Peter D. Welte, to be United States District Judge for the District of North Dakota.

COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

The Committee on Rules and Administration is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, February 13, 2019, at 10:30 a.m., to conduct a business meeting.

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS AND
ENTREPRENEURSHIP

The Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, February 13, 2019, at 10:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled, "Oversight of the U.S. Small Business Administration."

SUBCOMMITTEE ON READINESS AND
MANAGEMENT SUPPORT

The Subcommittee on Readiness and Management Support of the Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, February 13, 2019, at 2 p.m., to conduct a hearing entitled

"Conditions of the military housing privatization initiative."

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME
EN BLOC

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I understand there are two items at the desk, and I ask for their first reading en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the title of the bills en bloc.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 483) to enact into law a bill by reference.

A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 8) recognizing the duty of the Federal Government to create a Green New Deal.

Mr. McCONNELL. I now ask for a second reading, and I object to my own request, all en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection having been heard, the bills will be read for the second time on the next legislative day.

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY,
FEBRUARY 14, 2019

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the

Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m., Thursday, February 14; 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; further, that following leader remarks, the Senate proceed to executive session and resume consideration of the Barr nomination; finally, that at a time to be determined by the majority leader in consultation with the Democratic leader, the Senate vote on confirmation of the Barr nomination.

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

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M.
TOMORROW

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:35 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, February 14, 2019, at 10 a.m.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. RON KIND

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 13, 2019

Mr. KIND. Madam Speaker, I was unable to have my votes recorded on the House floor Monday, February 11, 2019 due to unexpected family obligations in Wisconsin. Had I been present, I would have supported the passage of both bills considered on the floor.

TRIBUTE TO NAT "KING" COLE

HON. ADAM B. SCHIFF

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 13, 2019

Mr. SCHIFF. Madam Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the life of Nat "King" Cole, who was born one hundred years ago on March 17, 1919 in Montgomery, Alabama.

Mr. Cole is recognized for being one of the most distinguished and exemplary music recording artists of all time and as a talisman for the civil rights movement.

Nat King Cole began his music career with a focus on jazz, having founded the Nat King Cole Trio as a young man. The band quickly became an influential melodic phenomenon. He signed with Capitol Records in 1943, and the release of his first album, *The King Cole Trio*, followed in 1945. The album was widely successful as it hit the top of Billboard's inaugural album chart. The talented pianist and vocalist went on to record approximately 700 songs under Capitol Record's label, including 150 singles that appeared on the R&B, Pop and/or Country charts of Billboard. Mr. Cole's success caused Capitol Record's legendary Hollywood building on Vine Street to be informally nicknamed "The House That Nat Built."

In 1946, he hosted the nationally aired, fifteen-minute "King Cole Trio Time," which was the first broadcast of its kind to have an African American musician as a host. Mr. Cole made history once again in 1956 when he became the first African American performer to host his own network television show, NBC's "Nat King Cole Show." He also appeared in numerous films, including *St. Louis Blues* and *Cat Ballou*.

Along with his legendary musical career, Mr. Cole is remembered for his milestone leadership in the civil rights movement. After purchasing a house in the all-white Hancock Park neighborhood in 1948, he became a target of the Ku Klux Klan who burned a cross on his family's lawn. This horrific incident spurred him to help overturn a 1920's City of Los Angeles statute that allowed the neighborhood to be segregated.

Before Mr. Cole's premature death in 1965, when he was just 45 years old, his final album, *L-O-V-E*, reached number four on the Billboard album chart. At that time, Capital

Records had sold more than nine million Nat King Cole records. Nat King Cole received many honors including being inducted into the Rock and Roll Hall of Fame, receiving a Recording Academy Lifetime Achievement Award and being featured on a U.S. Postal Service commemorative stamp.

Married in 1948, Mr. Cole and his wife, Maria had five children: Natalie, Carole, Nat Kelly, Casey and Timolin. In 2008, their twin daughters, Timolin and Casey Cole, founded Nat King Cole Generation Hope to help fund music programs for schools across America.

I ask all Members of Congress to join me in recognizing Nat King Cole on the one-hundred-year milestone of his birth. Mr. Cole's life is a lesson in success despite adversity, the triumph of respect, talent and civility coupled with cultural, business and political savvy.

RECOGNIZING THE CITY OF SUMAS, WASHINGTON

HON. SUZAN K. DELBENE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 13, 2019

Ms. DELBENE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the City of Sumas, which was voted to have the best-tasting water in Washington State. I congratulate them on this exemplary achievement.

On August 29, 2018, the Evergreen Rural Water of Washington held its sixteenth annual Water Taste Test, and the City of Sumas placed first among twenty-three competitors from across Washington state. The judges graded the water samples on taste, odor, and clarity. This is the second time in seven years Sumas has won best-tasting water title in the state.

By placing first in Washington State's Water Taste Test, the City of Sumas then qualified for the Great American Water Taste Test, hosted by the National Rural Water Association in Washington, D.C. On February 6, 2019, the City of Sumas' water sample placed fifth in the nation.

I am incredibly proud to see the City of Sumas' hard work and efforts be recognized at the state and national levels.

Again, I congratulate the City of Sumas on their accomplishments and look forward to enjoying a glass of their water the next time I am in town.

CELEBRATING THE RAMONA TOWN HALL 125TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. DUNCAN HUNTER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 13, 2019

Mr. HUNTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize a celebrated moment for one of San Diego County's true historical landmarks

located in my district. It is very rare to have a piece of living history in our community, but we are blessed with such a place on Main Street in Ramona, California, with the Ramona Town Hall. It is both a snapshot of the pioneering spirit of the Old West, as well as evidence of a thriving community spirit. The Ramona Town Hall is celebrating its 125th Anniversary this year and I would like to take a moment to highlight this important achievement.

In 1894, property lots were donated to the community on which to build a structure that would serve the people of the Santa Maria Valley. Designed by architect William S. Hebbard, the Ramona Town Hall, also known as Town Hall of Nuevo and Barnett Hall, would become one of the largest, and oldest, adobe structures in Southern California and serve as Ramona's first high school, bank, library, movie theater, justice court and community dance hall.

Ramona Town Hall was also home to many of the town's religious groups while their churches were being built, as well as the birthplace of many other local organizations, including the Ramona Grange, the Santa Maria Masonic Lodge, the Ramona Pioneer Historical Society, the Ramona Chamber of Commerce, the Ramona Art Guild, the Town Hall Players and the Ramona Council of Arts, Unlimited. Events that took place at Ramona Town Hall included temperance meetings, Turkey Days, voting polls, 4-H Youth benefits, political meetings, as well as community theater and silent film festivals. The Ramona Town Hall was listed on the National Register of Historic Places in 1994.

Despite this proud history, the fate of Ramona Town Hall at times became seriously in question. Since its inception, Ramona Town Hall has operated solely on fundraisers, grant monies, private donations and rent collected for a variety of events. While always seemingly in demand, there was a very real possibility at one point of the Ramona Town Hall closing its doors. Thankfully, the people of Ramona have never allowed this to happen and, due to the faithful service and dedication of private citizens on the Ramona Town Hall Board of Trustees, they help maintain and manage the Town Hall to ensure that it remains viable, available to the community, and a continued source of local pride. I have had the honor and pleasure myself of speaking with my constituents on several occasions at the Ramona Town Hall.

I want to congratulate the people of Ramona, particularly the private citizens who volunteer their time and resources toward ensuring the Ramona Town Hall continues to serve its intended purpose. Their commitment toward this cause is a reflection of the Ramona community as a whole and provides confidence to us all that the Ramona Town Hall will continue to be a local asset and treasure for years to come.

• 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.

PASSING OF LORETTA JONES

HON. KAREN BASS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 13, 2019

Ms. BASS. Madam Speaker, I would like to honor the life and memory of a pioneer in the field of health policy, my long-time friend, colleague and fellow organizer, Dr. Loretta Jones, who passed away on November 22.

She was a founding member of the Community Coalition for substance abuse Prevention and Treatment. In fact, she was the first staff person hired and developed the Coalition's Prevention Network. That network brought together social service providers from South LA to address substance abuse in the community.

Loretta had a towering passion for justice and a caregiver's attention to detail. She founded Healthy African American Families (HAAF) in the wake of the 1992 Los Angeles uprising to engage universities, think tanks, and community members together to seek solutions to longstanding health problems, including the scourge of pre-term births in the African American community. For this work she received two honorary doctorates and, last year, she received the UCLA Medal, the university's highest honor, for her career of working to address inequalities in health and health outcomes.

She is best known for co-developing methods that give underserved communities a greater role in planning and implementing academic research. Community-Partnered Participatory Research (CPPR) calls for transparency, accountability and equal power-sharing between academics and communities. In 2007, with UCLA professor Kenneth Wells, she published the CCPR model in the *Journal of the American Medical Association*.

In doing so, she demonstrated another tenet of CPPR—that community members co-author research publications alongside academics. Loretta had that rare ability to serve as a bridge between the worlds of policy and research, and the everyday lives of the people she cared about most. She mentored hundreds of physicians, nurses, public health practitioners, social scientists and community members to do the same. Those people went on to become tenured faculty members at medical schools, state officials and senior advisers in Congress and the White House.

A native of Massachusetts, she earned a BA in psychology in 1963 and Master's degree in criminal justice in 1972, both from Northeastern University in Boston. She had been community faculty member at Charles R. Drew University of Medicine and Science since 2010. A former foster youth herself, she fostered 20 children in addition to raising her daughter. She made a real difference in the world during her 77 years.

Loretta always insisted that "Everyone deserves the right to live, everyone deserves good health care, and we are all responsible for making it happen." I mourn her passing with all of those who loved her. I am grateful for her compassion, her dedication, and the work to which she dedicated her life: to empower families to lead truly healthy lives.

TRIBUTE TO MS. SOMHITA CHATTERJEE AND RECOGNIZING THE UNI-CAPITOL WASHINGTON INTERNSHIP PROGRAMME

HON. ANDRÉ CARSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 13, 2019

Mr. CARSON of Indiana. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the Uni-Capitol Washington Internship Programme, (UCWIP). Our great nation has benefited from the cross-cultural exchange and dedication to public service that a group of remarkable Australian college students have demonstrated during their time on Capitol Hill.

The Uni-Capitol Washington Internship Programme champions the positive growth of Australian undergraduate students through leadership and development on key political issues and in crucial policy areas. For two decades, UCWIP has matched some of the most outstanding young leaders with offices in the United States Congress. I am honored, once again, to be a host this year. Though each program participant is unique, I am proud to say that the reaction to working with them is universally positive. Our interns are known for being extremely bright, and their meaningful contributions regularly exceed our expectations. This has been especially true for our UCWIP intern, Somhita Chatterjee. Somhita came to us from the University of Melbourne, as an honor student pursuing Politics, International Studies, Media and Communications. Over the past month, I have watched Somhita work as an incredible leader, making assessments that are logical and well-thought out. She is dedicated and not afraid to champion issues that are important to her. She has also taught us so much about her home country and the many values we have in common. I have absolutely no doubt that Somhita's dynamic personality and skillset will help her to be the best that she can be in all her future endeavors. Somhita's generosity in serving Hoosiers, hard work, and positive presence have all been an incredible asset to our office, and we look forward to seeing her future success.

Moreover, the program would not be where it is without a dedicated leader with a strong vision, and an unwavering spirit, making it all possible. I would like to thank Eric Federer for his continued leadership as the director and founder of the Uni-Capitol Washington Internship Programme. Under Eric's supervision, we see individual U.S.-Australia relationships are thriving, forging new friendships that are a testament to our shared prosperity. Today's political climate calls for a global vision, and I am thankful that Eric continuously works to promote the exchange of views and ideas among leaders of the future. It has been an honor to have Somhita in our office, and I thank her for her hard work and commitment to public service. I wish her the best wherever her next journey may take her.

HONORING BRIGADIER GENERAL CYNTHIA TINKHAM, FIRST FEMALE OKLAHOMA ARMY NATIONAL GUARD GENERAL OFFICER

HON. KEVIN HERN

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 13, 2019

Mr. KEVIN HERN of Oklahoma. Madam Speaker, I rise today in honor of Brigadier General Cynthia Tinkham, the first female Oklahoma Army National Guard General Officer.

This is a tremendous accomplishment, but those who know her know that this is a long overdue honor.

Brigadier General Tinkham joined the Oklahoma Army National Guard in 1989, a time when female service was severely limited. She has seen the scope of female service change drastically over her 30 years of service. For most of her time in the Oklahoma Army National Guard, she has been either the first female or the only female in her position.

But she is not one to shy away from a challenge. Brigadier General Tinkham uses her platform to encourage more women to be trailblazers in their industries and especially in the army.

I congratulate Brigadier General Tinkham on her promotion and look forward to seeing how she influences the future of the Oklahoma Army National Guard and the future of women who serve.

HONORING ARMY SPECIALIST CHAD FULLER

HON. ELISE M. STEFANIK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 13, 2019

Ms. STEFANIK. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the life, service and sacrifice of Army Specialist Chad Fuller.

Specialist Fuller was born April 8, 1979 in the City of Potsdam, New York. In high school, Chad was a star athlete and an avid outdoorsman. He had a love for animals and was a dedicated volunteer at the Potsdam Humane Society where he frequently walked and fed the animals in the shelter's care.

After graduating high school in 1998, Chad enlisted in the Army. On August 31, 2003, Specialist Fuller was on patrol in Afghanistan when his unit engaged Taliban guerillas near the Pakistan border. He was one of six snipers who came under fire during the early hours of "Operation Mountain Viper". Tragically, Specialist Chad Fuller died from the injuries he sustained during the attack.

On Sunday, February 17, The Potsdam Humane Society will be breaking ground on a new building that will allow them to improve and expand their mission. That building will be dedicated in honor of Army Specialist Chad Fuller. On behalf of New York's 21st District, I want to join the Potsdam Humane Society in honoring Specialist Chad Fuller's life of service to his community and this nation.

CELEBRATING THE LIFE OF
LIEUTENANT BOB McMAHAN**HON. DOUG COLLINS**

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 13, 2019

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Lieutenant Bob McMahan.

Born in 1933, Lieutenant McMahan was a decorated veteran of the United States Army. He served as an Army Ranger and received many awards for his outstanding service, including the Purple Heart, the Vietnam Service Medal with a Silver Star, the Army Commendation Medal, Parachutist Badge, Ranger Tab, Combat Infantry Badge, Permanent Aircraft Crewman Badge, and Bronze Star Medal, among others.

Following his military service, Lieutenant McMahan returned to Georgia where he continued his career in public service. Joining the Hall County Sheriff's Department in 1973, he worked his way through the ranks from patrolman to lieutenant. In 1980, McMahan played an instrumental role in creating the first Hall County SWAT team.

His colleagues described him as a true leader and teacher, someone you could always count on. The Department would frequently approach McMahan with difficult tasks because they knew he would "tackle them with success." He will forever be remembered as a brother, mentor, motivator and father figure to countless individuals in the Sheriff's Office.

Lieutenant McMahan was a remarkable man who was beloved by many. He leaves behind a legacy of distinguished service to our country and to our community. May he rest in peace.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. FRANK D. LUCAS

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 13, 2019

Mr. LUCAS. Madam Speaker, on Friday, February 8th, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 072; YEA on Roll Call No. 073; YEA on Roll Call No. 074; and YEA on Roll Call No. 075.

RECOGNIZING ELIZABETH
WEIDNER OF DIETERICH, ILLINOIS**HON. JOHN SHIMKUS**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 13, 2019

Mr. SHIMKUS. Madam Speaker, I rise to congratulate a young student from my district who has achieved national recognition for exemplary volunteer service in her community. Ms. Elizabeth Weidner of Dieterich has been named one of the top honorees in Illinois by the 2019 Prudential Spirit of Community Awards program, an annual honor conferred on the most impressive student volunteers in each state and the District of Columbia.

Ms. Weidner is being recognized for bringing attention to the tragedy of childhood cancer through a website, social media, speeches, lobbying efforts, the recognition she has received as a top contender in several pageants, as well as being an ambassador for this cause. I had the pleasure of meeting Ms. Weidner a short while ago. I came away from our discussion very impressed with her in-depth knowledge of government programs aimed at addressing childhood cancer as well as her passion and character.

It's crucial that we encourage and support the kind of selfless contribution this young woman has made. People of all ages need to think more about how we, as individual citizens, can work together at the local level to ensure the health and vitality of our towns and neighborhoods. Volunteers like Ms. Weidner are inspiring examples to all of us, and are among our brightest hopes for a better tomorrow.

The program that brought this young role model to our attention—The Prudential Spirit of Community Awards—was created by Prudential Financial in partnership with the National Association of Secondary School Principals in 1995 to impress upon all youth volunteers that their contributions are critically important and highly valued, and to inspire other young people to follow their example. Over the past 24 years, the program has become the nation's largest youth recognition effort based solely on community service. It has honored more than 125,000 young volunteers at the local, state and national level.

Madam Speaker, Ms. Weidner should be extremely proud to have been singled out from the thousands of dedicated volunteers who participated in this year's program. I heartily applaud Ms. Weidner for her initiative in seeking to make her community a better place to live, and for the positive impact she has had on the lives of others. Her actions show that young Americans can—and do—play important roles in our communities, and that America's community spirit continues to hold tremendous promise for the future.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BILL HUIZENGA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 13, 2019

Mr. HUIZENGA. Madam Speaker, I rise today regarding missed votes. Had I been present for roll call vote number 76, on Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass, as Amended, H.R. 1065, the Social Media Use in Media Clearance Investigations Act, I would have voted "yay." Had I been present for roll call vote number 77, on Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass, as Amended, H.R. 1079, the Creating Advanced Streamlined Electronic Services for Constituents Act, I would have voted "yay."

CELEBRATING THE ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF MR. CHRIS MOORE

HON. JIM BANKS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 13, 2019

Mr. BANKS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the many accomplishments of Mr. Chris Moore. The Fort Wayne Mayor recently proclaimed February 22, 2019, as Chris Moore Day in honor of his more than thirty years of distinguished service to the community.

Since 1989, Chris Moore has worked tirelessly to help his clients reach their financial goals and lead fiscally responsible lives. Chris is regarded as someone who builds a relationship of trust with each of his clients. This is shown in Moore & Associates Mission Statement which states, "our mission is to build a long-term relationship that is the result of those things money cannot buy: trust, purpose and accomplishment; to become and remain our client's most trusted team of advisors and staff."

Chris Moore has been a strong advocate and supporter of local charities. He donates his time and resources to ensuring that some of the most vulnerable members in our communities are taken care of. He supports local charities such as Hope House, Shepherd's House, Riley Children's Hospital, and Mad Anthony. He has been a proud sponsor of the Mad Anthony's Children's Foundation since 1995, often a participant in their Pro-Am charity golf outing. He is also a long-term fan, ticket holder, and supporter of local sports including the Fort Wayne Komets, Tincaps, and Mad Ants.

I would like to thank Chris Moore for making our community a better place and congratulate him on this distinguished honor.

HONORING THE LIFE OF MR. ALAN
CANTER**HON. TED LIEU**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 13, 2019

Mr. TED LIEU of California. Madam Speaker, today I rise to celebrate the life of Mr. Alan Canter, who passed away on January 25, 2019 at the age of 82. Alan's stewardship of his family's restaurant in California's 33rd Congressional District, Canter's Deli, was crucial in making it a fixture in Los Angeles culture and a gathering place for people of all ages and degrees of fame.

Born in Los Angeles on May 2, 1936, Alan started out as a mechanic, with a love for racing cars and tinkering with new ways to drive faster. However, on the advice of his newly pregnant wife, Alan turned to the restaurant business in the 1950s, just as the deli expanded from its original Boyle Heights location, opened in 1931, to the Fairfax district.

Though he started as a pickle packer and delivery boy, Alan eventually took over his family's deli and dedicated nearly every waking minute over the next six decades to his customers, sometimes working 18-hour shifts in a day. Alan took on all of it, even the seemingly menial tasks, like cutting fruit, pickling, selecting ingredients, and tending to the kitchen equipment.

Alan's mechanical expertise, learned from his years racing and fixing cars, kept the place running even when a machine acted up. As the family patriarch for so many years, Alan taught his children how to run the business just as his father taught him.

Canter's Deli, "the soul of Fairfax Avenue," served not only its neighbors, but also post-concert crowds, musicians, actors, and even presidents. Additionally, his selflessness and humor touched all who encountered him.

Alan is survived by his wife; son, Marc; daughter, Jacqueline; and five grandchildren. I hope that Alan's family takes comfort in knowing that his family's legacy will live on in the memories of all the customers he served and the high standards he worked so hard to establish.

HONORING FILMORE WILLIAM
HART

HON. ELIJAH E. CUMMINGS

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 13, 2019

Mr. CUMMINGS. Madam Speaker, I rise to honor my constituent, Filmore William Hart. Mr. Hart was born on December 20, 1928 in Wheeling, VA to Gretchen Hart Morton. Filmore graduated from Dunbar High School in Washington, D.C. and attended Morgan State University in the great city of Baltimore, MD. He remains an active member of Morgan State's Alumni Association.

Mr. Hart served his country with honor. He retired from the U.S. Army as a Master Sergeant and later from the Social Security Administration as well.

He married the late Marion Kahn White on May 17, 1953. During their forty-six-year union, they were blessed with four children—Sandra Lynn Hart-Harris, Jocelyn Kahn Hart-Lovelace, Philmore James Hart, and Gerard Roderick Hart—as well as nine grandchildren and four great-grandchildren. The Lord smiled on Filmore again and he married Elaine Harris on June 3, 2017. The family circle has expanded with the inclusion of Elaine's four adult children—Larry Harris, Cathy Harris-Blackwell, Michael Harris, Allison Harris-Owens—and eight grandchildren.

Filmore has been an active member of Mount Ararat Baptist Church in Baltimore, MD for over sixty years and continues to serve in numerous capacities including Chairman of the Deacon Ministry, member of the Samuel B. Redd Scholarship Committee and Triple L Senior Ministry, Sunday School teacher, and van driver. His favorite scripture is Psalms 27:1, which says "The Lord is my light and my salvation whom shall I fear." His favorite song is "On Christ the Solid Rock I Stand."

He actively participates in several community sponsored programs such as scout troop master. He has been a leader of the Forest Park Baseball Little League, serving as team coach, league President, Vice President, and Treasurer. His commitment was evident as he continued to volunteer his services for years after his sons' participation in the league.

Mr. Hart served four years as President of the Troy B. Lewis Layman's League, an Auxiliary to the United Baptist Convention of Maryland, Inc., and continues to participate in this organization. He has also been Regional Co-

ordinator for the National Baptist Association's Deacon's Ministry, provides training to various church Deacon Boards in the Maryland, Virginia, Delaware and Pennsylvania area and served in several leadership roles with the Caucus of Black Aging through the Maryland State Department of Aging.

Mr. Speaker, Deacon Hart has a deep love for family. He is a devoted father and husband. Throughout his life, he has had a "heart" for helping others. He is the recipient of several awards and recognitions as a result of his military and civilian employment, church work, and community volunteerism. I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring him on the occasion of his 90th Birthday.

IN RECOGNITION OF MR. PATRICK
THOMPSON

HON. ROBERT J. WITTMAN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 13, 2019

Mr. WITTMAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Patrick (Pat) Thompson and his service to Virginia's First District.

Pat earned his Bachelor of Arts in Public Policy Studies and Master of Arts in Christian Studies from Duke University in North Carolina. Pat served as the Director of Basketball Operations for Duke Men's Basketball team and continues to remind my staff that Duke is a powerhouse for basketball. Upon graduation from Duke, Pat commissioned into the United States Army Reserves as a military intelligence officer, deploying to Afghanistan in support of Operation Enduring Freedom. Currently, Pat serves as a Captain in the United States Army Reserves.

Pat began as my Military Legislative Assistant in February 2016 and will be concluding his tenure in February 2019. During his three years serving Virginia's First District, Pat has helped me as a staff liaison to the House Armed Services Committee but specifically aiding in my role as Seapower and Projection Forces Subcommittee Chairman and Readiness Subcommittee Chairman. Pat provided me with guidance as Congress seeks to advance the United States Navy mission of increasing fleet size to 355 ships, promoting an increase in submarines to combat foreign enemies, improving sailor training, and increasing military readiness.

Pat exercises the Army values every day with his service before self-mentality shown through his dedication and work ethic. I would like to thank Pat for the fantastic job he's done over the past 3 years. I wish Pat the best as he continues his journey on the other side of the Capitol as National Security Advisor for Senator ROGER WICKER.

Madam Speaker, I ask you to join me in recognizing Patrick Thompson for his dedicated service to Virginia's First District. May God bless Pat as he continues his career in public service.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE KNIGHTS
OF LITHUANIA COUNCIL 143 AND
THE 101ST ANNIVERSARY OF
LITHUANIA INDEPENDENCE

HON. MATT CARTWRIGHT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 13, 2019

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the Knights of Lithuania Council 143 as they celebrate the 101st Anniversary of Lithuania's independence. The Knights of Lithuania is an organization of Roman Catholic men and women of Lithuanian ancestry located in Pittston, Pennsylvania.

Organized on April 27, 1913, the Knights of Lithuania was originally established as a youth organization. Its mission was to unite young Lithuanians living in the United States, preserve Lithuanian culture, and restore freedom to Lithuania, which, at the time, was divided between Russia and Germany.

In more recent times, it has become a family organization. St. Casimir, patron saint of Lithuania's youth, is honored as the organization's patron. "For God and Country," is the motto of Knights of Lithuania, and its members keep an appreciation of the Lithuanian language and culture alive, while also stressing the importance of Roman Catholic beliefs.

It is an honor to recognize the Knights of Lithuania as they celebrate 101 years of Lithuanian independence. I am grateful for their work preserving Lithuanian traditions for the citizens of the Greater Pittston. I wish their membership all the best as they continue their important mission.

CONGRATULATING THIS YEAR'S
CENTER FOR NATIVE AMERICAN
YOUTH CHAMPIONS FOR CHANGE

HON. RAÚL M. GRIJALVA

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 13, 2019

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate the impressive accomplishments of five Native American youth who were chosen as this year's Center for Native American Youth Champions for Change.

The Aspen Institute's Center for Native American Youth, or CNAY, will celebrate its seventh cohort of CNAY Champions for Change through a series of recognition events and leadership development trainings in Washington, D.C. this week.

Today we recognize Autumn Adams, Confederated Tribes and Bands of the Yakama Nation, Shandiin Herrera, Navajo Nation, Madison White, Mohawk Nation at Akwesasne, Charitie Ropati, Native Village of Kongiganak, and Adam Soulor, The Mohegan Tribe, who will serve as representatives of the next generation of leaders in Indian Country for the next year. From Alaska to Connecticut, and now Washington, D.C., these impressive young leaders advocate on issues like decolonizing education standards, supporting victims of sexual assault, and improving child welfare systems.

For their dedication to their communities and as leaders to their peers, I would like to

congratulate them as they continue their honorable work.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JASON CROW

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 13, 2019

Mr. CROW. Madam Speaker, on February 11, 2019, I was unable to be present to cast my vote on the Social Media Use in Clearance Investigations Act (H.R. 1065) and the Creating Advanced Streamlined Electronic Services for Constituents Act (H.R. 1079). Had I been present for roll calls No. 76 and 77, I would have voted "aye" for both measures.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE OUTSTANDING SERVICE BY FEDERAL WORKERS DURING THE LONGEST GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN IN AMERICAN HISTORY

HON. RAJA KRISHNAMOORTHY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 13, 2019

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. Madam Speaker, today I rise to honor the federal workers, both in my district and across the country, who went without pay during the government shutdown.

Across the country, about 800,000 federal employees went without pay for 35 days during the shutdown from December 22nd to January 25th. This wrongheaded situation was hard on all the affected workers, but it was particularly difficult for the 110,000 affected federal employees who earn \$50,000 or less annually. Despite not being paid, more than 420,000 employees were required to work for weeks on end. Worse still, these employees had to live with the uncertainty of not knowing when the shutdown would end, and when they would be paid again. Furloughs and delayed paychecks are not the right way to treat our hard-working employees who provide critical services to Americans across the country, and they are the wrong way to run an effective and functioning government.

Despite a misguided lapse in appropriations, many workers in my community and nationwide admirably and dutifully continued working without pay. Air traffic controllers at the O'Hare International Airport, and other American airports, worked without pay to ensure planes could take off and land safely. TSA Agents worked without pay so that Americans could travel safely, keeping our economy thriving. IRS and Treasury employees worked without pay to ensure our constituents could process their tax returns and plan for their financial security. HUD employees worked without pay so that society's most vulnerable, our low-income and senior citizens, had safe housing. USDA employees worked without pay so that our food would be inspected, and so working families could receive food aid, preserving public health and family wellbeing. Employees at the National Park Service worked without pay to protect our sacred public spaces. National Weather Service Employees worked without pay to provide critical

weather information that we rely on daily for comfort and accessibility. Madam Speaker, these employees worked tirelessly for the good of their country, even when their government wasn't working for them.

Unfortunately, this lack of pay required working families to turn to food banks, food pantries and other charitable organizations. These incredible civic organizations, including many faith-based organizations and places of worship, are the lifeblood of our local communities. Their life-saving services during this difficult time will not be forgotten.

Moving forward, I am committed to working with my colleagues in a bipartisan fashion to prevent future government shutdowns at all costs so that no Americans—including federal workers and citizens who rely on critical government services—will have to suffer the consequences of another government shutdown.

To quote the late civil rights icon Martin Luther King, Jr.: "The ultimate measure of a man is not where he stands in moments of comfort and convenience, but where he stands at times of challenge and controversy." In this moment of severe controversy, and in the face of extraordinary challenges, federal workers persevered for the betterment of their community. I want to recognize the vital work and sacrifice of these brave Americans. Their outstanding performance during the shutdown will always be remembered.

CHARLES WARREN POPE

HON. DONALD NORCROSS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 13, 2019

Mr. NORCROSS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor United States Navy Veteran, Petty Officer Third Class Charles Warren Pope of Somerdale in New Jersey's First Congressional District.

PO3 Pope was born in Hope Mills, North Carolina on August 22, 1946. He joined the Navy in 1966 and during the Vietnam War he was stationed on the USS *Saratoga*, an aircraft carrier. During this time, he worked as a Yeoman to the Chaplain and earned the rank of Petty Officer Third Class.

Upon his return to the United States he was stationed in the Philadelphia Naval Yard for maintenance and repairs. In 1972, PO3 Pope made the decision to serve his community as a law enforcement officer with the Somerdale Police Department. After thirty years of protecting the lives and property of citizens, PO3 Pope retired as Chief of Police in 2002.

Afterwards, PO3 Pope continued his lifelong public service career with the New Jersey State Assembly, Sergeant at Arms. Meanwhile, for more than a decade and a half he was a substitute teacher, primarily in the special education classroom at Sterling High School.

After his service to the United States Armed Force concluded, PO3 Pope's contributions to our country continued through his service to the community, as a volunteer with the Somerdale Fire Department, serving on the Somerdale Planning & Zoning Board and presently he serves as the President of the Somerdale Fire Department.

Petty Officer Charles Warren Pope has four daughters, Dawn, Amy, Meredith and Carrie,

and three grandsons Robert, Joshua and Elijah.

PO3 Charles Pope is an honorable American, having served our great nation in a time of war, the State of New Jersey, his community and his service to the public for over a half century merits our collective appreciation.

Madam Speaker, I ask you to join me in honoring Petty Officer Third Class Charles Warren Pope for his contributions and dedication to the safety of our nation.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JACKIE WALORSKI

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 13, 2019

Mrs. WALORSKI. Madam Speaker, on Monday, February 11, I was unavoidably detained due to inclement weather. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 76, and YEA on Roll Call No. 77.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BRAD R. WENSTRUP

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 13, 2019

Mr. WENSTRUP. Madam Speaker, on February 8, 2019, I was unable to be in attendance for votes on the House floor due to the funeral of my constituent, Detective Bill Brewer of the Clermont County Sheriff's Department, who selflessly gave his life in the line of duty on February 2, 2019.

Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 72; YEA on Roll Call No. 73; YEA on Roll Call No. 74; and YEA on Roll Call No. 75.

IN RECOGNITION OF PATTI MONTALBANO, UNICAN OF THE YEAR FOR UNICO NATIONAL SCRANTON CHAPTER

HON. MATT CARTWRIGHT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 13, 2019

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Madam Speaker, I rise today in honor of Patti Montalbano, who will be named Unican of the Year by the UNICO National Scranton Chapter. She, along with her husband, Bob, will be honored on February 23, 2019 during the annual UNICO Charity Ball.

Patti Montalbano was born in Scranton to Alfonso and the late Lucy Coviello Giambrone. She graduated from St. Anthony of Padua Grade School and St. Paul's High School. She then went on to receive her Registered Nurse diploma from Mercy Hospital School of Nursing at the University of Scranton and a Bachelor of Science from Trinity University. Patti's hospital nursing career was spent in obstetrics, newborn nurseries, and the neonatal ICU. She then moved to community health nursing at the Pennsylvania Department of Health. She was a member of several health-related networking groups in Lackawanna and

Luzerne Counties and a part-time hospital clinical instructor in newborn care at Penn State Scranton Campus. Following 25 years of service Patti retired from the Pennsylvania Department of Health as the school health consultant, where she served over 59 school districts.

Patti joined the Ladies Auxiliary to the UNICO National Scranton Chapter in 2006 and then the Chapter proper in 2009. Patti was very committed to the work of the Auxiliary and was instrumental in its reorganization in 2011 and 2012. After serving as President of the Auxiliary for three consecutive years, she joined the Auxiliary Board of Directors and was elected its President. Patti co-chairs the Scranton UNICO Friday Bake Sale at St. Joseph's Center Summer Festival with her husband. In recognition of her extraordinary volunteerism and service, Patti received the Al Dante Award in 2012.

Patti and Bob Montalbano will be married for 50 years this November. They are the proud parents of Lori Montalbano Nozzi, who is also a dedicated member of UNICO's Scranton Chapter and the Ladies Auxiliary. They currently reside in Dunmore, Pennsylvania and are active members of St. Anthony of Padua Church.

It is an honor to recognize Patti and Bob as they jointly accept the Unican of the Year Award from the Scranton Chapter of UNICO National. May they continue to work for UNICO and the people across Northeast Pennsylvania for many fruitful years to come.

IN REMEMBRANCE OF MR. HERBERT "HERB" LEWIS WHITE, JR.

HON. ROBERT J. WITTMAN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 13, 2019

Mr. WITTMAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Herbert "Herb" Lewis White, Jr., who passed away on January 27, 2019. Herbert was 77 years old.

Herbert "Herb" Lewis White, Jr. was known for his love for his community which kept him active in various organizations. He, along with four others, founded King William Rescue Squad (now King William Volunteer Fire and Rescue) in 1963 and was instrumental in adding the fire department to the organization in 1965. Herb remained an active member in the organization for more than 20 years. White also volunteered with the Mattaponi Volunteer Rescue Squad for several years. He assisted the county with zoning as the chairman of the King William County Board of Zoning Appeals for 36 years and redistricting matters as a member of the redistricting committee for two years. Herb also helped maintain and refresh the county's historical properties as director of the King William County Historical Society board during the renovation of the historical Acquinton Church Project and old jail at the courthouse. Herb was involved with the county Ruritan Club and was active in the construction of the new Ruritan Community Building and Park. Herb held 22 years of perfect attendance with the club. Herb also served as director of the Prevent Blindness Mid-Atlantic organization and chairman of the organization's board for two years, a member of the Joppa Lodge No. 40 AF and AM and a devoted member of Colosse Baptist Church. He

additionally gave back to his community as Board Director of King William County Emergency Ministries and worked for many years with its Christmas Wishes program to provide gifts for those less fortunate during the holidays.

Madam Speaker, I ask you to join me in remembrance of Herbert "Herb" Lewis White, Jr. Words cannot express our gratitude. May God bless Herbert White and his family, Herb's wife, Marian, and I look forward to seeing his selfless contributions to our community continue to live on in his name.

RECOGNIZING THE SELFLESS WORK OF MARTHA COLEY

HON. DOUG COLLINS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 13, 2019

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the admirable work of a fellow Northeast Georgian, Ms. Martha Coley.

Ms. Coley began caring for foster children thirty-three years ago, and has since cared for over 100 children in her home in Hall County, Georgia. In June of 2016, Ms. Coley's house tragically caught fire and burned to the ground, forcing her to start from scratch and completely rebuild. But that did not stop her from welcoming children back into her home just six months later, as soon as she moved in.

Ms. Coley's willingness to foster teenagers makes her an especially valuable foster parent. She says that the most rewarding part of being a foster parent is when she has the opportunity to witness her foster children succeeding after they have left her home, and often times giving back to their community, just as she has done for many years. The hardest part of fostering, she says, is when they eventually leave her home.

The State of Georgia has approximately 14,400 children living in foster homes, which is why we are especially fortunate to have citizens like Ms. Coley serving our communities.

All children deserve the opportunity to lead a happy and healthy life, free from any type of abuse or mistreatment, and I want to thank Ms. Martha Coley for the many lives she has touched.

HONORING THE SERVICE OF MR. JASON WITMIER

HON. DANIEL MEUSER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 13, 2019

Mr. MEUSER. Madam Speaker, it is with great respect and admiration that I rise today to recognize the dedicated service of Jason Witmier, Assistant Fire Chief of the Pottsville Fire Department and President of the Good Intent Fire Company. Jason is ending his tenure after bravely serving the city of Pottsville and its residents for over twenty-five years.

An exceptional public servant, Jason has acted with pride, humility, and courage as a firefighter since 1991 and as Assistant Fire Chief for ten years. He has responded to

countless emergency situations, always with an eagerness to help and a willingness to comfort those who are faced with unfortunate circumstances.

Jason has spent his career safeguarding the wellbeing of his fellow citizens and improving the safety of his community, which has made him a cornerstone of Pottsville. He is a truly valued member of his community and serves as an example for his peers and younger generations to follow.

On behalf of Pennsylvania's 9th Congressional District and the U.S. House of Representatives, I want to extend my sincerest thanks to Jason for his dedicated and brave service to Pottsville. We wish him the best as he embarks on this next chapter in life.

IN HONOR OF JUSTICE BILL CUNNINGHAM

HON. ANDY BARR

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 13, 2019

Mr. BARR. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor a special man, Justice Bill Cunningham. Cunningham retired on February 1 from the Kentucky Supreme Court. He is among the two longest serving justices in Kentucky history.

Justice Cunningham is from Lyon County, Kentucky. He is a graduate of Murray State University and the University Of Kentucky College Of Law. Cunningham began his career in public service in 1974 as the city attorney for Eddyville, KY, where he served until 1991. He also served as the Public Defender for the Kentucky State Penitentiary from 1974 to 1976. He went on to serve as the Commonwealth's Attorney for the 56th Judicial District from 1976 to 1988, where his peers voted him as Outstanding Commonwealth Attorney of Kentucky. In 1991, he was elected to the Circuit Court. While he was Circuit Judge, he requested and set up a makeshift courtroom in the Eddyville Penitentiary, avoiding the risk of escape when transporting prisoners and saving money for the Commonwealth of Kentucky. On one occasion while doing his courtroom duties, an inmate charged him and physically assaulted him. In 2006, Cunningham was elected to the Kentucky Supreme Court.

In addition to being a lawyer, judge, and justice, Cunningham was a prolific author and published several books, mostly on Kentucky history. One of his books details the history of the state penitentiary at Eddyville, including the major prison riot at Eddyville in the 1920's in which several people were killed, including one of Cunningham's ancestors. He also wrote a book on the tobacco wars of West Kentucky in the 1920's.

Justice Cunningham is married to Paula and they have five sons. Cunningham is a veteran of the United States Army, serving on deployments to Germany, Vietnam, and Korea. I thank him for his service in uniform. I also thank him for his long career in the courtroom, fighting for justice and serving with integrity. After years of service, Justice Cunningham has earned a well-deserved retirement. I join other Kentuckians in wishing him all the best.

RECOGNIZING THE YOWELL
FAMILY

HON. JOHN R. CARTER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 13, 2019

Mr. CARTER of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Yowell family, who have been an integral part of our Central Texas community since 1951. Across the years, the Yowells have tirelessly served the public through their participation in numerous civic organizations. Killeen and all Central Texas owe much to these devoted individuals.

The Yowell family's commitment to investing their gifts, talents, and abilities to improve Central Texas is a deeply held creed that speaks to the generosity and activism of true and devoted public servants. Civic-minded leaders like them work tirelessly to improve their communities, leading them to new heights and positioning them to continue into a bright future.

Starting with the late Bill Yowell, this proud family has committed their time and considerable energies to a wide range of civic causes, ranging from education to veterans to economic development. Their impacts on the region are vast, ever-lasting, and cannot be overstated.

Some go through life wondering if they have made a difference. The Yowell family does not have that problem. Their passion and selfless commitment to make Central Texas a better place is an example to us all. We cannot thank them enough for the immeasurable impact they have made. God bless them always.

RECOGNIZING MARY PETTINATO,
CEO OF HONOR FLIGHT CHICAGO

HON. MIKE QUIGLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 13, 2019

Mr. QUIGLEY. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mary Pettinato and her contributions to our community, our city, and our country throughout her distinguished service as the CEO of Honor Flight Chicago. Founded in 2008, Honor Flight Chicago provides a once in a lifetime opportunity for Chicago-area veterans of World War II and the Korean War by flying them to Washington, DC to visit memorials dedicated to their service.

Following Ms. Pettinato's graduation from Northwestern University's Kellogg School of Management in 2008, she cofounded the Chicago chapter of Honor Flight. This idea came after Mary asked of her father: "If you were on your deathbed, what's one thing you would wish you'd done during your lifetime?" He answered that his wish was to visit the World War II Memorial in Washington. On the subsequent trip they took to the Memorial, Mary was inspired to not only provide this opportunity to her father, but also to thousands of other veterans living in Chicago who might never have the chance to visit this and other historic monuments.

During the decade that Ms. Pettinato served as CEO of Honor Flight Chicago, the organization organized 88 flights from Chicago to Washington. They started with sixty veterans

on their first flight; now, they fly upwards of ninety service members on each trip and have had over eight thousand veterans participate in the program over the past ten years.

In 2015, Ms. Pettinato was honored by The Chicago Tribune as one of their "Remarkable Women" in a series of profiles written about inspiring women in the area. Mary's feature focused on her love of family, and how that passion led to the creation of the Chicago chapter of Honor Flight with three other women.

In the Tribune article, Ms. Pettinato offered an anecdote that demonstrates the achievement of Honor Flight Chicago. She recalls, "I was with one man, he was 92, and he was struggling with some things and having a tough day. As we got off the plane on the return for the welcome home celebration—he (had been) in a wheelchair the entire day—he said, 'I want to walk.' And he got out of his wheelchair and he had someone on his left and someone on his right and we were holding him very firmly and he walked through this procession. Someone leaned over and said, 'Bob, how was your day?' And he stopped and said, 'I've never been to heaven, but I'm guessing today was mighty close.'"

Madam Speaker, I ask all of my colleagues to join me in recognizing the ten years of dedication Ms. Pettinato has shown to the veterans of Chicago. Through the Honor Flight experience, she has brought joy to many of our country's heroes.

HONORING THE EASTSIDE CHURCH
OF GOD IN CHRIST OF THE CITY
OF SAN JOSE

HON. ZOE LOFGREN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 13, 2019

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to the Eastside Church of God in Christ (Eastside Church), whose ministry serves the City of San Jose through service and prayer. On February 17, 2019, the Eastside Church will celebrate a true milestone, its 50th anniversary. I would like to commend the Eastside Church for its half a century of fellowship and leadership in the San Jose community.

Founded by Pastor and Superintendent Sherman Harris, the Eastside Church has been at the heart of its members most important priorities—family and faith. It serves to inspire, uplift and gather all those who seek a deeper connection with God, and their community. It offers an opportunity to worship in community with others and serve others.

In 1979, Eastside Church moved to the East San Jose after outgrowing their previous location. The Church quickly became a beacon of hope and help to the Eastside through their Outreach Ministry, providing clothing and household goods for families in need and their Food Ministry Program, which distributes boxes of food to over 100 families on a weekly basis. They take special care to provide resources and activities for children in the community with the Back to School backpack program and the Sherman Harris Youth Center. The Center offers pre-school for low-income families, sports facilities and a venue for community functions.

Through its decades of service, Eastside Church has earned its place as a trusted source of hope and comfort in the San Jose community. As the Eastside Church of God in Christ enjoys its 50th Golden Anniversary Celebration, I join in congratulating them and wishing them the best for the next 50 years and beyond.

HONORING THE LIFE OF BISHOP
VAIFANUA
MULITAUAOPELE
SUIAVA

**HON. AUMUA AMATA COLEMAN
RADEWAGEN**

OF AMERICAN SAMOA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 13, 2019

Mrs. RADEWAGEN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Bishop Vaifanua Suiava Mulitauaopele. He was a friend of many years, a trusted adviser, and a respected leader to our Samoan people in the islands and in the U.S.

A native of Laulili, American Samoa, Bishop Mulitauaopele lived a full and joyful life in the service of the Lord, and he was a blessing to far more people than any of us will ever know. Even as we feel a sense of loss at his passing, we know he would be the first to comfort us. Our hearts are with his dear wife Eva, the rest of his family and his many friends.

He served our country as well as his church, and retired from the U.S. Army as a decorated Veteran of the Vietnam War. He gave 20 years of service to medical missions in Samoa, and was engaged in an ongoing clinic project at the time of his passing that will be of great help to our people.

He was a spiritual and community leader, and always a man of great faith, compassion and integrity. He brought honor to our Samoan people. Bishop Mulitauaopele will be missed, and his life is worthy of our best memories.

At the service, Pastors Salt and their congregation sang beautiful Samoan hymns, and it was livestreamed to be available anywhere he was known.

In addition to his wife, Eva Gonzalez Mulitauaopele, Bishop Pele was also survived by his son Anthony V. Mulitauaopele (Lauren) of Inman, SC, and two daughters, Jennifer Cotton (Nikko) of West Columbia, SC, Laura Frick (Ted) of Little Mountain, SC.

He also had six grandchildren: Victor, Grant, Marla, Chloe, Callie, and Cash; and his sister, Sua Peko; and two godchildren, Lautofa and Sam. Finally, his two beloved dogs were Buddy and Sammi.

Thank you and goodbye (Soifua).

TRIBUTE TO PATRICK DEVLIN

HON. JAMES E. CLYBURN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 13, 2019

Mr. CLYBURN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a dedicated public servant and long-time Congressional aide, Patrick J. Devlin, Sr. Patrick is retiring after 31 years of Congressional service this month, and I offer him a heartfelt thanks for his contributions and wish him well in his future endeavors.

Patrick was born in Fairfax, Virginia and is the youngest of six children of the late-LTC John J. Devlin (U.S. Army) and Nancy L. Devlin of Fairfax. He credits his father, a hero of World War II and the Korean War, as his inspiration to pursue a career in public service. A talented athlete and fierce competitor, Patrick earned a football scholarship to Carroll College in Helena, Montana and graduated with a bachelor's degree in political science from Virginia Tech.

He began his career as an intern and landed his first job on Capitol Hill straight out of college, working as a staff assistant on the U.S. House Armed Services Committee under the leadership of Chairman Les Aspin. He went on to spend three years working on defense policy as a legislative assistant to Texas Representative Jim Chapman, and then served as legislative director for Connecticut Representative ROSA DELAURO, a leader in the fight to protect Medicare, Medicaid and school lunches. Patrick spent the next 11 years as Legislative Director for my good friend North Carolina Representative Bob Etheridge, working to strengthen public schools in America.

In 2008, Patrick moved to the Senate side where he served two years as Communications Director for U.S. Senator JON TESTER from Montana, the only dirt farmer in the United States Senate. Bob Etheridge brought him back to the House to serve as his Chief of Staff in 2010. Following Bob's departure from Congress, Patrick joined my staff in 2011 as Communications Director for the Assistant Democratic Leader office.

Patrick has played various leadership roles working on Democratic Congressional staffs under a diverse group of members. As a member of my senior staff, he has been intimately involved in my work on the so-called Supercommittee to determine budget priorities, the conceptualization of the Background Check Completion Act to combat the proliferation of gun violence, and the promotion of the 10–20–30 formula to target federal resources into communities of need. He is a superior writer, strategist and institutionalist. His professionalism, expertise and loyalty have been the hallmarks of his service on Capitol Hill.

He is married to Helen Devlin, and they have two teen-aged sons, Patrick, Jr. and Michael. Patrick Sr. has served as a guest lecturer at the Georgetown University Government Affairs Institute and as a Senate Press Secretaries Association board member. He currently serves on the board of the Fort Hunt Youth Athletic Association, where he has been a youth sports coach for many years.

Madam Speaker, I ask you and my colleagues to join me in expressing our sincere thanks for the service Patrick Devlin has rendered to the United States Congress. May his retirement be productive and fulfilling.

RECOGNIZING DR. SUSAN ENFIELD
AS 2018 NATIONAL SUPER-
INTENDENT OF THE YEAR

HON. ADAM SMITH

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 13, 2019

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Madam Speaker, I rise to congratulate Dr. Susan Enfield, Su-

perintendent of Highline Public School District on being named the 2018 National Superintendent of The Year by the National School Foundations Association (NSFA). The award recognizes superintendents who through visionary leadership and collaboration, develop partnership with their education foundation which grants all students the opportunity of success.

Dr. Enfield has extensive experience in education leadership, having served in several leadership roles across three states since 2003. She is a former high school teacher of English, Journalism, and English Language Learning. Dr. Enfield attended University of California, Berkeley before earning master's degrees from both Stanford and Harvard University. In addition, she holds a doctorate in Administration, Planning, and Social Policy from the Urban Superintendents Program at Harvard University. Prior to joining Highline Public Schools in 2012, Dr. Enfield served as the Chief Academic Officer, and the Interim Superintendent for Seattle Public Schools.

NSFA selected Dr. Enfield based on her advocacy efforts, commitment to her students, and work with the Highline Schools Foundation. During her tenure as Superintendent, Dr. Enfield has overseen the renovation of school facilities, promoted technology and media literacy, and developed a strategic plan to make all Highline public schools inclusive and culturally responsive.

Dr. Enfield's commitment to the students is clear. She has made it her mission to know every student by name, strength, and need. Under her leadership Highline Public School's high school graduation rates continue to improve. Dr. Enfield promotes the teaching of critical thinking and problem-solving skills and has made it her mission to properly prepare all 19,000 Highline Public School students for the future.

Madam Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I recognize Dr. Enfield as the 2018 National Superintendent of The Year and celebrate her longtime commitment to education.

RECOGNIZING THE BECK FAMILY
OF KILLEEN, TEXAS

HON. JOHN R. CARTER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 13, 2019

Mr. CARTER of Texas. Madam Speaker, I'm both proud and honored to recognize the Beck family of Killeen, TX. For decades, the Becks have made invaluable contributions toward making Central Texas a great place to call home.

Thriving communities rely on devoted public servants like the Beck family who work tirelessly across a variety of civic causes. Whether it's supporting our brave veterans or active-duty warriors, boosting local economic growth, or ensuring the region benefits from elite education facilities, the Becks have rolled up their sleeves and done the hard work to turn dreams into reality.

They don't do any of this for publicity or personal gain. Their devotion to community is about ensuring Killeen and Central Texas remain an active and vibrant place to call home. Their commitment to service before self truly reflects the very best of the generous Texas spirit.

I join the people of Killeen in saluting the incredible service of the Beck family. They've positively impacted the lives of thousands and there's no doubt that Central Texas is a better place because of them. I salute their work, share their love of community, and wish them nothing but the best for the future.

IN HONOR OF JOSHUA LAU AND
NYMBL SYSTEMS

HON. ANDY BARR

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 13, 2019

Mr. BARR. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Joshua Lau, a Kentucky entrepreneur. Mr. Lau is a first generation Asian-American from Lexington, Kentucky. His company, NymbL Systems, has been selected as a Top 10 Small Business in the United States by America's Small Business Development Centers and is the first Kentucky business to receive this prestigious recognition.

Mr. Lau is a 2012 graduate of the University of Kentucky. Following graduation, he entered the field of information technology. One of his first clients was an independently owned prosthetic and orthotic provider that serves a large veteran patient population. Working for them led Lau to fill an important need for an improved medical records software platform. The innovation and efficiency he brought to his client allowed them to spend time better serving their patients.

Josh Lau and Chad Feinberg co-founded NymbL Systems in April of 2017. They provide a cloud-based, monthly subscription application that schedules appointments, keeps patient records, and bills insurance companies. Since their founding, they have raised approximately \$2.8 million in revenue. They exemplify the entrepreneurs that are the very engine of economic growth in America. Small businesses such as NymbL Systems are at the heart of our nation's economy and I commend Mr. Lau and his colleagues for their business success and their recognition by the Small Business Development Center.

IN RECOGNITION OF STANLEY J.
DUDRICK, M.D.

HON. MATT CARTWRIGHT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 13, 2019

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Stanley J. Dudrick, M.D., Professor of Surgery at the Geisinger Commonwealth School of Medicine. Dr. Dudrick is an outstanding innovator in the medical field who has contributed to the health and survival of millions around the world through his pioneering innovations. He is recognized as one of the top 50 most influential physicians in history for his groundbreaking research. Because of his work, the lives of an estimated ten million children have been saved, and adults with a wide range of conditions have benefited.

Dr. Dudrick is best known for his development of total parenteral nutrition (TPN). Also known as intravenous hyperalimentation (IVH), TPN is a specialized central venous feeding

technique and is considered a breakthrough accomplishment in the development of modern surgery. In fact, Dr. Dudrick's invention has been acknowledged as one of the three most important advancements in surgery of the past century, along with open heart surgery and organ transplantation.

In addition to his contribution to the advancement of medical practices, Dr. Dudrick is an accomplished medical writer. He has authored or co-authored works that have received 2,535 scientific reference citations, the most for any general surgeon in medical literature. Dr. Dudrick's over 700 published works address a variety of topics related to the care and management of surgical patients, especially those with complex nutritional, metabolic, critical care, and re-operative complications. Throughout his career, he has received over 100 honors and awards, including the prestigious Joseph B. Goldberger Award in Clinical Nutrition, the Brookdale Award in Medicine from the American Medical Association, and the Flance/Karl Award from the American Surgical Association. He holds honorary fellowships from prominent surgical societies on every continent except Africa and Antarctica. In 2005, he received the esteemed Jacobson Innovation Award from the American College of Surgeons to complement his 2016 recognition as one of the most historically innovative physicians.

It is an honor to recognize Stanley J. Dudrick, M.D. for all of he has contributed to the medical community throughout his career. May he continue to inspire a new generation of medical professionals and continue to transform the medical field as he serves Geisinger Commonwealth School of Medicine.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JERROLD NADLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 13, 2019

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I was unavoidably detained on February 7, 2019, and, as a result, I missed four votes. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on roll call vote no. 68, ordering the previous question providing for consideration of H.R. 840, the "Veterans Access to Child Care Act;" "aye" on roll call vote no. 69, on agreeing to H. Res. 105, the rule providing for consideration of H.R. 840 and adopting H. Res. 86, providing for the expenses of the Select Committee on the Climate Crisis and Modernization of Congress; "aye" on roll call vote no. 70, final passage of H.R. 450, the "Preventing Crimes Against Veterans Act;" and "aye" on roll call vote no. 71, final passage of H.R. 507, "Put Trafficking Victims First Act."

HONORING PASTOR JAMES L. BETNER'S 20 YEARS OF SERVICE TO THE DELAWARE VALLEY BAPTIST CHURCH

HON. ANDY KIM

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 13, 2019

Mr. KIM. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Pastor James L. Betner, a leader in

the Baptist church and dedicated servant to his community, for 20 years of leadership at the Delaware Valley Baptist Church.

Dr. Betner has led Delaware Valley Baptist Church through a remarkable period of revitalization over the past 20 years, which has grown the congregation's ability to positively impact their community. Under Dr. Betner's leadership, the church has grown spiritually, as well as in size. He has led Delaware Valley Baptist Church to build and expand into a new worship center and has aided in the spiritual development of countless men and women. Dr. Betner also serves as a denominational leader within the Baptist Resource Network (BRN) of Pennsylvania and South Jersey, serving most recently as the Healthy Church Catalyst for all the affiliated churches in South Jersey. Pastor James is a recognized leader and one of the longest tenured and most respected pastors in the BRN.

Pastor Betner has also led the church to establish its own community development corporation, the New Vision CDC. The New Vision organization prioritizes education, economic development and employment. Through this organization and Dr. Betner's leadership the CDC has partnered with the Food Bank of South Jersey to serve as a food and clothing pantry in Burlington county serving over 1,000 people annually. The CDC also has provided an annual low-cost summer camp to school age children in the community and has given out scholarships to rising high school seniors and college freshmen annually.

Dr. Betner's life of service has created educational opportunities for young people and helped grow the Delaware Valley Baptist Church's ability to effect change in South Jersey. Dr. Betner's commitment to the betterment of our community is deeply valued by all New Jerseyans, and we look forward to seeing the positive impacts of his legacy for years to come. I thank and congratulate Dr. Betner for his 20 years of service to our community.

THE CALEXICO CARNEGIE LIBRARY 100TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. JUAN VARGAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 13, 2019

Mr. VARGAS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the Calexico Carnegie Library on its 100th anniversary. The library has served as a center of the community for a century. It was built in 1919 with a grant provided by the Carnegie Foundation to be the centerpiece of a planned "intellectual park." When it was threatened with demolition in 1993, the citizens of Calexico united to preserve this historical landmark for future generations. On September 28, 2005 the library was added to the National Register of Historic Places, honoring its cultural significance and Spanish Colonial Revival architecture.

Today, the Calexico Carnegie Library is a public technology center that serves the community daily. The library hosts classes for seniors and reading sessions for children.

I would like to honor the Calexico Carnegie Library for their contributions to the community of Calexico over the past 100 years.

CONGRATULATING HADDAD'S WEST PEORIA MARKET ON 100 YEARS IN BUSINESS

HON. CHERI BUSTOS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 13, 2019

Mrs. BUSTOS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Haddad's West Peoria Market for celebrating 100 years in business. Haddad's has been a staple in Peoria since it first opened its doors in 1919.

Haddad's West Peoria Market has held its own as an independently-run business in the Peoria community owned by Mark Whel. Haddad's family owned operation along with its friendly atmosphere and welcoming staff is what has kept customers coming back for all of these years. Often times customers run into their neighbors, friends or familiar members of the community while walking the aisles at Haddad's to pick up their favorite products and providing them with a sense of community and comfort. Local businesses such as Haddad's are a critical part of our local economy and owners such as Mark should be celebrated for all of their hard work in creating a place for the community to come together and shop locally. 100 years of business is an outstanding achievement and I wish Haddad's continued success in the time to come serving the Peoria area.

It is because of businesses such as Haddad's West Peoria Market that I am especially proud to serve Illinois' 17th Congressional District. Madam Speaker, I would like to again formally congratulate Haddad's West Peoria Market on its 100 years in business.

IN RECOGNITION OF MRS. STACY HORNE

HON. ROBERT J. WITTMAN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 13, 2019

Mr. WITTMAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Mrs. Stacy Horne, a remarkable entrepreneur, businesswoman, public servant, and leader within our Fredericksburg community.

In 1992 she started her own Allstate Agency in Fredericksburg, after having worked as a government contractor for several years. She built her business from scratch, becoming one of the largest agencies in the area. Her business grew significantly over the years winning many awards and accolades along the way. In December of 2018 she retired from her business and is focusing on the multiple organizations that she is currently involved with. She is a charter member and past president of the Fredericksburg Area Service League. She has been a member of the Citizen Review Council for the Rappahannock United Way for many years; she is serving her third term as the President of the Board of Directors for the Lloyd F. Moss Free Clinic; is a member of the Board of Directors of the Community Foundation of the Rappahannock River Region and is currently serving as Chair of the Board of the Fredericksburg Regional Chamber of Commerce. Her dedication to the Fredericksburg Area has been clear throughout her life.

Madam Speaker, I ask you to join me in recognizing the work of Stacy Horne. Words cannot capture the amount of time, energy, and emotion that Stacy has devoted to her business ventures and public service throughout her career. It is our civic duty to thank those who stand as sources of inspiration just as Stacy has exemplified within her life.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY
OF JON ANDERSON

HON. MICHAEL F.Q. SAN NICOLAS

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 13, 2019

Mr. SAN NICOLAS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and legacy of Mr. Jon Anderson. Jon was a proud, adopted son of Guam, a media influencer, and a mentor to many in the community. His recognizable voice has been over Guam's airwaves since 1977. The bulk of his career on the island was spent as a talk show host, informing the Guam public of the latest news in our community and imparting wisdom at the same time.

Jon's distinct style of journalism is easily remembered for his fairness and diligence. His calming demeanor as an interviewer and orator had effortlessly captured his audiences throughout the island and the region. Many listeners to his shows would tune in to his morning radio show to discuss various topics of interest and hear the latest issues impacting our home. He spent his life encouraging and improving the lives of those in our community and serving as a senior member and mentor in his profession.

I am deeply saddened by the passing of Jon Anderson, and I join the people of Guam in remembering and celebrating his life and the legacy he left behind. My heartfelt condolences to his wife, Mahie, and their children, Debbie, Darren, Keoki, Maka, and Tony. Jon will be deeply missed, and his memory will live on in the hearts of the people of Guam and all those he had profoundly impacted.

IN RECOGNITION OF BOB
MONTALBANO, UNICAN OF THE
YEAR FOR UNICO NATIONAL
SCRANTON CHAPTER

HON. MATT CARTWRIGHT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 13, 2019

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Bob Montalbano, who will be named Unican of the Year by the UNICO National Scranton Chapter. He, along with his wife, Patti, will be honored on February 23, 2019 during the annual UNICO Charity Ball.

Bob was born in Scranton to the late Pellegrino and Lucy DeMaio Montalbano. After graduating from Dunmore Senior High School in 1963, Bob enlisted in the Air Force. After serving four years at Bunker Hill Air Force Base in Indiana, he worked for Printcraft and Spotless Cleaners. He then worked for Emery Worldwide as the Mail and Communications Office Supervisor for thirty-three years. While at Emery, Bob was on the Board of the North-

east Postal Customer Council. During this time, Bob organized an annual golf tournament to benefit the St. Francis Kitchen in Scranton and the St. Vincent de Paul Kitchen in Wilkes-Barre.

Bob joined UNICO in 2004 and quickly became active in supporting fundraising efforts. He took over the organization of cooking the porketta for the UNICO stand during Scranton's LaFesta Italiana. Bob also served on UNICO's Board of Directors for several years, and he received the Chapter's Presidential Award in 2015 for his extraordinary service and dedication. Additionally, Bob served as a presidential aide to UNICO National President Chris DiMattio. During his tenure at this post, Bob accompanied Chris on his travels to many UNICO National events.

Bob and Patti Giambone Montalbano will be married for 50 years this November. They are the proud parents of Lori Montalbano Nozzi, who is also a dedicated member of UNICO's Scranton Chapter and the Ladies Auxiliary. They currently reside in Dunmore, Pennsylvania and are active members of St. Anthony of Padua Church.

It is an honor to recognize Bob and his wife Patti as they jointly accept the Unican of the Year Award from the Scranton Chapter of UNICO National. May they continue to work for UNICO and the people across Northeast Pennsylvania for many fruitful years to come.

CELEBRATING THE LIFE AND
WORK OF BILL FAIRBROTHER

HON. JOHN R. CARTER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 13, 2019

Mr. CARTER of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the life and work of Bill Fairbrother, the longest serving Chairman of the Williamson County Republican Party, as he retires after more than 20 years of incredible public service. With his "can-do" spirit and high-minded vision, he's a model citizen and trusted community leader.

Bill's activism started when he joined the Baylor College Republicans and over the years he has served as an officer in the Texas Republican County Chairmen's Association, precinct chairman, election judge, and on numerous committees. He's proudly represented Williamson County as a delegate to both state and national Republican conventions.

Bill was elected Chairman of the Williamson County Republican Party in 1999. Carrying out this challenging and demanding responsibility without pay or compensation, Bill has worked tirelessly to unite factions within the party, administer primary elections, and make polling locations safe and comfortable for voters. There's no doubt that he's made a real difference for the party and the people and ideals it serves.

While Bill isn't tired of the privilege of public service he knows that everything has its season and the time has come to allow the next generation of leaders to take the stage. Stepping away from his office won't give him much idle time as he likes to read, travel, watch sports, entertain, and enjoy all the great amenities that Central Texas has to offer.

Bill Fairbrother's retirement is the richly-deserved beginning of an exciting journey. I sa-

lute his work and commitment to the Williamson County Republican Party. I join his colleagues, family, and friends in honoring his career and wishing him nothing but the best in the years ahead.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY
OF FRANK ROBINSON

HON. CEDRIC L. RICHMOND

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 13, 2019

Mr. RICHMOND. Madam Speaker, I rise to honor the life and legacy of Mr. Frank Robinson, a trailblazing figure who was a Major League Baseball (MLB) Hall of Famer, the first black manager in Major League Baseball, and had an amazing career that spanned 21 seasons. Mr. Robinson passed away on Thursday, February 7, 2019 at the age of 83.

Starting out in an era when Mays, Aaron, Mickey Mantle and Ted Williams were the big hitters, Mr. Robinson more than held his own more than 21 seasons. He finished with 1,812 RBIs, hit .294, played in the World Series five times and homered in each of them. Additionally, he had a .389 on-base average boosted by 1,420 walks against 1,532 strikeouts. Extremely alert on the bases, he had 204 steals.

Mr. Robinson was born August 21, 1935 in Beaumont, Texas. He was the youngest of Ms. Ruth Shaw's 10 children. His parents separated when he was an infant, and he accompanied his mother to Northern California when he was 4. Mr. Robinson attended McClymonds High School in Oakland, California. At 14 years old, he began playing for local coaching legend George Powles, and won an American Legion national championship.

In the days before the Major League Draft, Robinson was signed by the Cincinnati Reds out of McClymonds in 1953 for a \$3,500 bonus and made his Major League debut three years later. He won the NL Rookie of the Year Award and made his first All-Star appearance that season.

During 10 seasons with the Reds, Robinson averaged 32 home runs and was a six-time All-Star. He won the 1961 NL Most Valuable Player Award and finished fourth in NL MVP Award voting in 1962 and 1964.

In December 1965, Robinson was the centerpiece in what would ultimately be one of the most lopsided trades in baseball history, going to the Baltimore Orioles for pitchers Milt Pappas and Jack Baldschun and outfielder Dick Simpson. Robinson became an instant hit with the Orioles in 1966 as the unanimous AL MVP and a Triple Crown winner.

On May 8, he became the only player ever to hit a home run completely out of Baltimore's home park, Memorial Stadium. The drive came against Cleveland ace Luis Tiant and the spot where the ball sailed over the left-field wall was marked by a flag that read "HERE" that remained in place until the Orioles left for Camden Yards in 1991.

Mr. Robinson batted .316 with 49 home runs and 122 RBIs during his first season in Baltimore. He then homered in the first inning of the 1966 World Series opener at Dodger Stadium and capped off the four-game sweep of Los Angeles with another homer off Don Drysdale in a 1-0 win in Game 4.

Mr. Robinson hit two home runs against the Reds in teaming with future Hall of Fame third baseman Brooks Robinson to win another crown for the Orioles in 1970.

Mr. Robinson was an All-Star in five of his six seasons with Baltimore, reaching the World Series four times and batting .300 with 179 home runs. He was traded to the Dodgers before the 1972 season and played for the California Angels in 1973 and was dealt to Cleveland late in the 1974 season.

Mr. Robinson hit 586 home runs and was a 14-time All-Star and the only player to win Most Valuable Player Awards in both leagues—1961 for the Reds in the National League and 1966 for the Orioles in the American League.

Mr. Robinson managerial debut came 28 years after Jackie Robinson broke the MLB color barrier as a player. He became Major League Baseball's first African American manager on April 8, 1975, as the manager of the Cleveland Indians. Mr. Robinson, still an active player, celebrated the occasion with a home run in the Indians' 5–3 victory over the New York Yankees.

Mr. Robinson also managed the San Francisco Giants, the Orioles and the Montreal Expos/Washington Nationals over the course of his career.

Mr. Robinson served as manager of the Orioles from 1988–91. In 1989, he was named the American League Manager of the Year for guiding the Orioles to an 87–75 record, 33 more victories than the previous season.

Three teams—the Reds, Orioles and Indians—have retired Robinson's No. 20. All three teams honored Robinson with statues. And he was awarded the Presidential Medal of Freedom by President George W. Bush in 2005.

Aside from being one of the great home run hitters, Mr. Robinson was innovator in his involvement of the development of the youth aspect of the game. In 2012, he was hired by MLB as the vice president of player development. He managed to emphasize important aspects such as the Urban Youth Academy and the Future Game, as well as the Civil Rights Game. He was given the special position to become Honorary President of the American League.

Mr. Robinson was not hesitant to give appreciation to the Negro League players who came before him. His youth academy empha-

sized expressing to future generations the importance of the game outreach to urban areas to keep the youth in the game.

Mr. Robinson was a trailblazer and had a huge influence on Major League Baseball. His legacy will forever be a part of Major League Baseball and his dedication to community embodies the spirit of America. We cannot match the sacrifices made by Mr. Robinson, but surely, we can try to match his sense of service. We cannot match his courage, but we can strive to match his devotion.

Mr. Robinson's survivors include his wife Barbara, and daughter Nichelle.

Madam Speaker, I celebrate the life and legacy of Mr. Frank Robinson.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, February 14, 2019 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

FEBRUARY 26

10 a.m.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

To hold hearings to examine the Semi-annual Monetary Policy Report to the Congress.

SD-106

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources

To hold hearings to examine the state of the U.S. territories.

SD-366

FEBRUARY 27

10 a.m.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation

To hold hearings to examine policy principles for a Federal data privacy framework in the United States.

SH-216

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Armed Services
Subcommittee on Personnel

To hold an oversight hearing to examine military personnel policies and military family readiness.

SR-222

Committee on Indian Affairs

To hold an oversight hearing to examine the 45th anniversary of the Native American Programs Act and the establishment of the Administration for Native Americans.

SD-628

FEBRUARY 28

10 a.m.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources

To hold hearings to examine prospects for global energy markets, focusing on the role of the United States and perspectives from the International Energy Agency.

SD-366

MARCH 14

10 a.m.

Committee on Appropriations
Subcommittee on Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies

To hold hearings to examine the Ebola outbreak in the Democratic Republic of the Congo and other emerging health threats.

SD-124

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S1285–S1336

Measures Introduced: Nineteen bills and five resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 466–484, S.J. Res. 8, S. Res. 68–70, and S. Con. Res. 3.

Pages S1325–26

Measures Reported:

S. Res. 50, improving procedures for the consideration of nominations in the Senate.

S. Res. 70, authorizing expenditures by committees of the Senate for the periods March 1, 2019 through September 30, 2019, October 1, 2019 through September 30, 2020, and October 1, 2020 through February 28, 2021.

Page S1325

Barr Nomination—Agreement: Senate continued consideration of the nomination of William Pelham Barr, of Virginia, to be Attorney General, Department of Justice.

Pages S1286–S1319

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for further consideration of the nomination, post-cloture, at approximately 10 a.m., on Thursday, February 14, 2019; and that at a time to be determined by the Majority Leader, in consultation with the Democratic Leader, Senate vote on confirmation of the nomination.

Page S1336

Measures Placed on the Calendar:

Pages S1285, S1324

Measures Read the First Time: **Pages S1324, S1336**

Executive Communications: **Pages S1324–25**

Petitions and Memorials: **Page S1325**

Executive Reports of Committees: **Page S1325**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S1326–27**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions:
Pages S1327–35

Additional Statements: **Page S1323**

Authorities for Committees to Meet:

Pages S1335–36

Adjournment: Senate convened at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 6:35 p.m., until 10 a.m. on Thursday, February 14, 2019. (For Senate's program, see the re-

marks of the Majority Leader in today's Record on page S1336.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

CYBER OPERATIONS TO DEFEND MIDTERM ELECTIONS

Committee on Armed Services: Committee received a closed briefing on cyber operations to defend the midterm elections from General Paul M. Nakasone, USA, Commander, United States Cyber Command, Director, National Security Agency, Chief, Central Security Service; Anne Neuberger, Senior Policy Advisor to Director, National Security Agency; and Brigadier General Timothy D. Haugh, USAF, Commander, Cyber National Mission Force, Department of Defense.

MILITARY HOUSING PRIVATIZATION INITIATIVE

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Readiness and Management Support concluded a joint hearing with the Subcommittee on Personnel to examine the current condition of the Military Housing Privatization Initiative, after receiving testimony from Robert H. McMahon, Assistant Secretary for Sustainment, Alex A. Beehler, Assistant Secretary of the Army for Installations, Energy, and Environment, Phyllis L. Bayer, Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Energy, Installations, and Environment, and John W. Henderson, Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Installations, Environment, and Energy, all of the Department of Defense; Christopher Williams, Balfour Beatty Communities; John G. Picerne, Corvias Group; John Ehle, Hunt Military Communities; Denis Hickey, Americas Lendlease Corporation; Jarl Bliss, Lincoln Military Housing; Crystal Cornwall; Jana Wanner; and Janna Driver.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Committee ordered favorably reported the nominations of Janice Miriam Hellreich, of Hawaii, Robert A. Mandell, of Florida, Don Munce, of Florida, and

Bruce M. Ramer, of California, each to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, and a routine list in the Coast Guard.

AMERICA'S INFRASTRUCTURE NEEDS

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Committee concluded a hearing to examine America's infrastructure needs, focusing on keeping pace with a growing economy, after receiving testimony from William Friedman, Cleveland-Cuyahoga County Port Authority, Cleveland, Ohio, on behalf of the American Association of Port Authorities; Ian Jefferies, Association of American Railroads, Chris Spear, American Trucking Associations, and Larry I. Willis, Transportation Trades Department, AFL-CIO, all of Washington, D.C.; and Matthew M. Polka, American Cable Association, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.

INVASIVE SPECIES THREAT

Committee on Environment and Public Works: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the invasive species threat, focusing on protecting wildlife, public health, and infrastructure, after receiving testimony from Senator Cramer; Slade Franklin, Wyoming Department of Agriculture Weed and Pest Coordinator, Cheyenne; Terry Steinwand, North Dakota Game and Fish Department Director, Bismarck; and Joe Rogerson, Delaware Department of Natural Resources and Environmental Control Division of Fish and Wildlife Species Conservation and Research Program Environmental Program Manager, Smyrna.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:

S. 380, to increase access to agency guidance documents, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 394, to amend the Presidential Transition Act of 1963 to improve the orderly transfer of the executive power during Presidential transitions;

S. 195, to require the Director of the Government Publishing Office to establish and maintain a website accessible to the public that allows the public to obtain electronic copies of all congressionally mandated reports in one place;

S. 196, to save taxpayer money and improve the efficiency and speed of intragovernmental correspondence;

S. 395, to require each agency, in providing notice of a rule making, to include a link to a 100 word plain language summary of the proposed rule;

S. 406, to establish a Federal rotational cyber workforce program for the Federal cyber workforce;

S. 375, to improve efforts to identify and reduce Governmentwide improper payments;

S. 315, to authorize cyber hunt and incident response teams at the Department of Homeland Security, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 333, to authorize the Secretary of Homeland Security to work with cybersecurity consortia for training;

S. 387, to prohibit Federal agencies and Federal contractors from requesting that an applicant for employment disclose criminal history record information before the applicant has received a conditional offer;

H.R. 504, to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to require the Department of Homeland Security to develop an engagement strategy with fusion centers, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute; and

The nominations of Dennis Dean Kirk, of Virginia, to be Chairman, and Julia Akins Clark, of Maryland, to be a Member, both of the Merit Systems Protection Board.

NOMINATIONS

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of Michael H. Park, of New York, and Joseph F. Bianco, of New York, both to be a United States Circuit Judge for the Second Circuit, Greg Girard Guidry, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Louisiana, who was introduced by Senator Cassidy, Michael T. Liburdi, to be United States District Judge for the District of Arizona, who was introduced by Senators McSally and Sinema, and Peter D. Welte, to be United States District Judge for the District of North Dakota, who was introduced by Senator Hoeven, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Rules and Administration: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:

S. Res. 50, improving procedures for the consideration of nominations in the Senate;

An original resolution authorizing expenditures by committees for the 116th Congress; and

Committee adopted its rules of procedure for the 116th Congress.

SBA OVERSIGHT

Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship: Committee concluded an oversight hearing to examine the Small Business Administration, including S. 84, to amend the Small Business Act to require that

consumer reporting agencies and other credit reporting companies provide certain protections to small businesses, after receiving testimony from Linda E.

McMahon, Administrator, Small Business Administration.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 66 public bills, H.R. 1153–1218; and 8 resolutions, H.J. Res. 45; H. Con. Res. 18; and H. Res. 125–130 were introduced. **Pages H1580–83**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H1585–87**

Report Filed: A report was filed today as follows:

Conference report on H.J. Res. 31, making further continuing appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for fiscal year 2019, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 116–9). **Page H1580**

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein she appointed Representative Espaillat to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H1527**

Recess: The House recessed at 10:49 a.m. and reconvened at 12 noon. **Page H1532**

Journal: The House agreed to the Speaker's approval of the Journal by a yeas-and-nays vote of 215 yeas to 199 nays with one answering "present", Roll No. 80. **Pages H1532, H1542–43**

House Democracy Partnership—Appointment: Read a letter from Representative McCarthy, Minority Leader, in which he appointed the following Member to the House Democracy Partnership: Representative Buchanan, Ranking Member. **Page H1533**

Directing the removal of United States Armed Forces from hostilities in the Republic of Yemen that have not been authorized by Congress: The House passed H.J. Res. 37, directing the removal of United States Armed Forces from hostilities in the Republic of Yemen that have not been authorized by Congress, by a yeas-and-nays vote of 248 yeas to 177 nays with one answering "present", Roll No. 83. **Pages H1543–56**

Agree to the Kustoff (TN) motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Foreign Affairs with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with an amendment, by a recorded vote of 424 yeas with none voting "no" and two answering "present", Roll No. 82. Subsequently, Representative Engel reported the bill back to the House with the amendment and the amendment was agreed to. **Pages H1554–55**

Pursuant to the Rule, it shall be in order to consider as an original joint resolution for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 116–4. **Page H1554**

Agreed to:

Buck amendment (No. 2 printed in H. Rept. 116–8) that ensures the U.S. may continue intelligence collection, analysis, and sharing operations with other nations (by a recorded vote of 252 yeas to 177 noes, Roll No. 81). **Pages H1552–54**

H. Res. 122, the rule providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 37) was agreed to by a yeas-and-nays vote of 228 yeas to 193 nays, Roll No. 79, after the previous question was ordered by a yeas-and-nays vote of 227 yeas to 195 nays, Roll No. 78. **Pages H1533–42**

Suspension—Proceedings Resumed: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measure. Consideration began Monday, February 11th.

Settlement Agreement Information Database Act of 2019: H.R. 995, amended, to amend chapter 3 of title 5, United States Code, to require the publication of settlement agreements, by a $\frac{2}{3}$ recorded vote of 418 yeas with none voting "no", Roll No. 84. **Page H1557**

Committee Resignation: Read a letter from Representative Matsui wherein she resigned from the Committee on Rules. **Page H1558**

Committee Election and Ranking: The House agreed to H. Res. 125, electing Members to certain standing committees of the House of Representatives and ranking Members on a certain standing committee of the House of Representatives. **Page H1558**

Clerk to Correct Engrossment: Agreed by unanimous consent that in the engrossment of H.J. Res. 37, the Clerk be authorized to correct section numbers, punctuation, spelling, and cross-references, and to make such other technical and conforming changes as may be necessary to reflect the actions of the House, including the change placed at the desk. **Page H1558**

Recess: The House recessed at 7:06 p.m. and reconvened at 11:37 p.m. **Page H1571**

Recess: The House recessed at 11:37 p.m. and reconvened at 11:50 p.m. **Pages H1571–72**

Senate Referrals: S. 47 was held at the desk. S. 461 was referred to the Committee on Oversight and Reform and the Committee on Education and Labor. **Page H1579**

Senate Message: Message received from the Senate by the Clerk and subsequently presented to the House today appears on page H1533.

Quorum Calls—Votes: Four yea-and-nay votes and three recorded votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H1541, H1541–42, H1542–43, H1553–54, H1554–55, H1555–56, and H1557–58. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 11:52 p.m.

Committee Meetings

OVERSIGHT HEARING: DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY'S WEATHERIZATION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development, and Related Agencies held a hearing entitled "Oversight Hearing: Department of Energy's Weatherization Assistance Program". Testimony was heard from Michael Furze, Assistant Director, Energy Division, Department of Commerce; Annamaria Garcia, Director, Weatherization and Intergovernmental Programs Office, Department of Energy; and public witnesses.

U.S. MILITARY SERVICE ACADEMIES OVERVIEW

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Defense held a hearing entitled "U.S. Military Service Academies Overview". Testimony was heard from Vice Admiral Walter E. Carter, Jr., Superintendent, U.S. Naval Academy; Lieutenant General Jay B. Silveria, Superintendent, U.S. Air Force Academy; and Lieutenant General Darryl A. Williams, Superintendent, U.S. Military Academy.

LONG TERM HEALTHCARE CHALLENGES AND LONG TERM CARE HEARING

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies held a hearing entitled "Long Term Healthcare Challenges and Long Term Care Hearing". Testimony was heard from Teresa Boyd, Assistant Deputy Under Secretary for Health for Clinical Operations, Veterans Health Administration;

and Scotte R. Hartonft, Acting Executive Director, Office of Geriatrics and Extended Care, Department of Veterans Affairs.

MILITARY SERVICE ACADEMIES' ACTION PLANS TO ADDRESS THE RESULTS OF SEXUAL ASSAULT AND VIOLENCE REPORT AT THE MILITARY SERVICE ACADEMIES

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Military Personnel held a hearing entitled "Military Service Academies' Action Plans to Address the Results of Sexual Assault and Violence Report at the Military Service Academies". Testimony was heard from Elizabeth P. Van Winkle, Executive Director, Force Resiliency, Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense; Lieutenant General Darryl A. Williams, U.S. Army, Superintendent, U.S. Military Academy; Vice Admiral Walter E. Carter, Jr., U.S. Navy, Superintendent, U.S. Naval Academy; Lieutenant General Jay B. Silveria, U.S. Air Force, Superintendent, U.S. Air Force Academy; and public witnesses.

LEGISLATIVE MEASURE

Committee on Education and Labor: Subcommittee on Civil Rights and Human Services; and Subcommittee on Workforce Protections held a joint hearing entitled "Paycheck Fairness Act (H.R. 7): Equal Pay for Equal Work". Testimony was heard from Representatives Beyer, DeLauro, and Norton; and public witnesses.

PROTECTING CONSUMERS AND COMPETITION: AN EXAMINATION OF THE T-MOBIL AND SPRINT MERGER

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Communications and Technology held a hearing entitled "Protecting Consumers and Competition: An Examination of the T-Mobil and Sprint Merger". Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

STRENGTHENING OUR HEALTH CARE SYSTEM: LEGISLATION TO REVERSE ACA SABOTAGE AND ENSURE PRE-EXISTING CONDITIONS PROTECTIONS

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Health held a hearing entitled "Strengthening Our Health Care System: Legislation to Reverse ACA Sabotage and Ensure Pre-Existing Conditions Protections". Testimony was heard from Jessica K. Altman, Commissioner, Pennsylvania Insurance Department; and public witnesses.

HOMELESS IN AMERICA: EXAMINING THE CRISIS AND SOLUTIONS TO END HOMELESSNESS

Committee on Financial Services: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “Homeless in America: Examining the Crisis and Solutions to End Homelessness”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

CHALLENGES AND SOLUTIONS: ACCESS TO BANKING SERVICES FOR CANNABIS-RELATED BUSINESSES

Committee on Financial Services: Subcommittee on Consumer Protection and Financial Institutions held a hearing entitled “Challenges and Solutions: Access to Banking Services for Cannabis-Related Businesses”. Testimony was heard from Fiona Ma, State Treasurer, California; and public witnesses.

VENEZUELA AT A CROSSROADS

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “Venezuela at a Crossroads”. Testimony was heard from Elliott Abrams, U.S. Special Representative for Venezuela, Department of State; Sandra Oudkirk, Deputy Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Energy Resources, Department of State; and Steve Olive, Acting Assistant Administrator, Bureau for Latin America and the Caribbean, U.S. Agency for International Development.

DEFENDING OUR DEMOCRACY: BUILDING PARTNERSHIPS TO PROTECT AMERICA’S ELECTIONS

Committee on Homeland Security: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “Defending Our Democracy: Building Partnerships to Protect America’s Elections”. Testimony was heard from Christopher C. Krebs, Director, Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency, Department of Homeland Security; Thomas Hicks, Commissioner, U.S. Election Assistance Commission; Alex Padilla, Secretary of State, California; John Merrill, Secretary of State, Alabama; and public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on the Judiciary: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 8, the “Bipartisan Background Checks Act of 2019”; and H.R. 1112, the “Enhanced Background Checks Act of 2019”. H.R. 8 and H.R. 1112 were ordered reported, as amended.

CLIMATE CHANGE AND PUBLIC LANDS: EXAMINING IMPACTS AND CONSIDERING ADAPTATION OPPORTUNITIES

Committee on Natural Resources: Subcommittee on National Parks, Forests, and Public Lands held a hearing entitled “Climate Change and Public Lands: Examining Impacts and Considering Adaptation Op-

portunities”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

THE STATE OF CLIMATE SCIENCE AND WHY IT MATTERS

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “The State of Climate Science and Why it Matters”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

SMALL BUSINESS PRIORITIES FOR THE 116TH CONGRESS

Committee on Small Business: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “Small Business Priorities for the 116th Congress”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

PUTTING U.S. AVIATION AT RISK: THE IMPACT OF THE SHUTDOWN

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Subcommittee on Aviation held a hearing entitled “Putting U.S. Aviation at Risk: The Impact of the Shutdown”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

ORGANIZATIONAL MEETING

Committee on Veterans’ Affairs: Full Committee held an organizational meeting. The Committee adopted its Rules for the 116th Congress.

HOW MIDDLE CLASS FAMILIES ARE FARING IN TODAY’S ECONOMY

Committee on Ways and Means: Subcommittee on Select Revenue Measures held a hearing entitled “How Middle Class Families are Faring in Today’s Economy”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

Joint Meetings

ASSET RECOVERY IN EURASIA

Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe. Commission received a briefing on asset recovery in Eurasia from Bryan Earl, former Supervisory Special Agent and Assistant General Counsel, and Karen Greenaway, former Supervisory Special Agent, both of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Department of Justice; Sona Ayvazyan, Transparency International Armenia; and Kristian Lasslett, Ulster University.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 14, 2019

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Armed Services: to hold hearings to examine United States Special Operations Command and United

States Cyber Command in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2020 and the Future Years Defense Program, 9:30 a.m., SD-G50.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: to hold hearings to examine the nominations of Bimal Patel, of Georgia, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, Todd M. Harper, of Virginia, and Rodney Hood, of North Carolina, both to be a Member of the National Credit Union Administration Board, and Mark Anthony Calabria, of Virginia, to be Director of the Federal Housing Finance Agency, 10 a.m., SD-538.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: to hold hearings to examine the status and outlook for cybersecurity efforts in the energy industry, 10 a.m., SD-366.

Select Committee on Intelligence: to receive a closed briefing on certain intelligence matters, 2 p.m., SH-219.

House

Committee on House Administration, February 14, Full Committee, hearing entitled “For the People: Our American Democracy”, 8:30 a.m., 1310 Longworth.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

10 a.m., Thursday, February 14

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

10 a.m., Thursday, February 14

Senate Chamber

Program for Thursday: Senate will continue consideration of the nomination of William Pelham Barr, of Virginia, to be Attorney General, Department of Justice, post-cloture, and at a time to be determined by the two Leaders, vote on confirmation of the nomination.

House Chamber

Program for Thursday: To be announced.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Banks, Jim, Ind., E167
 Barr, Andy, Ky., E170, E172
 Bass, Karen, Calif., E166
 Bustos, Cheri, Ill., E173
 Carson, André, Ind., E166
 Carter, John R., Tex., E171, E172, E174
 Cartwright, Matt, Pa., E168, E169, E172, E174
 Clyburn, James E., S.C., E171
 Collins, Doug, Ga., E167, E170
 Crow, Jason, Col., E169
 Cummings, Elijah E., Md., E168
 DelBene, Suzan K., Wash., E165

Grijalva, Raúl M., Ariz., E168
 Hern, Kevin, Okla., E166
 Huizenga, Bill, Mich., E167
 Hunter, Duncan, Calif., E165
 Kim, Andy, N.J., E173
 Kind, Ron, Wisc., E165
 Lieu, Ted, Calif., E167
 Lofgren, Zoe, Calif., E171
 Lucas, Frank D., Okla., E167
 Meuser, Daniel, Pa., E170
 Nadler, Jerrold, N.Y., E173
 Norcross, Donald, N.J., E169
 Quigley, Mike, Ill., E171

Radewagen, Aumua Amata Coleman, American Samoa, E171
 Raja, Krishnamoorthi, Ill., E169
 Richmond, Cedric L., La., E174
 San Nicolas, Michael F.Q., Guam, E174
 Schiff, Adam B., Calif., E165
 Shimkus, John, Ill., E167
 Smith, Adam, Wash., E172
 Stefanik, Elise M., N.Y., E166
 Vargas, Juan, Calif., E173
 Walorski, Jackie, Ind., E169
 Wenstrup, Brad R., Ohio, E169
 Wittman, Robert J., Va., E168, E170, E173



Congressional Record

printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through the U.S. Government Publishing Office, at www.govinfo.gov, free of charge to the user. The information is updated online each day the *Congressional Record* is published. For more information, contact the GPO Customer Contact Center, U.S. Government Publishing Office. Phone 202-512-1800, or 866-512-1800 (toll-free). E-Mail, contactcenter@gpo.gov. ¶To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 979050, St. Louis, MO 63197-9000, or phone orders to 866-512-1800 (toll-free), 202-512-1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202-512-2104. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Publishing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.

The *Congressional Record* (USPS 087-390). The Periodicals postage is paid at Washington, D.C. The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are